

Chris Par

A Human Declaration of Freedom

Human Rights 162

Glauz-Todrank

2009: 9 Days After 4/20

A Human Declaration of Freedom

Freedom is but a concept of ever-changing ideas; for centuries, we human beings have been trying to define those rights with which freedom entails, preferably to be legally enforced (Wronka; 25, Donnelly; 11; 23, Hajjar; 390; 593; 595, An-Na'im; 167).

And it don't stop.

Thanks to time.

Times change, people change.

Generations change.

Values and morals CHANGE—it used to be ok to own blacks (Keck;42, Wronka; 493;8).

Thankfully, society also changes with time as we develop (Wronka; 34-88).

And as we've developed over time, we've periodically produced countless documents attempting to declare—in justice of—our rights, declaring independence, writing bills, even going as far as explicitly enumerating them one by one (Wronka; 32, Donnelly; 12, Hajjar; 597). However, as proven, even a clearly stated list of rights, such as those listed in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, is futile without freedom.

Slaves in the colonies did not have these rights.

In fact, did slaves *have* rights?

Their life in exchange for labor...

And, that's about it.

Article 29 of the UDHR explicitly states that no one shall be held in slavery or servitude.

The blacks are free, but look who's doing all the work now (Keck; 43).

We got slavery going on today in the United States of 2009;

Oh yeah (Keck; 40).

We got servitude going on in every form possible,

in the form of the division of labor, sex, drugs, and rock and roll (Yew; 3).

You can have it all...

All for the small fee of your life (Wronka; 32; 84, Pollis; 317; 319).

Yeah, we'll pay you for your life, your life of [labor] service to our nation:

You can be in service of making medicine available for the people of our nation.

You can be in service of making food available for the people of our nation.

You can be in service of making cars available for the people of our nation.

You can be in service of making oil available for the people of our nation.

Aren't those all you need in life. You don't even need a lot of medicine really, but you need food to stay healthy enough to pump gas in your car so you can drive to work and get paid for the 8 hours of service you provide 5 days out of the week for the people of our nation so we can all buy gas for the cars that we bought to drive to work and make money to buy food and medicine so we can all stay healthy and alive (Wronka; 32).

Communism is the same shit, except you don't get paid, and you're STILL forced to do slave labor, *work for the good of man* (Yew; 3). Political rights before human rights—wack.

When you're first conceived, your mother gave you the right to life for free (Wronka; 76). You're free to have the right to life. It doesn't cost money.

Life is not an economic right.

Rather, it's purely a human right (Wronka; 26, Pollis; 319).

You have the human right to travel (Wronka; 33) –train to Peru, it's free because a programmed GPS computer is steering and you don't have to pay that computer for it's service of labor. In fact, now everything you need to be alive won't need to be paid for.

What, how?

If your job fits under one of these categories of service you provide for your country that your brothers and sisters are dying for in Iraq, [click here](#) for a list of contact info for computer engineers that will build a slave robot to do your 8 hours of dirty work 5 days out of the week to be in service of making everything you need in life available to everyone in the world, instead of you, so you can be free—it's a school project.

“Freedom in capitalist society always remains just about the same as it was in the ancient Greek republics: freedom for the slave-owners” (Wronka; 81).

You are now a robot slave owner. No, not artificial intelligence, just programmed motor machines, such as [click here](#).

Now you're free from a job.

Huh!?

Free from a job?

That's TRUE FREEDOM!!!

Dude, you're gonna have so much free time.

What are you gonna do with all that free time?

As long as you do not fuck with anyone else's right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, enjoy your freedom to the right of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness (Wronka; 77, Wronka; 80, Donnelly; 15).

Otherwise, we'll kick your ass. Not too hard though, unless you really fuck up.

Otherwise, exercise your God-given rights to life, that your mamma gave ya.

That's the way the law should work.

And try to live your life by some of Jesus' teachings. They never hurt anyone.

Not one of his teachings ever taught to cause any evil in this world, nor have they.

In fact, his teachings were about being good and not doing evil things like killing, stealing, lying, and fucking your roommate's girlfriend (Wronka; 39).

10 Commandments and the Golden Rule:

that's all ya need, man.

If everyone just decided to be good,

since you have the God-given right to make a decision,

maybe the world would be at peace.

And together, we'll live as one.

Be with and do what you love—play ball, make art, music, movies, kick it, Xbox,
what's your hobby?

Take that trip to Peru.

Take care,

Chris par loves everyone I ever met and will always fight for freedom (Mutua; 3).

I'm dying every second I'm a alive, so I'm gonna live my life every second before I die.
Every Guacho knows, when the work's done, the party don't stop 'til 6 in the mornin'
[and technology did it for us so we could be]. Peace to IV. And Jesus' first. Love you
Mom and Dad! (Yew; 4)

Let's use
all of the
state's and government's
money
to fund
these computer engineers and
the destruction
of everything
and reconstruction
of eco-friendly, renewable resource luxury,

million dollar type--homes and public transportation systems
as well as online education systems
with volunteer teachers with pre-recorded
curriculum-permanent lectures on tape that are
accessible to all
anytime, anywhere,
for free on You Tube video
via iPhone;
those should be funded to be in the hands of
every human as well in order to
to inspire innovation and networking.
Welcome back to the renaissance,
the human first.
Man over money, not money over man.
Let's just chill out,
live like every day is Friday
or Summer after 9th grade
or retirement at the age of 0, it's a life-long vacation.
You deserve it:
you're human (Donnelly; 23, Wronka; 31, Keck; 43,
Hajjar; 593, An-Na'im; 167, Yew; 16, Pollis; 321, Mutua; 3).
Exercise your free right to life.

Will anybody
Anybody listen to
My plea
For
Peace
Love
Life
Liberty
And the Pursuit of happiness?
And Jesus, of course.

Chris Par

A Human Declaration of Freedom

Glauz-Toudrank

Human Rights 162

12 May 2009

A Human Declaration of Freedom

Human rights discourse in law concerning human rights as legal rights and the discrepancy between universalists and cultural relativists could be straightened out should every human rights claim be interpreted by the root rights behind every human right, that is, those rights as declared by the United States Declaration of Independence to be [universally] unalienable to all men, among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

When universalists respect the cultural relativist claim to interpret the law by the universal human right to liberty, in respect to cultural relativist practices which do not impede anyone's personal interpretation of their right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, everyone can agree and the law should reflect that in legal interpretation, protection, and enforcement. For example, if being beat by your husband sounds like a good time, as in that's your idea of your pursuit of happiness because you're practicing that which your religion [Islam] claims to be normal, **you should, by law, have a just cultural relativist claim to the universal human right to liberty, the right to do as you please as long as it does not impede the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness of anyone else—involved or affected.** However, once someone's right to life, liberty, and/or the pursuit of happiness is violated, a universal human right is violated and thus supersedes any cultural relativist human rights claim against it. For

example, you can't just go around beating random women that don't accept that practice as their religious norm because that violates *their* universal right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Law comes down to an interpretation of the right to life. Then, law comes down to an interpretation of the right to liberty. And finally, law comes down to an interpretation of the right to the pursuit of happiness.

All law concerning human rights and legal rights should be interpreted in respect to the unalienable [human] rights of all men, among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of.

The law in the United States does not fully protect our unalienable human rights as legal rights because the right to life is violated in the current monetary system.

It's the right to life that allows the right to liberty and the pursuit of happiness; the latter two are impossible without the right to life.

It's the right to life that the current monetary system in itself—just the current design in the way it works that if one does not work [do labor] to make money, one won't have money to buy food, therefore one would not eat; thus, one would starve and eventually die—is in violation of.

In the current monetary system, one is forced to do labor to make money to stay alive.

For society to run its current course, there's work to be done, and if one does not pitch in and do their part of the labor, one won't make money, thus one won't have money to buy those things necessary to life and die; so one has no choice, *one is forced to do labor to make money to stay alive.*

So, *one is* forced to do labor in exchange for the right to life.

Forced labor in exchange for the right to life is a form of slavery—but someone's gotta do the work.

From black slavery in Virginia during the colonial days to the working class of America today, slave labor has shifted from forced to forced and paid, delegated and race specific to globally assigned and nondiscriminatory (Keck; 42, Wronka; 493; 8). In the land of the free, free, in the context of freedom, is misconstrued.

All the human rights that should come with freedom are not being protected legally by the state because although there are all kinds of documents declaring all those human rights, these documents are irrelevant to the state enforcement of human rights as legal rights to those who do not have freedom, the slaves. Black slaves in Virginia only had the right to life in exchange for doing labor. Modern American wage-slaves, as Karl Marx puts it, also have the right to life, but in exchange for doing *paid* labor; without paid labor, one would not have the money for food, water, or medicine, and die (Keck; 40; 43).

So since you have to have money to buy the things you need to survive, to be alive—have money in exchange for the right to life—it costs money to be alive (Wronka; 32; 84, Pollis; 317; 319). Thus, life is an economic right.

But life is not an economic right, as practiced in this capitalist society, nor is it a political right, as practiced in a communist society. **Rather, it's purely a human right**, as stated in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the United States Declaration of Independence, and every other document declaring human rights. Ideally, one should have the right to life for free: It shouldn't cost money to be alive and have the right to life.

There's a way to turn the free human right to life from a utopian ideal into a legally enforced law by the state. A complaint needs to come with a solution. I'll start off with some background to lay the foundation behind my plan.

Because life is an economic right in capitalist society, **you *need* money to have everything you need to be alive**, hence Wal-Mart constantly bringing in top revenues, switching between number 1 and 2 on both the fortune 500 and the global 500 every year since 2001:

Wal-Mart provides everything needed to be alive, things.

Things at Wal-Mart cost money because all the people that put a collaborative effort into making those things available need to be paid for their part.

Third parties must produce those things, then they need to be transported, stocked, and checked out. Wal-Mart's employees consist of unskilled laborers. The jobs are so basic, eco-friendly-renewable-resource-powered, computer programmed robot machines could easily replace workers to do the same work for free.

Things at Wal-Mart WOULDN'T cost money because all the computer-programmed robot machines that put a collaborative effort into making those things available DON'T need to be paid for their part.

Wal-Mart would then provide things—everything needed to be alive—for free, so why would you *need* money?

You wouldn't, at least to have everything you need to be alive.

In this case, to be alive—the right to life—is free.

If you don't need money, you don't need to make money meaning you don't need a job.

The American-declared, legally enforced by the state, universal, cultural relativist, God-given, unalienable rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness is freedom: it's freedom from slave labor, it's the freedom to live life in the moment: no job, no worries, no responsibilities—it's a care-free life of, well, freedom; you are now free from wage-slavery. "Freedom in capitalist society always remains just about the same as it was in the ancient Greek republics: freedom for the slave-owners" (Wronka; 81).

In a sense, now programmed computers (not artificial intelligence) would be the new forced slave laborers. Instead of humans, technology will be the slaves providing everything humans need to survive.

Why do we feel the need to progress past that?

We have no other obligation but to survive.

Isn't the goal of progression just to make survival easier?

Technology is defined as something designed to make life easier.

What would make your life easier than technology doing your job for you?

Why waste a lifetime doing a job a machine could do?

There's always work to be done to provide everyone goods and services that make life, survival, easier for everyone: black slaves were bought, owned, and forced to get that work done, wage-slaves were divided, specialized, and paid to get that work done, and now robot slaves will be divided, specialized, and programmed to get that same work done—for free. History repeats itself better and better every time. Exercise your freedom to the right to life, for free.

Supplemental

To make this a reality:

Law should be enforced as our founding fathers intended: the protection of freedom to the **pure** rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness as long as long as it doesn't impede anyone else's rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

The government should fund/organize this project, paying computer and robotic engineers to research, design, and build these slave laborers for a monopolized Wal-Mart concept with all the best goods and services of the Fortune 500 in every city.

This project would create jobs right now, paying workers money and allowing them to enjoy the freedoms of being rich, before everyone else gets this freedom in the finished project, as the obvious incentive to design and build this society. Right now, no one would be denied a job, and we could be taken out of this recession because we'd boost the economy.

The government should fund the destruction of everything and the rebuilding of eco-friendly-renewable-resource-powered, million-dollar-type luxury resort hotels (available to book, not own), and "solar powered Bay Area Rapid Transit concepts" – within each city that connected to all the surrounding cities' solar powered BART concepts—in order to reverse the damage we're doing to the earth and allow everyone to enjoy a high standard of living and travel. Also, the construction of eco-friendly-renewable-resource-powered Las Vegas/Disneyland style entertainment should be funded in every city. Reconstruction is only possible one city at a time and should begin with my town Isla Vista, home to 20,000 UC Santa Barbara college students, as the ginny pig of what I'm calling the "Local, Eventually Global Project".

It starts locally, in every community.

Society should be about being local, having community. If anything, this idea of a local society would increase community, putting the human and all the things we love

first and foremost above all things. On the global scale, innovation has an arena to grow through the rapid spread of documented information through the instant communication technologies of the internet today. The online community of the internet has the power to significantly improve our education system in every way.

So, the government should fund online education systems and iPhones for everyone to utilize school with the iPhone's capabilities of accessing online eTextbooks, watching curriculum-permanent video lectures via Youtube, networking via Facebook, discussion forums, and e-mail in order to communicate and possibly meet up. A quality education would then be free, available, and accessible to anyone and everyone. Without all the specialization fields of education today—since money would be irrelevant by the end of this project, making many unnecessary jobs such as bankers non-existent—a broader education would be achieved, and would be able to include classes in tolerance, world peace, and ethics—classes seen otherwise to be irrelevant to getting a job or “what’s hot” in demand and would be seen as irrelevant to those in today’s top specialized fields of education.

It is up to parents to educate their children to be educated, tolerant, peaceful, and selfless (teachings of Jesus Christ). I’m not one for organized religion, but Jesus’ approval of the 10 commandments and the golden rule, do unto others the way you want others to do to you, are fundamentals one can teach their children with nothing to lose since Jesus’ teachings never hurt anyone. Not one of his teachings ever taught to cause any evil in this world nor have they. In fact, his teachings were about being good and not doing evil things like killing, stealing, lying, and coveting your neighbor’s wife. I’m not advocating for any religion—I’m actually against institutionalized religion—just saying that those are great things to live by, that if everyone did, would give an individual two

incentives: peace on earth, and the possibility of life after death. And if you don't have life after death, at least there was peace on earth. And if you DO have life after death, well, you'll be in heaven. So why not if it's for the betterment of society?

For the betterment of society, and to legally fully achieve the three end all be all of human rights—life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness—this project needs to be funded. Either paid by the government or paid for by each individual in exchange for freedom from a job.

If all worldly debts were zero-ed and started over so all that money could be used towards this project, it'd be in the best interest of everyone. If we funded this project would there be world peace? Would people stop all crime and war related to survival because one does not have (such as stealing from another because one has no food to eat or invading a country because one does not have oil to fuel the cars wage-slaves use to make a living)? Would genocide and hate end because classes and information on tolerance, world peace, and ethics would be available and accessible to anyone, anywhere, through the internet, creating a new generation of well-educated leaders? Would we put a stop to global warming because we rebuilt the sources of damage, production, housing, and transportation, with eco-friendly-renewable-resource-power? And finally I ask, would we be taken out of the global recession because we zero'd all debts, funded this project to create jobs for people right now, in building, planning, voting, and working together to physically design, build, and create this final step in progression—making money a want instead of a need because you wouldn't *need* money to be alive, so you could live without it and the evils of greed, corruption, and the meaningless competition that come with it? With that, I beg for one good reason why we should not use all the technologies we have now, integrate, combine, and use them to

build for a better tomorrow, if not in the name of human rights, in the name of the proper progression and the peace of humanity within itself and in relation to earth and our environment to live as one globally connected diverse array of interest/age-specific, local communities.

Chris Par

Final Paper: <http://video.google.com/videoplay?docid=-9111552425289153486>

Writing 109HU

Vallis

March 2009

Alive For Free: Thank You Technology

When you're first born, what do you need? Before air, before water, food, and medicine, what do you need?

The answer is money.

One needs money to buy those products necessary to survival—food, water, medicine, etc. Thus, without money to buy those products necessary to survival, even with air, one would not survive. For example, without money to buy food, one would starve and eventually die; so, it costs money to be alive.

Technology can make it possible for one to be alive without money.

It costs money to buy those products necessary to survival because people need to be paid to work in order to make those products necessary to survival available. If machines and computers worked for free in order to make those products necessary to survival available for free, then people would not need to be paid to work these jobs. For example, Wal-Mart makes “those products necessary to survival” available. The work that needs to be done at Wal-Mart to make those products necessary to survival available are as follows: third parties to produce the products, drivers to transport the products, workers to stock the shelves, and cashiers to work the cash register—the last mentioned has already been replaced by self check out machines. Wal-Mart's employees consist of

unskilled laborers. The jobs are so basic that programmed machines and computers could easily replace them and do the same work for free. If machines and computers were programmed to work for free in order to make those products necessary to survival available at Wal-Mart for free, then people would not need to be paid to work these jobs. Furthermore, one would not need money to buy those products necessary to survival. Therefore, one wouldn't need money to survive; it wouldn't cost money to be alive.

The greed, corruption, crime and poverty caused by the monetary system would become issues of the past.

Although this Wal-Mart concept would take away jobs, that's the point. If it doesn't cost money to be alive, one would not need money. Thus, one would not need to make money. Thus, one would not need a job.

The entire world would need to be re-landscaped with this Wal-Mart concept built at every residence. Every residence would need to be replaced by free green skyscraper resorts connected by free green trains in order to maintain a green, environmentally friendly high standard of living and transportation; the causes of global warming from manufacturing to housing would be redesigned to stop harm to the environment. For example, the concept would be similar to if UC Santa Barbara's Francisco Torres was taller, run by green technology, and consisted of luxurious furnished apartments that were available to rent for a maximum of four years for free. You could go down and get the things you needed, hop on the train to Peru or your friend's place without worrying about taking days off since you would not have a job. With a four-year lease, one would break from a monotonous, humdrum life. The chance to constantly have new neighbors means a chance to constantly meet new people and make new connections throughout

life. This would build community, as maintenance would work like a co-op where people in a residence would maintain their own place using household technology.

In this society, there most likely will be towns like Isla Vista. People get shit done and when the shit is done, they get drunk, smoke weed, love, and chill out with friends. Some would just lie around, get high all day and be perfectly contempt. My roommate, while watching birds on the show Planet Earth, said, “if I had wings I would just fly around all day and not do a damn thing”. Well, being alive for free is the same concept.

On the other hand, people would still be doing things. Blink 182’s Tom DeLonge said, “We were bored and we couldn’t get chicks. So we decided if we’d be in a band, that would take care of two problems at once”. Music and women were their incentives. I rap, yet I don’t get paid to do it, but chicks dig it. Kobe Bryant, if he didn’t get paid for playing basketball, would probably still play because he loves the sport, the recognition, and the women he gets. My friends play basketball at the recreational center and don’t get paid a dime to do so. They do it because they love it. I have a friend that films videos. He actually spends money to do so and doesn’t get paid in return. They’re posted up on You Tube for free in hopes that people will like his work. His work makes him happy.

This society is about living life and just doing things that make one happy. Being with the people that make one happy. If one lives their life and they’re happy, then that’s all that should matter. When women decided that they wanted to work, they lost their chance at the normality of this freedom—which would be just a taste of the society I

speak of, meaning they live life doing things they want and raising children they love with the husbands they love. Then, they die. And they're perfectly ok with that life.

I had a dog, a little Pomeranian named Kanye West. As the owner, Kanye being my pet, I gave this dog food, water, shelter, showers and love. All he did was sleep, hang out, and bang bad bitches. I'm pretty sure he lived a happy life because he wagged his tail all the time and hung out with me for my comfort and companionship. Now, taking the concept of a human making a dog a pet and taking care of it, in this society, machines and computers would be making humans pets by taking care of them—making food, water, shelter, and showers available; since machines can't love, we have each other for that. In respect to the argument, in this society, all one would really need is love. Kanye, my dog, never did anything wrong. That must be why they say all dogs go to heaven. They're only bad once people like Michael Vick corrupt them. In respect to the argument, society is what corrupts our newborns. Through education and technology, we can raise a new generation of peaceful, happy people. I believe that babies really are pure when they're first born, since there are no real reports of intentional evil from a two year old. One can teach a child anything. The way one teaches an American baby to speak English, one could've taught that same baby to speak Spanish had it grown up in Mexico. We can teach our children to live life peacefully through education and a personal relationship with Jesus.

Education would still be required by law as it is today, but could be completed on a person's own time through a free online education, which could be done from an iPhone by utilizing video/audio lectures, essays, tests, video chat discussions, and e-textbooks. K-12 curriculum should include required classes in world peace, tolerance,

ethics, humanities, philosophy, global studies, law and society, communications, music appreciation, art, environmental studies, religious studies, and a “finding a cure” class that focused on studying a particular disease. Then, college would be a chance to move out of one’s parents’ home into a skyscraper resort of their own. With such a broad education required, available, and accessible to everyone, we can raise a new generation of peaceful, happy people.

If we’re so closely related to the monkey, why not live like the rest of nature, except a lot more advanced? Monkeys go through so much to survive, just to chill out, yet we have it all right here in Wal-Mart. Taking action is as simple as joining the grassroots movement by visiting thevenusproject.com online.

Chris Par!

Paper

Philosophy 20B

Gee

30 January 2009

There Is A God

There are two kinds of evils in the world. One is moral evil and the other, natural evil. Moral evil is the intentional action or inaction by an agent that causes a morally negative event. Natural evil is a morally negative event that is not caused by intentional action or inaction by an agent. These evils exist. This leads me to the “Problem of Evil”. I am going to discuss the how the existence of these evils conflicts with the existence of God according to the ‘Problem of Evil’.

I will begin by explicating the problem of evil. According to the Christian belief that God exists, God is supremely perfect. Thus, God is omnipotent, omniscient, and omni benevolent. In other words, God is all knowing, all-powerful, and all loving. Given this argument for God’s existence, evil would not exist. Since evil does exist, there is a fallacy in this argument for God’s existence. Because evil exists, God must not be omnipotent, omniscient, and omni benevolent; furthermore, God must not exist. This inconsistency is where the conflict lies between the existence of God and the existence of evil. One cannot accept both existences to be true in respect to the argument. An interpretation is required to explain the contradiction causing the problem. I see this as a conflict of both philosophy and rhetoric. Augustine would agree.

Augustine's view doesn't explicitly say that the problem lies in a technicality of philosophy and rhetoric, but it seems to me that he's assuming it anyway because he attempts to solve this problem by defining the word evil and placing it into a category. "This perversion, like every imperfection in nature, harms nature and therefore, is contrary to the nature" (City of God, p. 307). I take Augustine's view to be that evil cannot be interpreted as an entity, for evil is not an entity; instead, evil is nothing more than a perversion, an imperfection. An imperfection is the defect of an intended purpose. To further illustrate his point, Augustine uses the example of blindness being a defect of the eyes, implying that the intended purpose of the eyes is to see. Augustine is expressing the idea that evil is a mere defect of our good natured design; rather, our intended purpose is of good nature and doing evil is faulty of our good nature. Augustine makes his stance on moral evil clear. He also takes on natural evil. Augustine claims that the existence of natural evil and can logically be explained in that good things come out of natural disasters. For example, after the tragedy of 9/11, the firefighters of New York showcased actions of heroism and courageous selflessness. In this example, good came out of the bad. When one door closes, another one opens.

We've just seen how Augustine says that evil is an imperfection of our good nature and that good comes out of natural evil. I will now present an argument that presents a more accurate view. My first argument is that when a child is first born, they are pure. Further support for this claim comes from the fact that no infant has purposefully engaged in an evil act. It is only until peers, society, and the environment corrupt a child that the child will engage in an evil act. These factors, which corrupt a person, become a part of their background. That part of a person's background is directly

linked to the evil act they commit. Thus, the explanation for an evil act lies in a part of the person's background. For example, when a politician commits an evil act, we look at his background—usually the bad parts. Another example, strippers and porn stars have a history of coming from a broken home, which is a part of their background. It is the experiences of the past that make a person who they are, both those that corrupt them and those that maintain their purity. Because a person's entire background makes a person who they are, it is their entire background that causes them to do evil. It is their entire background that causes them to do evil. Since their entire background includes peers, society, and the environment that corrupted them, it is those factors that corrupt a person that causes them to do evil. People are not evil, yet it is because of their background—peers, society, and the environment that corrupted them—that they do evil.

We have just seen my argument that a person's entire background causes them to do evil I will now argue for Augustine's accuracy of assessment, but against the entire assess.

I feel that Augustine has it all wrong, because the "Problem of Evil" has it all wrong. It claims that an evil will causes an evil act. In reality, money is the root of all evil. Thus, money causes evil.

Evil stems from a person's background. A Person's background is made up of their experiences, peers, society, and the environments they were brought up in. The experiences, peers, society, and the environments they were brought up in their entire lives were ruled by money. We have evil in the world because we let money be the oppressor. In a world where money is the oppressor, some have it so well off, while others have it 'hella shitty'. Those in the middle try so hard not to dip. One major thing

that causes them to dip is putting their kids in college, which causes the middle class to fight so much harder to stay in the middle. The rich are lounging. They have no worries, nor will feel the effect of our struggle. Those in the middle class are trying to raise their child into the upper middle class, in hopes of them striking it rich. Meanwhile, the kids in the lower middle class to poverty are living shitty in general. That class is the biggest class and is where a majority of evil occurs. Those in the middle to poverty class do anything they can to survive. Wait, what is it that is making the poor have such a hard time surviving? Why is life so hard for those in poverty? Why are they always complaining and committing crimes? Committing crimes that are evil. Why do they commit crimes and what causes this evil? The major motive behind it all is money; get money. Thus, money causes the evil in that class as well as big time rich crooks such as those at Enron. Money can even break marriages. Money just causes evil in general. Thus, the cliché, “money is the root of all evil” is accurate respective to my argument. If money is behind poverty, which is home to a majority of crimes committed because of what they’re doing to survive—which are evil, then money is the root of all evil. And the only way to eliminate evil in the world is to eliminate money. You go to school to go to college to get a job to get money to raise a family and then you die. Why are you wasting your time doing the work a robot could do?

Nobody was put on this earth to be a waiter. People were not born to work anyway, yet we have no choice. A human's right to be alive is oppressed by money. Money is the root of all evil. We depend on money because we depend on it to survive. If you don’t have money in a world run by money you will die, yet if you don’t have money in a world where there is no money, you’d be fine—according to my critical

theory of proper progression and redirection. Since the world is run by money—and it is run by money because without money to buy those necessary to survival, one would die—we are slaves to the dollar; however, freedom is imminent. True freedom is freedom from evil. Freedom from evil is freedom from money. My critical theory of proper progression and redirection states that certain technological advancements will liberate us from enslavement and as a result, end poverty, solve the economic crisis, stop global warming, and create world peace.

For the purposes of this essay, I take “green” to mean environmentally friendly. Also, I take “technology which generates basic necessities” to mean a device, which will evolve from manufacturing advancing and getting smaller, that combines the use of resource transportation systems and nanotechnology to create food, water, medicine, material, etc.

If we re-landscaped the earth so that every residence, connected by a free green train, was converted into free green skyscraper resorts that provided free access to green technology which generates basic necessities for free, and robots took over the jobs of the working class for free, then money would lose all value and cease to exist.

Money would no longer be a need nor would it dictate our lives and we would finally, truly be free: free from doing jobs that we don't want to do and free to pursue our passions, free to spend time with the ones we love, free to travel the world for free, free to learn for free, and free to live for free.

In a world without money, there is no poverty. There is no economic crisis. There is no money-related crime.

We would see a second renaissance period. The concept of building community

would thrive. Exchanging of information over the internet would fluctuate—movies, music, art, photography, books, lectures on video/audio, and communication would soon all be accessible through the internet; this eliminates the need of physically producing such media and saves natural resources like the trees needed for paper. Innovation and education would continue through schools, universities, and the internet; our focus would be redirected towards research and getting a broader education, rather than a specialized education geared for commercial business.

Redirection from our dependence on earth's limited natural resources to using green technology in production, housing, and transportation, will stop global warming. Because society will no longer be dependent on oil to run the very transportation that fuels each nation's economy, war for oil would end.

Furthermore, war over land, money and resources in general would end. Incidentally, the only war that technology cannot solve is war over religion, but that can be solved with an education in the concept of tolerance because it eliminates hate, and the use of marijuana because it causes amotivation. All things considered, when we reach this evolution of society, we will create world peace.

I have just shown how my theory can eliminate money. If money is the root of all evil and we can eliminate money, then we can eliminate the root of all evil. If we can eliminate the root of all evil, then we can eliminate evil. If we can rid the world of evil, respective to the argument, then there is a God. There is a God.

When you're first born, what do you need? Before air, before water, food, and medicine, what do you need?

The answer is money.

Money controls our lives. Without money to buy those necessary to survival, one would die. A human's right to be alive is oppressed by money—creating greed and corruption. We are slaves to the dollar; however, freedom is imminent. My critical theory of proper progression and redirection states that certain technological advancements will liberate us from enslavement by eliminating scarcity, and as a result, abolish currency, end poverty, solve the economic crisis, stop global warming, and create world peace.

For the purposes of this essay, I take “green” to mean environmentally friendly. Also, I take “technology which generates basic necessities” to mean an evolution of the concept of Wal-Mart, where every aspect, including its third parties and resource transportation, is run by robots and computers on a smaller scale.

If we re-landscaped the earth so that every residence, connected by a free green train, was converted into free green skyscraper resorts which provided free access to green technology that generates basic necessities for free, and technology took over all the jobs of the working class for free, then money would lose all value and cease to exist.

Money would no longer be a need nor would it dictate our lives and we would finally, truly be free: free from doing jobs that we don't want to do and free to pursue our passions, free to spend time with the ones we love, free to travel the world for free, free to learn for free, and free to live for free.

In a world without money, there is no poverty. There is no economic crisis.
There is no money-related crime.

We would see a second renaissance period. The concept of building community would thrive. Exchanging of information over the internet would fluctuate—movies, music, art, photography, books, lectures on video/audio, and communication would soon all be accessible online; this eliminates the need of physically producing such media and saves natural resources such as trees needed for paper. Innovation and education would continue through schools, universities, online classes, and the internet; our focus would be redirected towards research and getting a broader education, rather than a narrow, specialized education geared for commercial business. By law, education would have to be completed before an individual can have the option to move out of their parent's home.

Redirection from our dependence on earth's limited natural resources to using green technology in production, housing, and transportation, will stop global warming. Because society will no longer be dependent on oil to run the very transportation that fuels each nation's economy, peak oil would no longer be an issue and war for oil would end.

Furthermore, war over land, money and resources in general would end because scarcity would be eliminated as a result of technology; in a world where everybody has everything they want and need, there is no crime or warfare.

Incidentally, the only war that technology cannot solve is war over religion, but that can be solved with a course within the education system on the concept of tolerance because it eliminates hate and the use of marijuana because it causes amotivation.

All things considered, when we reach this evolution of society, we will create world peace.

This is not utopia. We have the technology to do this today, yet we haven't geared our advancements in this direction because of fear that business would be put out of business; however, according to my critical theory of proper progression and redirection, there is nothing to fear.

We need a technological revolution to save civilization, the world, and humanity as we know it. With that, I challenge everyone—our president, world leaders, philosophers, scientists, and engineers of all sorts—to take a second to imagine, find flaws in my theory, and build on this outline of a call for action. Together, we can eliminate evil, progress towards a brighter tomorrow, and make the world a better place.

Liberty is best defined by Article 4 of the French Declaration, “liberty consists in the power of doing whatever does not injure another. Accordingly, the exercise of the natural rights of every man has no other limits than those which are necessary to secure to every other man the free exercise of the same rights” (Wronka; 77). In the same respect, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights—ratified by 130 states including the United States—similarly defines liberty in Article 29, “In the exercise of his rights and freedoms everyone shall be subject to only such limitations as are determined by law solely for the purpose of securing due recognition and respect of the rights and freedoms of others” (Wronka; 77). Finally, liberty is one of our three God-given unalienable rights as defined by our own United States Declaration of Independence: “We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness.”

Sure, I was doing a service, a deed, by volunteering to be the sober designated driver and driving my drunk—legally so, as he was 21 at the time of the citation—former roommate’s car across the square mile of the unincorporated community I know and love, Isla Vista, to get food at Jack in the Box in Goleta for him so he would not put himself, as well as countless possible others, in danger of the fatal consequences that go along with drinking and driving, and though he, from the passenger seat, was the one who turned up “Young Money In Charge” by Lil Wayne **FOR A MERE MOMENT** only for me to turn it off immediately, this is not my initial argument against the citation. Regardless of the circumstances, my roommate turned up the music because he had the will to do so, the liberty to do so, in pursuit of his own happiness, I will go further to say that he turned up the music in pursuit of my own happiness as well. He knows I love Weezy F Baby,

how could one not? But I digress. **The citation in dispute is in violation of my unalienable rights, among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.**

I have the freedom to exercise my unalienable right to the pursuit of happiness, and I have the freedom to exercise my unalienable right to liberty, defined three times above as the right to do as one pleases, as long it does not violate another's life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

My roommate and I were exercising our rights to liberty and the pursuit of happiness in the moments listening to the Lil Wayne's music—that I received a citation for playing—because we had the will to listen to Lil Wayne at reasonably thunderous volumes in order to make us happy, and in doing so, were not impeding anyone else's right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness **IN THE MERE MOMENT OF THE SITUATION**—nor did we have the will to.

The citation was, then, in violation of both our rights to liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

In fact, the zero tolerance noise ordinance itself, from which the citation derived, is in violation of the universal unalienable rights to liberty and the pursuit of happiness; there are cases when **A MERE MOMENT OF MUSIC DOES NOT BOTHER ANY ONE, nor impede another's right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.** Our founding father's intended law to be interpreted **by the values and morals of the times and the situation**, never to be absolute.

Furthermore, the violation does not lie simply in the fact that I am being fined, implying that I will be forced to work to make money to pay the fine; the violation lies in that I will be forced to work to make money to pay for the things I need to be alive beforehand; the root: the lack of the pure right to life in the current monetary system.

It's the right to life that the current monetary system in itself—just the current design in the way it works that if you didn't work [do labor] to make money, you don't have money to buy food, therefore you do not eat; thus, you starve and eventually die—is in violation of.

You are forced to do labor to make money to stay alive.

For society to run its current course, there's work to be done, and if you don't pitch in and do your part of the labor, you won't make money, thus you won't have money to buy those things necessary to life and die; so you have no choice, *you're forced to do labor to make money to stay alive*.

You are forced to do labor in exchange for the right to life.

Forced labor in exchange for the right to life is a form of slavery—but someone's gotta do the work.

From black slavery in Virginia during the colonial days to the working class of America today, slave labor has shifted from forced to forced and paid, delegated and race specific to globally assigned and nondiscriminatory (Keck; 42, Wronka; 493; 8). In the land of the free, free, in the context of freedom, is misconstrued.

All the human rights that should come with freedom are not being protected because although there are all kinds of documents declaring all those human rights, these documents are irrelevant to the enforcement of human rights as legal rights to those who do not have freedom, the slaves. Black slaves in Virginia only had the right to life in exchange for doing labor. Modern American wage-slaves, as Karl Marx puts it, also have the right to life, but in exchange for doing *paid* labor; without paid labor, one would have no money for food, water, or medicine, and die (Keck; 40; 43).

So since you have to have money to buy the things you need to survive, to be alive—have money in exchange for the right to life, it costs money to be alive (Wronka; 32; 84, Pollis; 317; 319). Life is an economic right.

But life is not an economic right, as practiced in this capitalist society, nor is it a political right, as practiced in a communist society.

Rather, it's purely a human right, as stated in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the United States Declaration of Independence, and every other document declaring human rights. Ideally, one should have the right to life for free: It shouldn't cost money to be alive and have the right to life.

There's a way to turn the free human right to life from a utopian ideal into a legally enforced law by the state. If you complain, you need a solution. I'll start off with some background to lay the foundation behind my plan.

Because life is an economic right in capitalist society, **you need money to have everything you need to be alive**, hence Wal-Mart constantly bringing in top revenues, switching between number 1 and 2 on both the fortune 500 and the global 500 every year since 2001:

Wal-Mart provides everything needed to be alive, things.

Things at Wal-Mart cost money because all the people that put a collaborative effort into making those things available need to be paid for their part.

Third parties must produce those things, then they need to be transported, stocked, and checked out. Wal-Mart's employees consist of unskilled laborers. The jobs are so basic, eco-friendly-renewable-resource-powered, computer programmed robot machines could easily replace workers to do the same work for free.

Things at Wal-Mart WOULDN'T cost money because all the computer-programmed robot machines that put a collaborative effort into making those things available DON'T need to be paid for their part.

Wal-Mart would then provide things—everything needed to be alive—for free, so why would you *need* money?

You wouldn't, at least to have everything you need to be alive.

In this case, to be alive—the right to life—is free.

If you don't need money, you don't need to make money meaning you don't need a job. No job, no worries, no responsibilities; it's a care-free life. The freedom to live life in the moment. You are now free from wage-slavery. "Freedom in capitalist society always remains just about the same as it was in the ancient Greek republics: freedom for the slave-owners" (Wronka; 81).

In a sense, now programmed computers (not artificial intelligence) would be the new forced slave laborers. Instead of humans, technology will be the slaves providing everything humans need to survive.

Why do we feel the need to progress past that?

Isn't the goal of progression just to make survival easier?

Technology is defined as something designed to make life easier.

What would make your life easier than technology doing your job for you?

Why waste a lifetime doing a job a machine could do?

There's so many better things you could be doing with your short amount of time here on earth!

There's always work to be done to provide everyone goods and services that make life easier for everyone: black slaves were bought, owned, and forced to get that

work done, wage-slaves were divided, specialized, and paid to get that work done, and now robot slaves will be divided, specialized, and programmed to get that [same wage-slave] work done—for free. History repeats itself. Enjoy Freedom.

Exercise your free right to life.

To make this a reality:

Law should be enforced as our founding fathers intended: freedom to the rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness as long as long as it doesn't impede anyone else's rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. As far as cultural relativists, The government should fund this project, paying computer and robotic engineers to research, design, and build these slave laborers for Wal-Mart monopolized with all the best of the Fortune 500 in every city. This project would create jobs right now, paying workers money and allowing them to enjoy the freedoms of being rich, before everyone else gets this freedom in the finished project, as the obvious incentive. No one would be denied a job, and we could be taken out of this recession. People currently holding jobs should have a percentage of the next few months' paychecks

The government should fund the destruction of everything and the rebuilding of eco-friendly-renewable-resource-powered, million-dollar-type luxury resort hotels (available to book, not own), and "solar powered Bay Area Rapid Transit concepts" – within each city that connected to all the surrounding cities' solar powered BART concepts—in order to reverse the damage we're doing to the earth and allow everyone to enjoy a high standard of living and travel. Also, the construction of eco-friendly-renewable-resource-powered Las Vegas/Disneyland style entertainment should be funded

in every city. Reconstruction is only possible one city at a time and should begin with my town Isla Vista, home to 20,000 UC Santa Barbara college students, as the ginny pig of what I'm calling the "Local, Eventually Global Project".

It starts locally, in every community.

Society should be about being local, having community. If anything, this idea of a local society would increase community, putting the human and all the things we love first and foremost above all things. On the global scale, innovation has an arena to grow through the rapid spread of documented information through the instant communication technologies of the internet today. The online community of the internet has the power to significantly improve our education system in every way.

So, the government should fund online education systems and iPhones for everyone to utilize school with the iPhone's capabilities of accessing online eTextbooks, watching curriculum-permanent video lectures via Youtube, networking via facebook, discussion forums, and e-mail in order to communicate and possibly meet up. A quality education would then be free, available, and accessible to anyone and everyone. Without all the specialization fields of education today—since money would be irrelevant by the end of this project, making many unnecessary jobs such as bankers non-existent—a broader education would be achieved, and would be able to include classes in tolerance, world peace, and ethics—classes seen otherwise to be irrelevant to getting a job or "what's hot" in demand and would be seen as irrelevant to those in today's top specialized fields of education.

It is up to parents to educate their children to be educated, tolerant, peaceful, and selfless (teachings of Jesus Christ). I'm not one for organized religion, but Jesus' approval of the 10 commandments and the golden rule, do unto others the way you want

other to do to you, are fundamentals one can teach their children with nothing to lose since Jesus' teachings never hurt anyone. Not one of his teachings ever taught to cause any evil in this world nor have they. In fact, his teachings were about being good and not doing evil things like killing, stealing, lying, and coveting your neighbor's wife. I'm not advocating for any religion—I'm actually against institutionalized religion—just saying that those are great things to live by, that if everyone did, would give an individual two incentives: peace on earth, and the possibility of life after death. And if you don't have life after death, at least there was peace on earth. And if you DO have life after death, well, you'll be in heaven. So why not if it's for the betterment of society?

For the betterment of society, and to legally fully achieve the three end all be all of human rights—life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness—this project needs to be funded. Either paid by the government or paid for by each individual in exchange for freedom from a job. If all worldly debts were zero-ed and started over so all that money could be used towards this project, it'd be in the best interest of everyone. If we funded this project would there be world peace? Would people stop all crime and war related to survival because one does not have (such as stealing from another because one has no food to eat or invading a country because one does not have oil to fuel the cars wage-slaves use to make a living)? Would genocide and hate end because classes and information on tolerance, world peace, and ethics would be available and accessible to anyone, anywhere, through the internet, creating a new generation of well-educated leaders? Would we put a stop to global warming because we rebuilt the sources of damage, production, housing, and transportation, with eco-friendly-renewable-resource-power? And finally I ask, would we be taken out of the global recession because we zero'd all debts, funded this project to create jobs for people right now, in building,

planning, voting, and working together to physically design, build, and create this final step in progression—making money a want instead of a need because you wouldn't *need* money to be alive, so you could live without it and the evils of greed, corruption, and the meaningless competition that come with it? If you can answer to no to this question, I would like a response.

imagine a world without money
you wouldn't go to school to go to college to get a job to get money,
people spend they whole lives tryna get that paper
but aint nobody put on this earth to be a waiter
ya go to work day in and day out
but tell me, what is life really about?
it ain't cash --but right now it is,
we could live without it, if it didn't exist
ain't no poverty no mo, ain't no rich ain't no poor
just people, livin life how they wanna do
the best things in life are free what are we spending for
all you need is love, friends, family, and reefer
if money equal'd happiness then michael'd be the happiest
them broke motha fuckas be zanny off that xanax mess
without a dime, ain't no crime, ain't no brothers doin time
if robots did our jobs, we'd be doin just fine

im ridin high
put the car in drive
lay it on the line
it's my time
i got to get mine, get mine
let me go so i can fly-y-y-y
up up in the sky-y
we could, we could change the world if we try

imagine a world without drugs
fuck heroine, crack, smack, dope, and slugs
they all manmade, all made man break
yo life too precious for the lives that they waste
the world as it was stemmed marijuana buds
from the earth that God created with trees, shrubs, and them other herbs,
it's a plant, (kat said) and if you happen to set it on fire,
there are some effects, you might get tired,
hungry, happy, sleepy, but that's it,
pure, shit that organic legit
weed's mother nature's cure for worst fuckin diseases,
aids, cancer, glacomeau, it treats it.
our leaders need kick back pack and light up a bowl
forget what we're at war for and smoke a lil more
if the whole world was stoned we'd be too lazy to fight
and i could see peace, i hope one day that i might

i'm ridin high
put the car in drive
lay it on the line

it's my time
i got to get mine, get mine
let me go so i can fly-y-y-y
up up in the sky-y
we could, we could change the world if we try

imagine a world without cars
just a solar powered bart that took you any where you want
imagine no possessions, just houses not for lease
and you could come and go as you please
travel the world for free, see aunts and uncles that you
otherwise could not see/this is the world in which i one day dream
and maybe, just maybe if we eliminate religion,
agreed there was a God and things happened for a reason
we'd stop stop all of the fighting, stop all this dividing,
stop looking for guidance and start looking for the lighting
if God planned our lives and we were put here for a purpose
then why are we so worried bout following a scriptures?
ain't we live life and feel safe in God's hand?
instead we follow a book, written by a man
we got muslims overseas, sayin we're so strict,
kill anybody wanna tell us any different
christians over here screamin' Jesus' the Son
now how the fuck do we know which God is the right One?
what if i praised the wrong God my whole life?
will He have mercy over me or will i burn when i die?

all i know is, each person was put on earth with a purpose...
mine was to help make the world a better place;
if i don't, then God knows i tried.