Condorcet and I - A Fictional Conversation between Condorcet and Me: on the Outlines of an Historical View of the Progress of the Human Mind

Michael S. Christopher
Rollins College, chrstsm@yahoo.com

Follow this and additional works at: http://scholarship.rollins.edu/mls
Part of the Fiction Commons

Recommended Citation
http://scholarship.rollins.edu/mls/63

This Open Access is brought to you for free and open access by Rollins Scholarship Online. It has been accepted for inclusion in Master of Liberal Studies Theses by an authorized administrator of Rollins Scholarship Online. For more information, please contact rwalton@rollins.edu.
Condorcet and I
A Fictional Conversation between Condorcet and Me on the Outlines of an
Historical View of the Progress of the Human Mind

A Project Submitted in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree of

Master of Liberal Studies

by

Michael S. Christopher

May, 2015

Mentor: Dean, Patrick Powers
Reader: Dr. Eric Smaw

Rollins College
Hamilton Holt School
Master of Liberal Studies Program

Winter Park, Florida
Condorcet and I

A Fictional Debate between Condorcet and Me on the Outlines of an Historical View of the Progress of the Human Mind

Table of Contents

Preface ............................................................................................................. 3

Character Biographies ....................................................................................... 5

Condorcet ........................................................................................................... 5

Michael Christopher ......................................................................................... 20

Introduction to Thesis ..................................................................................... 30

Chapter 1: Men United Into Hordes ............................................................... 31

Chapter 2: Pastoral State of Mankind ............................................................. 46

Chapter 3: Progress of Mankind ................................................................. 58

Chapter 4: Progress of the Human Mind ...................................................... 68

Chapter 5: Progress of the Sciences .............................................................. 81

Chapter 6: Decline of Learning .................................................................. 95

Chapter 7: First Progress of the Sciences, Their Revival, Printing .............. 102

Chapter 8: Printing, Science & Philosophy Throw Off Authority’s Yoke ...... 117

Chapter 9: Descartes to French Republic .................................................... 133

Chapter 10: Future Progress of Mankind .................................................... 169

Conclusion ...................................................................................................... 234

Bibliography .................................................................................................... 240
Preface

The thesis’ main question is: Has the reality of Condorcet’s *Outlines of an Historical View of the Progress of the Human Mind* been realized with humanity becoming perfect, as Condorcet indicates? In answering that question, my thesis contention will present the fictional encounter between Condorcet and me in which we debate Condorcet’s essay. The two of us will embark upon our world views of humanism and theism in a dramatic debate, presenting our perspectives and try to get to a resolution.

During the course of human history numerous ideologies have occurred concerning the ways and means by which humanity is to make its way; to prosper, to peacefully coexist with one another, and find fulfillment in life. This is the search for and promotion of “Life, Liberty, and the pursuit of Happiness,” 1 as proclaimed in the Declaration of Independence for the United States of America. The methods have ranged from philosophies and religions in numerous manifestations. Everyone has had his or her own way and the outcome is determined by the result of the chosen process. This thesis will present a fictional debate between the two lives and worldviews that are proposed with the humanism of Marie-Jean-Antoine-Nicolas Caritat, Marquis de Condorcet and my own life by Christian theism with our similarities and differences.

In the pursuit of our contentions, both of us have had extraordinary lives, but Condorcet was killed during the early years of his life. I however, am still alive and offer this thesis, which critiques Condorcet’s essay, as required by the MLS program. Nevertheless, both Condorcet and I have worldviews that differ but, those who follow these perspectives have continued on through the centuries. While Condorcet’s method is found in many peoples’ lives; humanism, the

---

method I live by is found only in the life of Jesus Christ and that of his converted followers;\footnote{John 1:12, 13, 3:3-16; Galatians 2:20; Ephesians 2:1-5; 1 Peter 1:3; and 2 Peter 1:4 The Oxford Study Bible.} a life submitted to the divine. I find that reason and rationality can help humanity to a degree, but they leave us failing and therefore, we need divine revelation.

Lastly, this thesis uses an earlier English wording in the translation of Condorcet, it uses a variety of Bible translations to grasp a fuller, more diverse understanding of Scripture, a diverse array of required texts from my Master of Liberal Studies courses among other sources, and each chapter of this thesis will reference at least two points per each epoch of Condorcet’s essay.
Character Biographies

Condorcet

Marie-Jean-Antoine-Nicolas Caritat, Marquis de Condorcet, known most prominently as Condorcet, lived in France from 1743 - 1794. Condorcet was a French aristocrat, mathematician, philosopher, political scientist, social theorist and revolutionist. He is also known as a rebel; a nonconformist and his humanism is a reflection of this. Condorcet was born to his noble father Antoine Caritat de Condorcet and Marie-Madeleine-Catherine de Saint-Félix in Ribemont, France. His father died close to a month after his birth and because his mother was unable to sufficiently care for him outside of her overwhelming piety, he was sent to Reims, a city in the Champagne-Ardenne district of France at the age of eleven for a Jesuit education. Reims is known as a former site for the “coronation church of dynasties of French monarchs going back to Clovis, first king of the Franks.” However, because of his mother’s devotion and dedication to the Virgin, young Condorcet was “kept in white dresses until the age of eight” and it can only be imagined what ridiculing experiences he endured among his peers for having to wear dresses though being a boy to this later age. Further, Monsieur FranÇois Arago writes of how young Condorcet’s wearing of dresses “prevented him from entering the public schools, since a boy in petticoats could not fail to be an object of derision.” It is also known that,

---

Little boys wore dresses like their sisters until they were breeched at about 5 or 6 years. The clothes they wore after breeching were much like their fathers, a jacket and knee breeches.\(^6\)

Despite Condorcet being a boy past his breeching age, he had no father to intervene for him and was subject completely to his mother’s whims and these included her religious devotion with the Virgin and the dresses that she imposed upon young Condorcet regardless of his gender and age. It is understandable that the seeds of dissent were planted within him and it is highly likely, that the experiences that Condorcet lived through led to his nonconformist and rebellious life and his mother’s domineering had a great impact upon him.

With his mother being a widow, his paternal uncle; “the orthodox-leaning bishop of Lisieux,”\(^7\) contributed to his education and had him enrolled with a “Jesuit instructor; and at age eleven he was enrolled for four years in the Jesuit school at Reims, where he had his first academic success”\(^8\) and was able to “win a college prize.”\(^9\) This was a scholarship to the University of Paris. Later, his skills in mathematics began to be noticed and he was discovered by Jean-Baptiste le Rond D’Alembert, who aided Condorcet in his philosophe (French for philosopher) and political career. D’Alembert, being a Man of Letters, wrote that,

---


For the intellectual community to function effectively, however, certain internal norms and external conditions were also necessary. “LIBERTY, TRUTH, POVERTY (for if one fears the last, one is very far from the others), these are three words that men of letters must have constantly before their eyes, as kings the word PROSPERITY.  

Essentially, D’Alembert was conveying that “LIBERTY, TRUTH... and PROSPERITY” are the goals for the Men of Letters and that if there is a fear of poverty, the attainment of liberty and truth will not be recognized because of the bondage that fear brings. Men of Letters are men who are devoted to literary or scholarly activities or humanism, classical scholars or students of the liberal arts. This recognition also gave rise to Condorcet’s own view of himself, that though he was not within the family of the monarch, he was from a line of nobility. He was also a young, humanist scholar, who would work to bring about the changes that he and his compatriots believed were necessary for the maturation of France’s population and government. It came about by Jean Le Rond d’Alembert introducing Condorcet to the French salons, the society within them, and the women who ran the salons. These salons were frequented by a Men of Letters culture. In fact, because of Condorcet’s participation within the culture of the French salon, he would later wed one of the salonnières. In 1786 he married Sophie de Grouchy, a woman twenty years younger than his forty-three years of age. She held a “salon at the Hôtel des Monnaies that was

---

11 Ibid.
frequented by the philosophes”¹³ and was considered a most stunning woman of beauty. Sophie was also a blooming intellect in her own right and “translated Adam Smith and Thomas Paine”¹⁴ into French and these include Smith’s *Theory of Moral Sentiments* and Paine’s “written correspondence and his speeches to the National Assembly.”¹⁵ For with Condorcet’s own maternally domineered childhood, his having no strong paternal influence, and the success for his intelligence that led to the mentorship of political philosophe d’Alembert, the forming of a personality took root. Additionally, it was d’Alembert’s mentorship from whose “guidance the new academician was rapidly transformed into a philosophe.”¹⁶ Along with his friendship with Voltaire, and his relationship with women of social power, it is understood how his perspectives were influenced by not only the cries for socio-political change, but also by the influence of his persuasive wife. Concerning Condorcet’s wife, Katharina M. Wilson writes within her *Encyclopedia of Continental Women Writers* that after the Revolution and Napoleon taking rule,

> It is told that when she was introduced to the Emperor Napoleon, he complained to her that women were meddling too much in politics; she made this wry answer: “In a country which cuts off their heads, the least they can do is ask why!”¹⁷

For Sophie de Grouchy was a woman of high intelligence and full of wit. Independently running a salon that catered to men of letters was no easy task and not one to be attempted by those

---


without a strong sense of satire. With her abilities and accomplishments, she displayed that she was not a submissive handmaiden; rather she was a woman of power, united with her proficient husband. It is also noted that because of the political turmoil and the position that Condorcet eventually found himself within, the couple divorced as a way to secure a future for both Sophie and their young daughter Eliza. McLean and Hewitt describe that,

By January 1794 Condorcet had been missing for six months. He was therefore liable to be declared an émigré and have all his property forfeited. In the atmosphere of Terror, Sophie might lose not only her property but also her life unless she did something so hateful that she could not even use the word: divorce Condorcet.\(^\text{18}\)

This divorce secured Sophie and Eliza a future. Sophie continued to write and publish until her eventual death while Eliza, would later marry and publish many of her father’s writings.

Now concerning his contributions to political science, which came about by his friendships with both d’Alembert and Voltaire and his use of mathematics, he is famously known for what is called the Condorcet Method, which involves the voting process for elections. Here, the tally selects the candidate, who would beat each of the other candidates in a run-off election. Therefore, the

Condorcet method is a pairwise election system where ranked ballots are used to simulate many head-to-head elections. The winner of a Condorcet election is the candidate who wins all pairwise matchups.\footnote{“Condorcet's Method,” accessed on 2/5/2014, http://robla.net/1996/politics/condorcet.html.}

The Condorcet winner is the candidate who has beaten all of the opponents in the election process. Alameda County, CA. has used this voting method and it “allows voters to rank up to three candidates, in order of preference, when marking their ballots. Ranked-choice voting eliminates the need for run-off elections.”\footnote{“Ranked-Choice Voting,” Alameda County, CA acgov.org, accessed 3/5/2014, http://www.acgov.org/rov/rcv/faq.htm.} Further,

With Ranked-Choice Voting, if a candidate receives a majority (50%+1) of the first-choice votes cast for that office, that candidate will be elected. However, if no candidate receives a majority of the first-choice votes cast, an elimination process begins. The candidate who received the fewest first-choice votes is eliminated. Next, each vote cast for that candidate will be transferred to the voter's next-ranked choice among the remaining candidates. This elimination process will continue until one candidate receives a majority and is deemed the winner.\footnote{Ranked-Choice Voting,” Alameda County, CA acgov.org, accessed 3/5/2014, http://www.acgov.org/rov/rcv/faq.htm.}

Additionally, this voting methodology can also have a “Condorcet Paradox where there is not a candidate who is a clear winner in all of the matchups.”\footnote{James Hamblin, “Math for Liberal Studies: The Condorcet Method,” Youtube, LLC, accessed on 2/5/2014, http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=5RtOCvFqIKk.} In essence, this voting strategy created by Condorcet sheds light onto his humanist ideology and this demonstrates that
Condorcet wants to give every candidate the best possible option for being elected. This stands in opposition to the ruling of the monarchy where no voting by the population occurs and only subjection to the monarch. Condorcet sought to expand the rights and authority of the citizens and his voting method gave a greater availability to the population for the choosing of its candidates. He wanted all people to have a chance and a voice in a democratic government.

On the other hand, Marquis de Condorcet is also known for his political ideas and writings. He is recognized for his views on free and public education, equal rights for all people; women and people of every race, and a liberal economy. He is regarded as a personification of the Enlightenment Age; a Renaissance Man.

In detailing Condorcet’s embodiment of the Enlightenment, free and public education was noted as some of his ideals. In fact, “he drew up plans for a state education system which were adopted” by France. Though this comes across ideally for most people, this is not always the case. As education typically leads to employment, there are those who will still suffer from the impending results of this state education system with its enforced rules and standards. The following will elaborate upon the inherent problems within the education system. Although Condorcet lived prior to its creation, he did add to the development of what William J. Bogard presents in a history of Affirmative Action in education and employment. Bogard writes,

---

The assumed corollary of certain students being admitted because of their race is that other students would be denied admission on the basis of their race, i.e., suffer from reverse discrimination.\textsuperscript{24}

Now, of course this is just one of the problems that results from this model of free, public education which Condorcet proposed. However, just as Karl Marx planned with Friedrich Engles in their \textit{Communist Manifesto},\textsuperscript{25} the concept of free education does not truly exist because there will always be a cost. It appears that Condorcet and subsequent advocates do not fully understand that the hope for free, public education has to be funded and this by either forced taxation, tuition, or by charitable contributions. Certainly, it is the ideal for all people to benefit from this education and progress on to employment from which government budgets are partially supplied, but as has been realized in capitalist nations like the United States of America, there has occurred the need for programs like Affirmative Action to support the professed deficiencies in equality. Affirmative Action was set into place by President John F. Kennedy in his Executive Order on March 6, 1961.\textsuperscript{26} Yet, this policy for nondiscrimination has created an unforeseen side effect of reverse discrimination where the support for admitting or employing the typically inhibited race(s) can actually prevent the admission and employment for members of the uninhibited race(s). So in the end, Condorcet’s well intentioned idea of free, public education has resulted in no clear winner.


The same holds true for Condorcet’s ideas of equal rights for all people. Clearly, the United States has built part of its foundation upon equal rights for all people in its Declaration of Independence and its Bill of Rights. This is despite the times that these laws have had to undergo legal administration within the Supreme Court because of failed enforcement for all people.

Along with the progression of time, unforeseen situations arise. Presently, Condorcet’s idea of equal rights for all people has evolved in an unanticipated manner. This is another unforeseen area that is realized within contemporary times, but the majority of people in the past may not have imagined these issues in the making of their proposals. Because of the current situations regarding the debates on these rights, this is related in footnote citation.27

He also supported the French Revolution and it was the revolution that brought his untimely death. When the French Revolution broke out, Condorcet promoted the liberal cause; including a complete change in government from monarchy to democratic republic, similar to the United States of America and transforming the socioeconomic culture. Though, because of the political atmosphere, Condorcet did not meet the end that he had hoped for nor did the social environment move in the manner that he had written about in his philosophical and political essays. Prior to his demise, Condorcet enjoyed an active political career in which he became the assistant to the Secretary of the Academy of the Sciences under Jean-Baptiste le Rond

27 Citations: Here, I refer to the current debates and news regarding gender and identity. An instance is that if a person that was designated a female at birth, but had the reproductive organs and many of the secondary sex characteristics of the male sex may choose during her life to switch gender association and instead choose to be known and recognized as a male. The reverse equally holds true for males, who choose at some point during their lives to switch the gender that they were originally identified with. Examples of this are pop-singer Cher’s son Chaz Bono and co-director of The Matrix films, Lana Wachowski. Chaz was born female, but underwent a female to male transition of gender and is no longer known as the female, Chastity Sun Bono. Similarly, Lana Wachowski was born male, but chose to switch from male to female gender and is no longer identified by her original name, Laurence Wachowski. Each had surgical operations for gender switching. More recently, Time magazine placed transgender woman, Laverne Cox, on its June 9, 2014 cover with title The Transgender Tipping Point – America’s next civil rights frontier. The article describes how “another social movement is poised to challenge deeply held cultural beliefs.” (Time 6/9/2014, 38-46) Laverne was born with male genitalia, but has transitioned and chosen for her identity to be based on something different than her genitalia. Katy Steinmetz, “America’s Transition,” Time Vol. 183, No. 22 (2014): 38-46
d’Alembert and later, “he was elected as the Secretary of the Assembly in 1777”\(^{28}\) and this position lasted until August of 1793. If it were not for the continually changing political situations within France with its revolution, Condorcet may have died serving France as the Secretary of the Assembly. However, due to the environment and the political shifts from supporters of the monarchy; the Feuillants, the Girondists, who were the liberal republicans, and the Jacobins or radical revolutionaries, the career of Nicolas de Condorcet ended. This was partially related because, “By 1792 Condorcet had become one of the leaders of the republicans, joined the moderate Girondists and argued strongly that the King’s life should be spared”\(^{29}\) from the coming death by the newly ruling Jacobin party, who were known for their radical views and practices. In fact, because of different takes upon the composing of France’s constitution,

He was elected as the Paris representative in the Legislative Assembly and he became the secretary of the Assembly. He drew up plans for a state education system which were adopted.\(^{30}\)

Despite this, the Jacobin party became the ruling party and because Condorcet’s ideas were not supported within the new, National Convention, Condorcet was deemed a traitor and a warrant was issued for his arrest. He went into hiding and while there, he finally finished his last essay, the *Sketch for a Historical Picture of the Progress of the Human Mind* or also known as, *Outlines of an Historical View of the Progress of the Human Mind*, though he was working on it


\(^{30}\) Ibid.
for over a decade. Professor Keith Michael Baker of Stanford University and an expert on France and Condorcet’s life comments that the essay was “hastily written while he was in hiding from his Jacobin enemies and was in part, an ironic by-product of the author’s political defeat.”

With the arrest warrant being issued, different versions of what happened to Condorcet vary, but they all end in his death. Most relate that he died in prison after his eventual arrest. However, one of the more intriguing ideas is that he was killed by freedom fighters for the very revolution that he promoted. One source offers the following account of how Condorcet wrote the essay while in prison awaiting execution by the Jacobins.

He fled into hiding at the home of Madame Vernet, who with his wife and friends persuaded him to write, under difficult conditions, his main work, *Outlines of an Historical View of the Progress of the Human Mind*, and some essays. For his own safety, he was kept as a prisoner in the house. When he eventually escaped from his friends he was captured by villagers who, recognizing the marks of gentility and education, assumed he was an enemy of the Republic and imprisoned him. He was found dead shortly afterwards.

Granted, no source specifically identifies how Condorcet died, whether by suicide, at the hands of those who imprisoned him, or “execution by the Jacobins,” his ideal for humanity has continued on through history and many aspects have been put into place by national governments, like the idea of free, public education. Marquis de Condorcet was a non-

---

conformist; a rebel with a humanist cause. His life and career demonstrated his disdain for religion, as Condorcet and his friends d’Alembert and Voltaire noted that Condorcet’s Jesuit schooling could be compared to,

A moral education fit to make debauched and hypocritical atheists of fanatically bigoted imbeciles; a philosophical education comprised of scholastic jargon and theological dreams; a closed educational environment calculated to foster and perpetuate the adolescent tendency to homosexuality: these were the principal aspects of his education at the hands of the Jesuits that Condorcet remembered at the age of thirty.\(^\text{34}\)

These remarks aptly display the contempt that these men felt toward religion and what Condorcet claimed to have experienced from the Jesuits despite the higher degree of education that the Society of Jesus gave to him. However, because Condorcet, d’Alembert and Voltaire were atheists, which assumes that there is no God, as they are not omniscient beings to know this, they were unable to fulfill these words from Biblical scripture,

The Lord’s bond-servant must not be quarrelsome, but be kind to all, able to teach, patient when wronged, with gentleness correcting those who are in opposition, if perhaps God may grant them repentance leading to the knowledge

of the truth, and they may come to their senses and escape from the snare of the devil, having been held captive by him to do his will.\textsuperscript{35}

Instead, they lived lives that uttered hatred and condemnation toward those, who believed in and lived by Biblical scripture. They were prevented from this warning,

See to it that no one takes you captive through hollow philosophy, which depends on human tradition and the basic principles of this world rather than on Christ.\textsuperscript{36}

It also must be remembered that the Jesuits are a group within the Catholic Church, who seek to find God in all things and that the “The all-male Society . . . with members . . . in parishes, schools, colleges and spirituality centres”\textsuperscript{37} is known as,

An incredibly influential order, members of the society were heavily involved in European politics from the offset. . . The society has a strong educational focus. During the 16th and 17th Centuries the Jesuits grew rapidly, founding missionaries, schools, colleges, and seminaries around Europe. By the 17th Century there were more than 500 Jesuit schools established across Europe. The Jesuits' standardised curriculum and teaching methods became the basis of many education systems today.\textsuperscript{38}

\textsuperscript{35} 2 Timothy 2:24-26 New American Standard Bible (Hereafter, NASB).
\textsuperscript{36} Colossians 2:8 NASB.
\textsuperscript{38} Ibid.
It is easily understandable how and why Condorcet was able to excel within his life and career from the education that he received from them. It is also understandable why he and his two friends could make the remarks that they did as it is more than certain that at least Voltaire knew of Jesuit involvement within the Spanish Inquisition and that the “Jesuits were implicated in plots to overthrow Elizabeth I”\textsuperscript{39} and “their alleged influence over monarchs and leading figures.”\textsuperscript{40} So the attitude that Condorcet held goes along with his nonconformist and rebellious life. Amélie Suard and Julie de Lespinasse were two women who spent a great amount of time with and knew Condorcet quite well. It was in

the gentle [Jean-Baptiste-Antoine] Suard and his wife Amélie, in whose philosophical household he [Condorcet] was to live for two intimate years before moving to the Hôtel des monnaies at the end of 1774—to these friends the young mathematician gradually revealed a passion for humanity that was the essential characteristic of the philosophe, an unselfish devotion to the public good which earned him the title \textit{le bon Condorcet}, and an unrelenting rage in pursuit of this goal that threatened to rob him of his sobriquet almost as soon as he had earned it.\textsuperscript{41}

Similarly, Julie de Lespinasse was the proprietor of the salon that Condorcet and many of his friends, like Voltaire, Turgot, and d’Alembert continually frequented. From the two women;

\begin{itemize}
  \item\textsuperscript{40} Ibid.
\end{itemize}
Amélie Suard and Julie de Lespinasse, who knew him best aside from his wife, they remark that Condorcet,

Was a study in contrasts: the snow-capped volcano and the enraged lamb, whose lightning ambivalences his friends were constantly trying to compass in a single, potent phrase. For both women, he remained ultimately an enigma.\textsuperscript{42}

Further, Julie de Lespinasse stated that the “awkward, shy, and introverted\textsuperscript{43} Condorcet was admonished to leave off biting his nails and gnawing his lips in company; to refrain from folding himself in two while talking . . . to keep his ears free of chalk and his hair cut less close to his head; to leaven the madness of his long days of study with some cultivation of the science of love.\textsuperscript{44}

It is also remarked that,

As for the gentle arts of love, he made such a fool of himself in 1771 that Mlle de Lespinasse was forced to expostulate that in matters of experience he was still as naive as the day he left the college.\textsuperscript{45}

\textsuperscript{43} Ibid, 23.
\textsuperscript{44} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{45} Ibid, 24.
So from the striking contrasts that Condorcet embodies, his attitude differs from what was given to him while in school.

On the other hand, Condorcet also exhibited an optimistic view of humanity despite the differences he had with the original monarchal government and his objection to the radical attitude of the newly ruling Jacobin party with their effortless stance on executing King Louis XIV and his wife Marie Antoinette. Condorcet’s *Outlines of an Historical View of the Progress of the Human Mind* has exposed and promoted his optimistic ideal on the perfection of humanity and this idea has continued forward despite the author’s mysterious death.

**Michael Christopher**

In contrast to Marquis de Condorcet, the other character within this conversation is I, Michael Stephen Christopher (1974- present). I was born in Palo Alto, California, but was moved back to my parents’ former home of Connecticut in 1976 to the government housing projects. Afterwards, my younger brother was born and we moved into our first house as a family. However, by 1980 my parents divorced and neither of them gave any detailed explanation to us and this led to a long, continued life full of confusion for me. I have had a prolonged experience of insecurity from this event, which consequently fostered more insecurity within my life. For me, what was once thought to be a secure foundation, like a house built on rock, turned out to be nothing but, a house built upon shifting sand that easily crumbles when the torrents of life come. Obviously, this drastic change added to the altercations within my young heart and mind; my soul. Once my parents began their split, my brother and I stayed with our mother, but the locations changed a few times. My dad moved out first and then they switched to where my mom, brother, and I settled in an apartment. My mother joined with her soon to be
new husband; my eventual stepfather. We first moved to Morton Grove, a suburb of Chicago, IL. We stayed there for a year and then moved to Lakewood, Ohio, which is outside of Cleveland and both of these homes were rentals; something I did not fully understand as being only a limited residence. After a little over 3 years, we then moved to a house in Tarpon Springs, Florida. This was a very hard time for me, as I had spent just over three years of my life forming a foundation, gaining solid friendships, which I did not have in Illinois and lost from my few years in Connecticut. I remember crying about leaving my friends and moving, yet again. My mother pulled my brother and me out of school early one day, the day that I knew was my last day. We had planned to celebrate with my classmates as my mom had given me a few bags of candy to share at the end of the school day. However, being pulled out early brought more tears and another bruise to my insecure soul.

Tarpon Springs brought another chapter of life to me with a new beginning, in a new school; starting over again. One thing I can highlight is that I won an award for my studies in science, other than that no great memories remain from my first year there. In the sixth grade I joined the Boy Scouts and gained a new best friend. Uniquely, Elia Velis and I are of Greek origin, as his family had immigrated from Rhodes, Greece a few years prior to Tarpon Springs, which is a small city established by a Greek population. It is also unique that the Greek Orthodox Church there is a St. Nicholas cathedral and it has the same name, as the one that I was christened in back in California. Because Elia was forced to be an altar boy for the church by his parents and I wanted to spend as much time with my friend as possible, I learned that I too could be an altar boy because of my own Greek ancestry and christening. However, I learned nearly nothing concerning the God whom the church preached about or anything else aside from some superstition that was laden with fear. Of course, I was unaware of these being superstitious tales
that I was told and believed what my friend and the other altar boys told me. I fearfully wondered who would look up at the religiously painted ceiling of the church building during the prayer times within the altar room when I was told that if you do this, you will be consumed with fire from God and be automatically sent to hell! That is just one of the myths that I was told. Plus, I was only informed from my friend, that Jesus died on the cross for either the world’s sins or my sins. I don’t remember which he said. Nevertheless, from my limited understanding, that meant Jesus died for the bad things either the world’s people or I did. After about three years or so of being an altar boy and diving for the cross in the church’s epiphany celebration for those three years, I no longer attended the church and by age nineteen, declared myself an atheist. I only viewed the Bible as a book that was culturally relevant and that had some good rules for life yet, I had only read about a few pages from Genesis after crying while watching a Jesus of Nazareth miniseries on television one year. That was it, my church or Christian experience. The church spoke Greek during each of the services and I did not understand it. I was taught superstition, a few rituals, and got into trouble for burning too much incense a few times during the service rituals. Who God, Jesus, or the Holy Spirit was or is I basically had no idea outside of the television miniseries and from the pictures within the church building’s interior and the church icons. That was my experience with Christianity.

Further, my first job was in the fast food industry and eventually, Elia came to work with me too. Our own arrogance shined brightly during our time at work. We continually judged most everyone before our eyes and this particularly related to their English speaking skills or lack thereof. Plus, because of my lack of acceptance within the crowd of popular kids and my enjoyment of alternative and punk music, I began changing my appearance with my Mohawk style hair, its color, and wearing the infamous Doc Marten boots. Venturing into Ybor City with
its dangers, its clubs and attending concerts there brought an internal sense of acceptance and bravery. However, most all of this bravado was a false fortress door used to protect me from all of the dangers and pains within the world, but the reality is that this false fortress was a prison for my soul. Instead of keeping the bad out, it released all of my internal fears and pains that were displayed through my insecurity based life and behaviors. If anyone were to study me, they could see a skinny, arrogant boy with that was trying to hide his deep fears and pains. I was an introvert who had brief moments of extroversion in order to gain acceptance. I was always looking to gain acceptance and this typically came by my outward behaviors.

In 1999, I truly began a life of seeking. I had no longer considered myself atheist because for me, it displayed too much arrogance. I knew that I was not omniscient and that I had not searched the entirety of the universe finding there to be no god. So, I began to seek whatever metaphysical source there could be. I began with astrology and often read the horoscopes enjoying the fluctuating accuracies. Plus, as I researched some of the Asian symbolism along with the Western symbols, I found more identification. Being Pisces, I too, enjoy the water, as I was active in some beach sports. From the Asian sources, I was a tiger. According to some of the Asian sources, my tiger classification has me as someone “Assertive, Adventurous, Independent, Inventive, Generous, Restless and Impulsive,”\(^{46}\) while the Western Pisces has me as,

selfless, spiritual and very focused on their inner journey. They also place great weight on what they are feeling. Pisces alternate between reality and non-reality in keeping with their introspective natures; their voyage between consciousness and an unconscious dream state says much about their intuitive, almost psychic

natures. For this reason, Pisces can be hard to pin down, prompting some to call them the chameleons of the zodiac. ⁴⁷

Granted, astrology is no longer part of modern science, as there is questionable scientific scholarship, but revisits do occur. French scientist and astrologer Michel Gauquelin found unique instances regarding that the “Mars Effect” was derived from a study and analysis of more than 2000 eminent athlete's births. The findings were that there were a significantly higher number than chance would allow of those people having Mars either just risen (in the 12th or 11th house) or culminating (near the MC/Midheaven 8th-10th house). He also found that the position of the planets at the hour of birth of 576 members of the French Academy of Medicine, something very odd showed itself. Among these distinguished doctors, certain planetary positions appeared at the moment of birth far more than they should. This result could not be dismissed as “mere chance.” Any statistician would have judged it to be very significant. In study of astrology, researchers analyzing Michel Gauquelin’s work found that,

when Gauquelin's unpublished cases are added to the pool of published athletes (solid line), the correlation between eminence and Mars G% is not diminished as it should have been if the Mars effect were simply a product of Gauquelin's selection bias. Instead, the correlation increases (the line becomes steeper) as it

should if the effect is genuine. Hence, the idea that Gauquelin’s planetary claim was due to biased selection was clearly refuted.\(^{48}\)

Additionally,

Prof. Dommanget replied (15 March 1993) to Ertel's question concerning Gauquelin's possible influence on the Committee's data: "I consider it very difficult to fake a material like the one of 535 sports champions in such a way that this could not be seen."\(^{49}\)

So, aside from my astrological searching, which eventually gave me no peace and from which I found minimal hope, I then turned to the religious section within a local Barnes and Noble bookstore. I came upon a book that had a title aptly describing my life’s condition. It was something like, *A Road to Travel* and was by a Jain Hindu author. I read the book and was initially well pleased with it and I even became a vegetarian for a year. My philosophy was skewed with ignorance though, as I held to the false thoughts that if even the Bible talks about “thou shall not kill,” then, I shouldn’t be involved in eating meat. Odd rational, but for me it fit. However, the author’s book was a bit of an autobiography and one portion brought the end to my ideal. Though I had chosen to become a vegetarian and began trying to meditate with prayers to whichever divinity there is, I was disturbed with the author’s sexual biography. The author had no problem with fornicating with a woman, who had sought this Jain guru for his teaching and


\(^{49}\) Ibid, 12.
counsel, but she was married to another man. The guru pondered with misunderstanding about
the husband’s anger concerning the marital violation. This had a deep impact within me! I had
and still find adultery and the author’s lack of concern with it to be terribly troubling. Whatever
morals that I had within me; morals that I invented and had no solid basis, ran counter to those of
the author and from this, my year as a vegetarian and the following of this man’s tale were
ended.

Still, I needed something or someone’s help, as my soul, which consists of my mind, my
will, and my emotions was in continual unease. I was lacking inner peace. Along with this, my
heart was also in torment from the break-up of my last dating relationship. Roughly ten years of
dating; ten years of unfulfilled relationships, as the hope of marriage never attained. Sure, there
was the momentary fulfillment of sexual desire, but that was the end result; momentary
fulfillment. To counteract this, a new employee arrived at the job during the summer of 1999.
She was a younger girl, who shared with me about her own religious/spiritual life. She was of a
liberal Catholic origin and we regularly spoke about the divine. Though she only stayed at the
job for a month or two, she helped fortify my belief in a god. Another odd situation began to
happen to me. I started receiving a large post card in the mail for three weeks in a row. On the
front of the card was a cartoon image of an English-like explorer within the jungle, while on the
back was notification about a young adult group meeting at a local church. Each of the three
weeks the card had the character progressing forward on his mission on the front side and the
same church information in the back. It was strange because the cards were only addressed to
me, while my housemates received nothing. It was odd too, because I knew no one who went to
church. On the last card, the explorer was in the bushes and peering toward a door with the
caption stating that his treasure was beyond the door. I threw the card away, as I had done with the last two, but things were about to change.

Next, another girl named Megann became an employee at the job and she too, held to a Christian life. However, with this girl there was a greater seriousness. I continually besieged her with questions about “God” and church and gave some of my own biography concerning religion. Somewhere around November, I decided to take another step in my search to rectify my soul and went to the local Borders Book store and bought a *New International Version Men’s* devotional Bible. I began reading it like any other book, starting from the first page and proceeding forward to the end. I remember, I enjoyed what I was reading and I was open-hearted/minded concerning the miraculous within the Old Testament. However, as I read the Book of Jeremiah, something odd occurred within me. I began to cry as I read this portion of the Bible. Later, I learned that Jeremiah was also known as the crying prophet and this was out of the ordinary for me to cry while reading a book. So, I daily read the Bible and spoke with Megann about God. Eventually, Megann invited me and another guy from the job to a church that she was turned on to by one of her friends. We both agreed and went. However, the church gathering was a bit of a bore because the group of young adults was hanging out in the back yard of the church building with a bonfire and a few had guitars. I was introduced to a few people, but that was it. We decided to leave, but I agreed to try again the next Tuesday night with Megann for an actual church meeting. It was now the second Tuesday of January 2000 and I went to my first official church meeting. At first, there were the greetings of one another for all of the late teens and twenty-something’s. Then the worship team got onto the stage and began playing music. Just about everyone in the audience stood up and sang along and the lyrics were projected onto two viewing screens. I however, sat in my chair. I wasn’t a Christian, I don’t sing, and it was too
embarrassing for me to get up and be like everyone else. After a few songs, the young pastor, who was close to my twenty-five years of age got onto the stage too, and began to preach while the music continued. I could no longer ignore the music or the crowd because a torment began rising within me. The preacher spoke of the pain that was raging within me. He spoke of God’s love for me even though I had continually lived against him. He shared of Jesus dying on the cross to glorify God and remove the penalty of my sin, my sins, and my rebellion against God. With this, my head was lowered and I began to cry like a little child in extreme agony. The pastor was reading every page from within my heart like it was a book in his hands. There was no condemnation coming forth as it should have. For I knew of my own turmoil and all of the crimes I had committed throughout my life. I am not only speaking of emotional crimes toward others and myself, but also of the illegal activities I committed during my short years, along with the angst and deceit within me. As a youth, I regularly fought with and beat my brother. I continually make fun of other people and lashed out in my mind or physically toward those who differed from or against me or my thoughts. I was like a viper full of poison waiting to unleash upon someone. However, the words of love and peace poured forth from the pastor. I knew the actualization of my own sinfulness toward God, but the reverse came forward from God toward me. God offered love, peace, and forgiveness to me through Jesus and I wanted this; to be free from all that was within me. At this, I was converted. I became as the Bible states,

a new creation (a new creature altogether); where the old [previous moral and spiritual condition] has passed away. Behold, the fresh and new has come.\(^\text{50}\)

\(^{50}\) 2 Corinthians 5:17 Amplified Bible.
I chose to believe into Jesus as being the Christ; being my savior and my lord. With this, I am continuing to learn that the God, who has created everything, has chosen to live within me through his own son, Jesus Christ. Though this officially began in January of the year 2000, I am continuing to grow in my new life as a Christian. My life has been completely changed and I am heading in a direction that I would have never imagined. I am no longer living a life based upon my own personal wants and needs. I am learning to submit to someone else’s lordship and not my own, as the Apostle Paul wrote in the Galatians Epistle,

\[\text{it is no longer I who live, but Christ lives in me; and the life which I now live in the flesh I live by faith in the Son of God, who loved me and gave Himself up for me.}\]  

This is who I am; Michael Christopher.

\(^{51}\text{Galatians 2:20 NASB.}\)
**Introduction to Thesis**

At this point, the thesis will begin the fictional conversation between Condorcet and me in discussing Condorcet’s *Outlines of an Historical View of the Progress of the Human Mind*. The section will have Condorcet and I describe, evaluate, and engage the first Nine Epochs of Marquis de Condorcet’s essay. These first Nine Epochs are a brief glance across history from Condorcet’s viewpoint and he comments that the Ninth Epoch was in effect at the time of his writing the essay. He also presents the allusion that the tenth and final Epoch is essentially around the corner if not already beginning; the cusp of the Tenth Epoch was taking root. As noted, Marquis de Condorcet and I will converse concerning these Epochs that Condorcet has authored and there is the understanding of the vocabulary of the time; the terms man and mankind refer to humanity and are not designated as sexist. However, a few words will be addressed in regards to the Introduction of the essay and this will set the stage for what is to come from Condorcet and from me.
Chapter 1: Men United Into Hordes

The Introduction to N. Caritat de Condorcet’s *Outlines of an Historical View of the Progress of the Human Mind* begins with these words,

Man is born with the faculty of receiving sensations. In those which he receives, he is capable of perceiving and of distinguishing the simple sensations of which they are composed. He can retain, recognise, combine them. He can preserve or recall them to his memory; he can compare their different combinations; he can ascertain what they possess in common, and what characterises each; lastly, he can affix signs to all these objects, the better to know them, and the more easily to form from them new combinations.

This faculty is developed in him by the action of external objects, that is, by the presence of certain complex sensations, the constancy of which, whether in their identical whole, or in the laws of their change, is independent of himself. It is also exercised by communication with other similarly organised individuals, and by all the artificial means which, from the first development of this faculty, men have succeeded in inventing.

Sensations are accompanied with pleasure or pain, and man has the further faculty of converting these momentary impressions into durable sentiments of a corresponding nature, and of experiencing these sentiments either at the sight or recollection of the pleasure or pain of beings sensitive like himself. And from this
faculty, united with that of forming and combining ideas, arise, between him and his fellow creatures, the ties of interest and duty, to which nature has affixed the most exquisite portion of our felicity, and the most poignant of our sufferings.

Were we to confine our observations to an enquiry into the general facts and unvarying laws which the developement of these faculties presents to us, in what is common to the different individuals of the human species, our enquiry would bear the name of metaphysics.

But if we consider this development in its results, relative to the mass of individuals co-existing at the same time on a given space, and follow it from generation to generation, it then exhibits a picture of the progress of human intellect. This progress is subject to the same general laws, observable in the individual development of our faculties; being the result of that very developement considered at once in a great number of individuals united in society. But the result which every instant presents, depends upon that of the preceding instants, and has an influence on the instants which follow.

This picture, therefore, is historical; since subjected as it will be to perpetual variations, it is formed by the successive observation of human societies at the different eras through which they have passed. It will accordingly exhibit the order in which the changes have taken place, explain the influence of every past period upon that which follows it, and thus show, by the modifications which the
human species has experienced, in its incessant renovation through the immensity of ages, the course which it has pursued, and the steps which it has advanced towards knowledge and happiness. From these observations on what man has heretofore been, and what he is at present, we shall be led to the means of securing and of accelerating the still further progress, of which, from his nature, we may indulge the hope.  

Condorcet: “This is what I hold to and what I, along with the rest of learned, mature humanity recognizes as the reality of human existence. I also hold to this other well reasoned idea within the Introduction and that is,  

From reasoning and from facts, that no bounds have been fixed to the improvement of the human faculties; that the perfectibility of man is absolutely indefinite; that the progress of this perfectibility, henceforth above the controul of every power that would impede it, has no other limit than the duration of the globe upon which nature has placed us.  

We are progressing toward happiness and that is the demonstrable hope that I am established upon.  

My view: That is quite an introduction to your personal estimation and understanding of human history for the past, the present, and the future. I will only make a few comments regarding your  

53 Ibid, 10.
Introduction and look forward to our conversation regarding the further discussion concerning your Nine Epochs. Condorcet, the problem is that you think humans are progressing toward happiness. This has been part of man’s or humanity’s continual striving, as people do not find contentment. Yes, I agree that knowledge is advancing and my heavenly Father, God stated by his Holy Spirit that “Many shall run to and fro, and knowledge shall be increased”\(^{54}\) in the Book ascribed to Daniel within *The Interlinear Bible*. However, I must note that “knowledge inflates a man, whereas love builds him up”\(^{55}\) and I ask you where is love, the self-sacrificial love where a person or even mankind itself lays down our own lives, our wants, our needs to benefit someone else? I note, “Man's undoing is found in his own ingenuity.”\(^{56}\) What I mean by this is that as mankind seems to progress with all of his inventions and philosophies, there is always the reality that something new is needed to fulfill mankind’s deeper needs and wants. All of mankind’s inventions suffer decay and do not last; they need eventual replacement. Nothing mankind invents ever fulfills what mankind truly needs, as there is the continual inner drive in having to invent something else or something better and there is never contentment or everlasting peace within mankind. This is because man has his own antithesis within himself. The antithesis is the sin within mankind; the continual missing of the mark of God’s perfection and this causes mankind to continually struggle to reach the fulfillment that only God can provide. Man cannot obtain this, on his own. Therefore, the relentless striving continues across the millennia. I will continue to demonstrate this throughout the entirety of our discussion on your *Outlines of an Historical View of the Progress of the Human Mind* because you do not seem to understand what lies deep within the hidden chambers of your own heart nor the hearts of humanity. You do not seem to realize what lies behind the masks that are put upon human faces in the effort to hide the

---

\(^{54}\) Daniel 12:4 LITV.

\(^{55}\) 1 Corinthians 8:1 The Oxford Study Bible.

\(^{56}\) T. Austin-Sparks, *The Cross, the Church, and the Kingdom* (Tulsa: Emmanuel Church, 2008), 14.
unfathomable insecurities that are within each person. Let us move on to your actual Epochs and discuss what you have written in your estimation of history.

**Condorcet:** My First Epoch describes how men united in hordes. Granted, the information regarding this is limited and

It is only by examining the intellectual or moral faculties, and the physical constitution of man, that we are enabled to conjecture by what means he arrived at this first degree of civilization.\(^{57}\)

I describe how

A society consisting of a family appears to be natural to man. Formed at first by the want which children have of their parents, and by the affection of the mother, as well as that of the father, though less general and less lively, time was allowed, by the long continuance of this want, for the birth and growth of a sentiment which must have excited the desire of perpetuating the union.

**My view:** That is a reasonable assertion from what information you have available, but I find it interesting that you state that society was formed by the “want which children have of their parents, and by the affection of the mother, as well as that of the father.”\(^{58}\) I have a similar view to your knowledge and understanding on how society was initially formed. The God that I know

---


\(^{58}\) Ibid.
and who is my spiritual father had a relationship with the first humans that he created and he told them,

Be fruitful and increase, fill the earth and subdue it, have dominion over the fish of the sea, the birds of the air, and every living thing that moves on the earth.  

He also gave them sustenance and did not leave them as helpless creatures that had to continually strive for their existence. In fact, my heavenly Father said to them,

Throughout the earth I give you all plants that bear seed, and every tree that bears fruit with seed: they shall be yours for food.

There was no competition or strife until disobedience came forth and as was later stated by the apostle Paul, “sin pays a wage, and the wage is death.” This death is exactly the same thing as God said to the first humans, Adam and Eve, if they were to eat of the Tree of the Knowledge of Good and Evil. Death would come forth from their disobedience; their sin, their missing the mark or target and that target is unity with God. For “God gives freely, and his gift is eternal life in union with Christ Jesus.” Obviously, these first humans did not die physically initially, but there was the death of full and open fellowship with God; their maker, who loved them and provided for them everything that they could ever need or even want. That is how expansive and

---

59 Genesis 1:28 The Oxford Study Bible.
60 Genesis 1:29 The Oxford Study Bible.
61 Romans 6:23 The Oxford Study Bible.
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grand my Father God is; he is limitless. However, let us go to your next point as it is very crucial in what else I have to say in regard to our differences and verifies some of my previous points.

**Condorcet:** Though I disagree with your rendition, it is possible because as I mentioned, there is limited data on how both humans and society came about, but I will continue. In my anthropology, I write of how families formed and grew. They then, gathered together, several of them at a time and formed hordes. From this,

The art of fabricating arms, of preparing aliments, of procuring the utensils requisite for this preparation, of preserving these aliments as a provision against the seasons in which it was impossible to procure a fresh supply of them—these arts, confined to the most simple wants, were the first fruits of a continued union, and the first features that distinguished human society from the society observable in many species of beasts.⁶³

There was also the formation and “use of an articulate language”⁶⁴ for the people to communicate with one another. For more repeated and reliable connections with the same individuals, a similarity of interests, the succour mutually given, whether in their common hunting or against an enemy, must have equally produced both the sentiment of justice and a reciprocal affection between

---


⁶⁴ Ibid.
the members of the society. In a short time this affection would transform itself into attachment to the society.\textsuperscript{65}

So, from this, “the necessary consequence was a violent enmity, and a desire of vengeance not to be extinguished, against the enemies of the horde.”\textsuperscript{66}

\textbf{My view:} Here is where I continue on with my repeating the difference between your worldview; your ideology and what I hold to and the distinct contrast between the two of us and our lives. You mention “the art of fabricating arms”\textsuperscript{67} and “connections with the same individuals . . . in their common hunting or against an enemy.”\textsuperscript{68} I ask why you have “an enemy”\textsuperscript{69} outside of our sinful nature; our inner “law of sin and of death”\textsuperscript{70} that opposes God? Why do you find it necessary to “fabricate arms,”\textsuperscript{71} which you will obviously use to either injure, as a warning to your foe or to bring about his death? Do you not see the problem with this? You have already devised a plan within your account of history to justify contentions and lack of peace among humanity. Why not sow love among humanity and reap the peace that comes from it? Nevertheless, please continue on with the description of your essay.

\textbf{Condorcet:} Well, dear Michael, the answer to your questions is revealed throughout my essay and as we continue on, you will gain understanding as to why there are enemies and why there is

\textsuperscript{66} Ibid, 17.
\textsuperscript{67} Ibid, 16.
\textsuperscript{68} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{69} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{70} Romans 8:2 LITV.
the need of constructing weaponry. However, let us continue and I will describe how from the
initiation of man into hordes there becomes the need for,

The want of a chief, in order to act in common, and thereby defend themselves the
better, and procure with greater ease a more certain and more abundant
subsistence, introduced the first idea of public authority into these societies. In
circumstances in which the whole horde was interested, respecting which a
common resolution must be taken, all those concerned in executing the resolution
were to be consulted. The weakness of the females, which exempted them from
the distant chase and from war, the usual subjects of debate, excluded them alike
from these consultations. As the resolutions demanded experience, none were
admitted but such as were supposed to possess it. The quarrels that arose in a
society disturbed its harmony, and were calculated to destroy it: it was natural to
agree that the decision of them should be referred to those whose age and personal
qualities inspired the greatest confidence. Such was the origin of the first political
institutions.\(^\text{72}\)

This is the understanding of society’s initial political birth and how leadership was formed within
these communities. It is the testimony of territorial imperative with differences of lifestyle,
ideology, etc.

**My view:** I am reminded of some earlier writings to your own by Thomas Hobbes, Machiavelli,
and John Locke in reflection to what you wrote here. Obviously, all three of these men had

\(^{72}\) Marie-Jean-Antoine-Nicolas Caritat, Marquis de Condorcet, “Marie-Jean-Antoine-Nicolas Caritat, Marquis de
Condorcet, *Outlines of an historical view of the progress of the human mind* [1795],” *The Online Library of Liberty*,
different viewpoints on how political authority was composed and administered, but each of their accounts denotes a perspective concerning authority. As we know, Thomas Hobbes gave us his *Leviathan* and explained that the sovereign monarchy is the best form of government for a social contract within a Common-wealth, as opposed to a Democracy or Aristocracy.\(^7^3\) This is similar to that of the Egyptian Pharaohs, whose sovereign office indicates divine authority to the people under their rule. Machiavelli too, gives a comparable account within *The Prince* and writes of how hereditary princedoms are the best and easiest, as opposed to mixed princedoms or provinces living by their own laws of freedom.\(^7^4\) For Machiavelli,

> There is no sure way of holding other than by destroying, and whoever becomes a master of a City accustomed to live in freedom and does not destroy it, may reckon on being destroyed by it.\(^7^5\)

Locke though, gives a contrasting vision to these types of governmental authority. Whereas Hobbes and Machiavelli have their kings with the submitted residents of the kingdom, Locke sets forth the active participation of the permitted members of the population; a form of democracy. Nevertheless, all three of their accounts require a hierarchal system and a hierarchy indicates inequality. Therefore, some people are deemed to be less than others and some people are deemed to be better. How this is accounted for none of these three authors will give reason other than what has already been explained. With these understandings, society is composed of people, who are forever trapped within a system that does not allow freedom to all and mandates a system where each person has a designated role that cannot be diverged from. If we, as

\(^7^3\) Thomas Hobbes, *Leviathan* (Seattle: Amazon Digital Services, Inc., 1651), Ch.2.
\(^7^5\) Ibid, 11.
humanity, say that we are materialists and are only the composition of our parts does this mean that we do not have the ability to choose and that we cannot help but be racist, sexist, hypocritical bigots that cannot help but go to war and commit crimes? That is something to consider given the seemingly pre-arranged systems that we claim nature has given us.

Further, Locke, who gave inspiration for the Constitution of the United States of America, did not allow for equality among the races and he continued with the idea that women are less equal to men throughout his *The Second Treatise of Civil Government*.\(^76\) I am reminded of these lines from the Biblical *The Book of Judges* “in those days there was no king in Israel; everyone did what was right in his own eyes”\(^77\) regardless of the cost. The Biblical *The Book of Judges* documents the period prior to Israel’s monarchies when Israel had no external government and because the people continually disobeyed their God, they were in anarchy and were regularly attacked from outside tribal nations. Further, “a road may seem straightforward, yet end as the way to death”\(^78\) and even though “a person’s whole conduct may be right in his own eyes, but the Lord weighs the motives.”\(^79\) An example of this is how d’Alembert manipulated you by introducing you to the world of the salon; the salons of Madame du Deffand, then with Mademoiselle Julie de Lespinasse, and culminating with your marriage to the salonnières Sophie de Grouchy.\(^80\) Here, you were brought into the sphere of philosophes, literary writers, mathematicians, scientists, and politicians, as well as entertaining women. You were crafted into a being who, could intellectually negotiate within the bureaucratic world and bring about changes within the politic for the one-sided, tactics of your group’s humanistic ideas. I will


\(^{77}\) Judges 17:6 and 21:25 The Oxford Study Bible.

\(^{78}\) Proverbs 14:12 & 16:25 The Oxford Study Bible.

\(^{79}\) Proverbs 21:2 The Oxford Study Bible.

also quote further from your First Epoch in revealing some additional problems between our ideologies and these include more concerning the human desire for death and your views regarding the supernatural. I quote, “The invention of the bow was the work of a single man of genius,”81 “There were at that period love songs and war songs,”82 and

The right of commanding in war considered as the prerogative of an individual family; together with the first dawn of various kinds of superstition.83

Along with these statements on the subjects of death, killing, and war that you seem so attracted to, you begin affirming your strong abuse to anything religious or spiritual. I quote some of your opinion on the spiritual;

The mysteries or ceremonies of religion, of the practices of superstition, and frequently even of the secrets of legislation and polity. I mean that separation of the human race into two portions; the one destined to teach, the other to believe; the one proudly concealing what it vainly boasts of knowing, the other receiving with respect whatever its teachers condescend to reveal: the one wishing to raise itself above reason, the other humbly renouncing reason, and debasing itself below humanity, by acknowledging in its fellow men prerogatives superior to their common nature.84

82 Ibid.
83 Ibid.
84 Ibid, 18.
You relate this to superstition and tyranny. However, the social democracy that you lean toward, radical and dangerous for your time, so often leads to the state becoming deity. Further,

Social democracy makes society increasingly dependent upon the state for continual sustenance, thereby cementing its bondage.  

Thereby, the citizenry is forced into a position of worship toward the state; treating state as it was a god, for only the state is able to provide salvation from the miseries that citizens suffer. David Williams indicates that you wrote in *On the nature of political powers in a free nation* in 1792 that,

You can see here how necessary it is to persuade the majority of people of the benevolence of the laws, that they should have confidence in those who draft, implement or execute them, and that every citizen should be deeply conscious of the feeling that he must offer a provisional obligation to obey even those laws of which he disapproves, as well as the implementation, which he might find unjust.  

Another example is the “system of public education” that you propose, but we must thoroughly understand that “one of the most useful tools in the quest for power is the educational system”

---

and it is through education that the future of humanity takes shape. If the state is the officiator of education, parents and the rest of the citizenry must put all of their faith and hope in the state to form a proper and upright future class of people. However, we must ask, who governs the state and its education system other than those who have the adequate power. These holders of power, whom we assume will never be corrupted by their power, are the ones transforming the students’ lives to know what is right and wrong, what is true vs. the false, the understandings of morals and values, and how a benevolent life is to be led. Thus, “all education is fundamentally religious.”\(^8^9\) This is with the amount of faith that is required to believe that there will be progress for all with the forthcoming generations, whose education is controlled by the state and not by the families that know the students; often their children, the best. So, families are forced to give over their children to the state in the same way Abraham was called to give over his son Isaac as a sacrifice to God. However, when Abraham was about to sacrifice his dear son, he was told by the Lord “do not stretch out your hand against the lad, and do nothing to him,”\(^9^0\) for a ram was caught in nearby bush and used instead, for sacrifice to God. Here, sacrifice was made to a God that continually demonstrated his provision, grace, and love toward Abraham, while the sacrifice to the state does not offer the same.

Conversely, the government that I offer would be a theocracy with Jesus as the King and civil life in communalism as I read in New Testament scripture. You, Condorcet leaned toward republic which was as radical and dangerous as Jesus’ ideas were too, and you both paid the price with your lives.

---


\(^9^0\) Genesis 22:12 NASB.
From this, we see that we have parallel ways of thinking that only have momentary intersections evidencing the substructures of our different worldviews. Yours is based upon your understanding of reason and mine is based upon reason and revelation, which has a different understanding of human reasoning. However, our attempt to communicate will persist. In contrast to your social democracy that puts more power into corrupted humanity, I offer a government submitted to God, who is love\(^{91}\) and works in a communalism where we are to “Do nothing from selfishness or empty conceit, but with humility of mind regard one another as more important than yourselves.”\(^{92}\) That is the type of government that I offer and demonstrated in the lives of Jesus, Paul, and other Christians.

Condorcet: In reference to these particulars of my First Epoch, I wrote them because this is the nature of human history that we humans are able to piece together from the miniscule amount of historical data that is available to us. I write of “The invention of the bow was the work of a single man of genius,”\(^{93}\) because as you know, we the members of humanity are currently caught within the trap of our insufficient knowledge, but over the course of our history we are proceeding forward in progressive intelligence which will enable us to no longer have the need for either warfare or the weapons that are the tools for it, as my essay relates and pronounces in the Tenth Epoch.

In relation to my thoughts on religion and the superstition of it, I can only point you towards the tyranny that has existed for centuries within the lordship and totalitarianism of what calls itself the Church; both the Catholic, Coptic, and Protestant versions.

---

\(^{91}\) John 4:8, 16 NASB.  
\(^{92}\) Philippians 2:3 NASB.  
My view: You are correct concerning these issues within the religion that mankind has professed and demonstrated. This is the mystery of iniquity that I personally detest and this bears no equality to what I spoke of and what I live for. We will continue on with this throughout our discussion.

Chapter 2: Pastoral State of Mankind
Condorcet: The Second Epoch is titled *Pastoral State Of Mankind.—Transition From That To The Agricultural State*. I note the domestication of animals and husbandry. Here, I state that,

The idea of preserving certain animals taken in hunting, must readily have occurred, when their docility rendered the preservation of them a task of no difficulty, when the soil round the habitations of the hunters afforded these animals an ample subsistence, when the family possessed a greater quantity of them than it could for the present consume, and at the same time might have reason to apprehend the being exposed to want, from the ill success of the next chace, or the intemperature of the seasons.\(^94\)

Along with this, I write of how,

From keeping these animals as a simple supply against a time of need, it was observed that they might be made to multiply, and thus furnish a more durable provision. Their milk afforded a farther resource: and those fruits of a flock, which, at first, were regarded only as a supplement to the produce of the chace, became the most certain, most abundant and least painful means of subsistence.\(^95\)

I am sure that you will hold to the Biblical tradition and state the similarities to what came forth following the alleged flood with Noah and how the proceeding humanity was allowed by the


\(^{95}\) Ibid.
Bible’s God to begin consuming meat from animals and was no longer restricted to a vegetarian diet.

**My view:** You are correct with your assumption. I do hold to the Biblical account though there are similar stories from other religions, like that of the Babylonian Gilgamesh and the Greek flood story with Deucalion and Pyrrha. The Biblical order differs slightly too, as humanity starts from a vegetarian diet and moves on to an omnivorous diet. However, you progress into a model that I disagree with, as you write,

> A more sedentary and less fatiguing life afforded leisure favourable to the development of the mind. Secure of subsistence, no longer anxious respecting their first and indispensable wants, men sought, in the means of providing for those wants, new sensations.

You again add different social classes, as you did in your First Epoch and include urbanization,

> Family societies became more urbane, without being less intimate. As the flocks of each could not multiply in the same proportion, a difference of wealth was established. Then was suggested the idea of one man sharing the produce of his flocks with another who had no flocks, and who was to devote his time and strength to the care they require. Then it was found that the labour of a young and able individual was of more value than the expence of his bare subsistence; and

---

the custom was introduced of retaining prisoners of war as slaves, instead of putting them to death.  

From what you have written here, my disagreement continues. Apparently, now men were enabled to spend time thinking in a progressive manner, as they realized the “retaining prisoners of war as slaves, instead of putting them to death” would benefit them and the coming ideologies of pre-Socratic and Socratic thinking. So, I guess the earlier men were less intelligent, but somehow they built the pyramids of Egypt, and the other wonders of the world. Yet, scientists of my own time period or epoch are still unable to fully conceive of how these people were able to place the capstone atop the pyramids, as the capstone holds the greatest weight of the entire pyramid itself. These were the people, whom you claim were of a lower intelligence level because of their inferior Epoch level. However, we are still striving with the current ideas of how the pyramids were built.

Further, you assume that villainy was neither a source of wealth nor anything else outside of your belief that differences in wealth only occurred because only honesty, intellect, and hard work ruled these primitive societies. Additionally, you write,

And it is at this Epoch of society that we must place the origin of slavery,

---

99 Ibid.  
and inequality of political rights between men arrived at the age of maturity. The consuls of the chiefs of the family or tribe decided, from ideas of natural justice or of established usage, the numerous and intricate disputes that already prevailed. The tradition of these decisions, by confirming and perpetuating the usage, soon formed a kind of jurisprudence more regular and coherent than the progress of society had rendered in other respects necessary. The idea of property and its rights had acquired greater extent and precision. The division of inheritances becoming more important, there was a necessity of subjecting it to fixed regulations.\(^{102}\)

In essence, you describe private property and if it be true that honesty and not villainy was a major factor in the division of wealth, you then need to account for how there is “the origin of slavery and inequality of political rights.”\(^{103}\) In fact, slavery within more generalized circumstances and inequality of political rights demonstrates the exact opposite of honesty or integrity among people. Yes, Jesus came as a servant, but this was a form of voluntary servitude or slavery in opposition to the forced “slavery and inequality of political rights”\(^{104}\) that you mention.

Further, your mention of “The division of inheritances becoming more important, there was a necessity of subjecting it to fixed regulations”\(^{105}\) is strikingly similar to what would later be mentioned by Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels in their *Communist Manifesto*, where they


\(^{103}\) Ibid, 20.


\(^{105}\) Ibid.
write that there is to be the “Abolition of all rights of inheritance.” You give no reason as to why inheritances are to be subjected to fixed regulations other than the enforced will of the “chiefs of the family or tribe” and that is totalitarianism. If parents choose to leave inheritance to their children, who aside from these parents or the parents’ will at testimony has the authority to determine to whom the inheritances are given? Does this leave the work of the parents unto the authority of the state and therefore, a socialist or even communist or totalitarian polity is the rule? From this, there is the lack of freedom of choice as the working parent is not allowed to bless the children with a gift since the state has control of the property.

Further, the hope and initiative that you, D’ Alember, and Voltaire created, “Liberty, Truth, Posterity” for the Men of Letters is not available to all people and this qualifies a socioeconomic classism. From your version of history and based upon the very desire that you and your two compatriots have conceived, equality is absent and a socioeconomic classism form of slavery has become law.

For me, equality comes out of love. Love for God and love for one another. As I mentioned near the end of your First Epoch, we are to “Do nothing from selfishness or empty conceit, but with humility of mind regard one another as more important than yourselves.” This brings forth equality because people are actually seeking to benefit others instead of themselves and with this no one is working to be better than another. Self-promotion is gone and each person is benefiting the other. Inequality ends when people give agape love; self-sacrificing love to each other and this only comes from the life of Jesus Christ living within people.

---
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Condorcet: That is not the full reality of what I have written and particularly relating to the future of what D’Alembert, Voltaire, and I desired to set forth. You see, as we humans increase in our progressive intelligence, a different order develops and our astuteness will be the prevailing rule.

My view: Sadly, you do not seem to understand that you hold to a prejudice in which there is the conviction that Europeans are the vanguard of the human race. You justify Western intellectual dominance. You imagine that rational enlightenment, which was the current province of the Western elite would spread to all corners of the earth, improving the human condition everywhere.\footnote{Sandra Hinchman, “Condorcet, Marie Jean Antoine Nicholas Caritat, Marquis de,” Enlightenment Revolution, 26 December 2014, accessed 4/28/14. http://enlightenment-revolution.org/index.php/Condorcet,_Marie_Jean_Antoine_Nicholas_Caritat,_Marquis_de.}

Furthermore, you continue on with your bigotry as you write,

But we observe advancing at the same time the art of deceiving men in order to rob them, and of assuming over their opinions an authority founded upon the hopes and fears of the imagination. More regular forms of worship begin to be established, and systems of faith less coarsely combined. The ideas entertained of supernatural powers, acquire a sort of refinement: and with this refinement we see spring up in one place pontiff princes, in another sacerdotal families or tribes, in a third colleges of priests; a class of individuals uniformly affecting insolent prerogatives, separating themselves from the people, the better to enslave them, and seizing exclusively upon medicine and astronomy, that they may possess.
every hold upon the mind for subjugating it, and leave no means by which to
unmask their hypocrisy, and break in pieces their chains.\textsuperscript{111}

This verifies your disgust with not only those who accept or consider the spiritual, but
particularly Christians. Your revulsion toward your Jesuit education and upbringing does not
qualify and is an absurd generalization against something that you do not seem to understand.
For you and your elite company,

Science, as humans now call this procurement of knowledge, relies strictly on
observation and calculation. And, because metaphysics has been removed from
the process, true associations between concepts and observations are no longer
identified, and all meaning is lost. Modern science often appears as a flood of raw
data that does not seem to apply to everyday life or connect one theory to another.
Thus, humanity is left with a one-sided empirical view of nature, and the
relationship between humans and nature is reduced to mechanistic coexistence.\textsuperscript{112}

Essentially, you and your intellectual elite initiate a mechanized system of evolving humans into
mechanical beings. You appear to rely on Plato’s \textit{Allegory of the Cave}.\textsuperscript{113} These are lines 6803-
7267 in Book VII of \textit{The Republic} and you think that you and your group are the philosopher
kings that are able to free humanity from our supposed chains. You write that “forms of worship

\textsuperscript{111} Marie-Jean-Antoine-Nicolas Caritat, Marquis de Condorcet, “Marie-Jean-Antoine-Nicolas Caritat, Marquis de
Condorcet, \textit{Outlines of an historical view of the progress of the human mind [1795]},” \textit{The Online Library of Liberty},
\textsuperscript{112} Justin Stone, ”Humans and Nature: Finding Meaning through Metaphysics,” \textit{Masters of Liberal Studies These},
\textsuperscript{113} Plato, \textit{The Republic}, trans. Benjamin Jowett (Seattle: Amazon Digital Services, Inc., 2008), lines 6803-7267 in
Book VII.
begin to be established, and systems of faith”¹¹⁴ come from “the art of deceiving men in order to rob them, and of assuming over their opinions an authority founded upon the hopes and fears of the imagination.”¹¹⁵ To you, these are just some of the supposed chains that bind humanity in religious superstition. Yet, you do not see that you are deceiving humanity with your one-sided view of life and that you have set up your own “colleges of priests; a class of individuals uniformly affecting insolent prerogatives, separating themselves from the people, the better to enslave them”¹¹⁶ with your own doctrines. You are a part of your own college of rational priests and your graduation ceremonies verify this, as you dress in luxurious robes, graduating into the priesthood before your own high priest and separate yourselves from those whom you consider a less evolved species. As one of your own philosophical fellows, Baruch Spinoza, you are apparently not able to conceive of anything outside of your empirical observations. However, at least Spinoza was able to understand and confesses that there is a human condition which causes humanity to fall short and be in error.¹¹⁷

Condorcet: Obviously, I disagree with you on this. Our very senses validate that there is nothing more than what we can perceive by what our senses verify for us. That is true reason and the empiricism of science validates this and I note this at the beginning of my essay. Let us go on with the essay and how I point out how man was able to develop his authority over agriculture.

In like manner, where plants, grain, the spontaneous fruits of the earth, contributed with the produce of the flocks to the subsistence of man, it must

---

¹¹⁵ Ibid.
¹¹⁶ Ibid, 21.
equally have been observed how those vegetables multiplied; and the care must have followed of collecting them nearer to the habitations; of separating them from useless vegetables, that they might occupy a soil to themselves; of securing them from untamed beasts, from the flocks, and even from the rapacity of other men.¹¹⁸

My view: If this was so, and I am not denying that man has learned how to work with horticulture for his benefit but, how did man survive from the beginnings of his existence? If it was all a matter of chance, how was man able to continually survive if he or she only found the harmful plants? Man had to have had a guide and that would be God; from my perspective, to help him find healthy sustenance. The supernatural, which you deny, offers an alternative. Otherwise, only the possibilities of impersonal chance occur. Though in reality, chance would not work and humanity could not continue. That is more along the lines of the superstition that we each write against. I also, ask what of the foods that made man sick, like the quick stomach flu or for longer periods of time or even killed him? Plus, man’s diet needs variety so, with this, he has to find foods that are both safe and healthy to eat; foods that do not kill him. Relying upon animals is not safe enough because some foods are safe for animals, but not for humans. What of poisoned water? Man needs someone other than himself to survive upon this earth and not only other humans, but a source to guide him or her from destroying everything within sight, as humanity is known for our continual evolution of destruction. This takes place in the destruction of his own environment and his history is filled with a progression of violence. The

twentieth century is the bloodiest recorded century and the current century is on its way to surpass the prior centuries.

Condorcet: You make some valid points regarding agriculture and horticulture as far as man discovering which foods to eat; those that are healthy and safe for consumption. However, your reliance upon a deity is foolhardy, as it is superstitious, based upon hopeful emotions, and this type of thinking is what I have described within this Second Epoch. Your religious beliefs, your faith in something or someone that cannot be easily perceived by our natural senses is foolhardy and has brought about such a great degree of not only schism, but also death-filled warfare. Look at the Crusades and the Inquisition for examples of what I mention with the hypocrisy and enslavement to ignorance and naïveté, which leads to the regression of man.

My view: I agree that there is a current of hypocrisy that flows like a strong river among those who hold a divine faith and that there has been warfare among those claiming to be followers of Christ. They deny their Lord with their lives and their actions are blasphemous. However, to claim that the Crusades and the Inquisition is Christian is flawed. The Crusades were sacrilegious political events prompted by the Muslim military invasion of Jerusalem. The Inquisition too, was hypocritical of Christ and his followers' claim to “love your neighbor”\textsuperscript{119} and “love your enemy.”\textsuperscript{120} Nevertheless, as we continue with the Second Epoch of your essay you write,

It will there be seen why the progress of the mind has not been at all times accompanied with an equal progress towards happiness and virtue; and how the leaven of prejudices and errors has polluted the good that should flow from

\textsuperscript{119} Matthew 19:19, 22:39; Mark 12:31; and James 2:8 LITV.
\textsuperscript{120} Matthew 5:44; Luke 6:27 and 35; and Romans 12:14, 18-21 LITV.
knowledge, a good which depends more upon the purity of that knowledge than its extent. Then it will be found that the stormy and arduous transition of a rude society to the state of civilization of an enlightened and free people, implies no degeneration of the human species, but is a necessary crisis in its gradual advance towards absolute perfection.\textsuperscript{121}

I agree that over time there is a progress of intelligence and this has occurred greatly within the realm of technology, but for you to write that the human species will gradually advance towards absolute perfection is astonishing. You are faulty in your views of both contemporary and historical events. It also displays that you do not understand humanity. I would ask you to look at what is called the Hundred Year’s War between England and your own French nation. This was a battle that took numerous human lives and it was an effort concerning

the status of the duchy of Guyenne (or Aquitaine)-though it belonged to the kings of England, it remained a fief of the French crown, and the kings of England wanted independent possession; second, as the closest relatives of the last direct Capetian king (Charles IV, who had died in 1328), the kings of England from 1337 claimed the crown of France.\textsuperscript{122}

Despite this political chaos and the destruction of human life, the only area that brought about a hint of perfection was the war’s end.


Condorcet: I am glad that you agree that religion has brought about a large degree of tragedy and that hypocrisy and bloodshed are often the result. Yet, what you call the Hundred Year’s War between England and France is essentially a restatement of my own words concerning the progression of the human mind. We humans have progressed further and away from such battle. Man is getting more intelligent and becoming a better species, as I am relating throughout my essay; mankind is progressing. From my Third Epoch forward, you will see this.

Chapter 3: Progress of Mankind

I write,

Invasions, conquests, the rise and overthrow of empires, will shortly be seen mixing and confounding nations, some times dispersing them over a new territory, sometimes covering the same spot with different people.
Fortuitous events will continually interpose, and derange the slow but regular movement of nature, often retarding, sometimes accelerating it.

The appearances we observe in a nation in any particular age, have frequently their cause in a revolution happening ten ages before it, and at a distance of a thousand leagues; and the night of time conceals a great portion of those events, the influence of which we see operating upon the men who have preceded us, and sometimes extending to ourselves.\(^{123}\)

This is an adequate observation of history and substantiates my premise. Man has progressed, though sometimes through warfare, toward perfection. It is displayed in the pages of my Third Epoch\(^ {124}\) and throughout my essay. Though there are struggles along the way these can be symbolized as merely growing pains in mankind’s maturing.

**My view:** Concerning your Third Epoch, I have only a few things to discuss as most of it is acceptable as a rendition of human history. Though there are some points that I would like to debate. Near the start of this Epoch you limit mankind to only four groups when you write,

> Thus to the three classes of men before distinguishable in pastoral life, that of, proprietors, that of the domestics of their family, and lastly, that of slaves, we must now add, that of the different kinds of artisans, and that of merchants.\(^ {125}\)


\(^{124}\) Ibid, 26.

Here, you seem to miss a few other groups of people who have had a large impact and place within society and these are shamans or medicine men and the priests. These people have been a vital part of human civilization and have remained so throughout the ages. You claim that within the progression of nations,

To murder the vanquished, or to strip and reduce them to slavery, was no longer the only acknowledged right between nations inimical to each other. Cessions of territory, ransoms, tribute, in part supplied the place of those barbarous outrages.126

Yet, as we view history over the proceeding centuries, this is only partially true and there are some striking contrasts. I will cite that as of the year 2004, the number of people caught within human trafficking and slavery are at the greatest in all known time. Twenty-seven million slaves exist in our world today127 and some nations still act in this manner. We have had a confederacy of nations known as the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, which was known for its mass murders and human slavery within the early decades of its inception.128 Similarly, China has experienced similar massacres and human enslavement as Mao Tse Tung ruled the nation.129

Similar forms of destruction and violence continue to occur both among and within nations throughout the centuries. Plus, the UN has not really done much to circumvent this (Sudan,

126 Ibid, 25.
Israel, Palestine, North Korea, etc.). The very nation that I live in has also committed horrendous devastation to the natives of the land. Similarly, you write,

But frequently a king surrendered himself to the impulse of personal vengeance, to the commission of arbitrary acts of violence; frequently, in these privileged families, pride, hereditary hatred, the fury of love and thirst for gold, engendered and multiplied crimes, while the chiefs assembled in towns, the instruments of the passions of kings, excited therein factions and civil wars, oppressed the people by iniquitous judgments, and tormented them by the enormities of their ambition and rapacity.

I see this as the demonstration of sin within humanity, which is disobedience and missing the mark or target that is unity with God and here, I am in complete agreement with you concerning man’s behavior. History has numerous accounts of kings and other leaders having decimated peoples with acts of violence by way of their passions to acquire anything that they have felt within their very souls that they needed or wanted for both themselves and their nations.

**Condorcet:** Gladly, we can agree on some more of the things that I have written within my essay. However, as I have noted,

---

In many nations the excesses of these families exhausted the patience of the people, who accordingly extirpated, banished, or subjected them to the common law; it was rarely that their title, with a limited authority, was preserved to them; and we see take place what has since been called by the name of republics.\textsuperscript{132}

This began to happen within Greece, though it was with a limited democracy, but Rome was the forefront of the Republic, as I note in my Fifth Epoch\textsuperscript{133} and your own nation, the United States of America is a combination of the two being a democratic republic. Further, you will agree that,

In other places, these kings, surrounded with minions, because they had arms and treasures to bestow on them, exercised an absolute authority: and such was the origin of tyranny.\textsuperscript{134}

This is the formation of feudalism and I note it within the continuation of this Third Epoch. On the next page, I write,

It is here also we may observe the origin of the feodal system, a pest that has not been peculiar to our own climate, but has found a footing in almost every part of the globe, at the same periods of civilization, and whenever a country has been

\textsuperscript{133}Ibid, 43.
\textsuperscript{134}Ibid, 26.
occupied by two people between whom victory has established an hereditary inequality.\textsuperscript{135}

\textbf{My view:} Here too, we have some agreement though from my perspective, feudalism had an earlier origin because man will do whatever he can to gain power and authority over whomever he can. Man often strives in effort to gain any advantage for his own benefit over others and human history demonstrates this, as you have written within your essay. The very essence of chiefdom or dominion has often led to forms of feudalism with leaders gaining authority over others and subjecting these people to their sometimes tyrannical power. You give example of this when you write that some of the people of this Third Epoch,

\begin{quote}
Taught not what they believed to be true, but what they thought favourable to their own end.\textsuperscript{136}
\end{quote}

From this, you verify my point concerning the human condition that besieges man with the sin within him and the sins that result. Some of these are the manipulations of one another, along with “the art of deceiving men in order to rob them, and of assuming over their opinions an authority founded upon the hopes and fears of the imagination”\textsuperscript{137} and all of the wars and killings of people for personal or social profit. If this is inevitable as societies become more complex, then your premise that man is progressing toward equality and perfection is inherently flawed.

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{136} Ibid, 30.
\end{flushright}
because you do not want to recognize that man, as even Spinoza conceded, has a condition that causes him to fall short and be in error.\textsuperscript{138}

Continuing on, you again display your prejudice toward those who identify with a faith in the divine. In the last few pages of this Third Epoch you deride all forms of belief outside of the empirical and I note,

The priests by whom the first allegorical language was preserved, employed it with the people, who were no longer capable of discovering its true meaning; and who, accustomed to take words in one acceptation only, that generally received, pictured to themselves I know not what absurd and ridiculous fables, in expressions that conveyed to the minds of the priests but a plain and simple truth.

Thus, for example, the priests, in their contemplations, invented, and introduced almost every where, the metaphysical system of a great, immense and eternal all, of which the whole of the beings that existed were only parts, of which the various changes observable in the universe were but modifications.\textsuperscript{139}

But the language, the memorials, employed in expressing these metaphysical opinions, these natural truths, exhibited to the eyes of the people the most extravagant system of mythology, and became the foundation of creeds the most


absurd, modes of worship the most senseless, and practices the most shameful and barbarous.

Such is the origin of almost all the religions that are known to us, and which the hypocrisy or the extravagance of their inventors and their proselytes afterwards loaded with new fables.¹⁴⁰

Though some of this may be true for some religions, but this cannot be generalized for all. You write that,

The priests by whom the first allegorical language was preserved, employed it with the people, who were no longer capable of discovering its true meaning; and who, accustomed to take words in one acceptation only¹⁴¹ is a gross injustice to not only these, but all people who hold to belief in the supernatural. I do agree that some people have chosen to

in their contemplations, invent, and introduce almost everywhere, the metaphysical system of a great, immense and eternal all, of which the whole of

¹⁴⁰Ibid, 32.
the beings that existed were only parts, of which the various changes observable
in the universe were but modifications.\textsuperscript{142}

Similarly, there have been “modes of worship the most senseless, and practices the most
shameful and barbarous.”\textsuperscript{143} One of these rituals did develop in Greece, moved on to Rome, and
it is the worship of Dionysus where maenads, which are orgies and phallic obscenity were
connected with the Dionysus festivals.\textsuperscript{144} Later, the worship of Mithras progressed into Rome
too, and this worship contained “the blood of the sacrificed bull,”\textsuperscript{145} a “baptism of blood”\textsuperscript{146} for
initiates, and that “Mithra forbade their (women) participation in his Mysteries.”\textsuperscript{147}

On the other hand, when you write that this,

is the origin of almost all the religions that are known to us, and which the
hypocrisy or the extravagance of their inventors and their proselytes afterwards
loaded with new fables,\textsuperscript{148}

you actually condemn all people who differ from your line of thinking. I, however, do not see
that I have the right, power, or authority to condemn, as this would display that I think that I am

\textsuperscript{142} Marie-Jean-Antoine-Nicolas Caritat, Marquis de Condorcet, “Marie-Jean-Antoine-Nicolas Caritat, Marquis de
Condorcet, \textit{Outlines of an historical view of the progress of the human mind [1795]},” \textit{The Online Library of Liberty},
\textsuperscript{143} Ibid, 32.
\textsuperscript{144} “RITUALS OF DIONYSUS: GREAT DIONYSIA,” \textit{University of Houston}, accessed on 4/30/14,
http://www.class.uh.edu/mcl/classics/Dion/Rituals_Dion.html.
\textsuperscript{145} Roger Beck, \textit{The Religion of the Mithras Cult in the Roman Empire: Mysteries of the Unconquered Sun}, (Oxford:
\textsuperscript{146} Franz Cumont, \textit{The Mysteries of Mithras}, (Charleston: BiblioBazaar, 2007), 100.
\textsuperscript{147} Ibid, 95.
\textsuperscript{148} Marie-Jean-Antoine-Nicolas Caritat, Marquis de Condorcet, “Marie-Jean-Antoine-Nicolas Caritat, Marquis de
Condorcet, \textit{Outlines of an historical view of the progress of the human mind [1795]},” \textit{The Online Library of Liberty},
better than others or higher up in the very hierarchies that I stand against. Earlier you and your friends proclaim the glory of liberty, as D’Alembert conveyed this with his “LIBERTY, TRUTH... and PROSPERITY,” but the exact opposite holds true with your words. You continue to deride those of religious belief; those who partake of the metaphysical and do not solely retain a strict adherence to only that which can be perceived with the senses. They reason that there has to be something or someone more than what is before their physical eyes. A simple example of this is that some of the ancient Greeks believed that matter is composed of tiny, miniscule particles called atoms, yet it was not until over a millennia that this was proven true. Atoms could not be seen with the eyes, but the reality is that atoms were present and the same holds true for the divine despite your disbelief.

**Condorcet:** Baffling as it is, you do not seem to understand that our senses; our sensations are all that we have to engage in this world around us. These senses or sensations inform us of what is before us and that which we have yet to discover. As we continue with science to learn of and progress with our senses, maturing our perceptions and understandings of them, we will progress ourselves too. You must understand that religion is only a system for those who seek control over others and for those who long to be controlled. It is a system for tyrants to hold dominion over those who will not pursue the truth that is available to them; those who have not chosen to progress onward and my own experiences validate this as I have mentioned with this quote regarding my own sensations with,

> A moral education fit to make debauched and hypocritical atheists of fanatically bigoted imbeciles; a philosophical education comprised of scholastic jargon and

---

theological dreams; a closed educational environment calculated to foster and perpetuate the adolescent tendency to homosexuality: these were the principal aspects of his education at the hands of the Jesuits that Condorcet remembered at the age of thirty.\footnote{Baker, Keith Michael. \textit{Condorcet: From Natural Philosophy to Social Mathematics} (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1975), 3, 4.}

**My view:** As noted, you may have endured some tragedy within the time of your education with the Jesuits, but it was because of and through these years that you were able to proceed forward, growing in your knowledge, and become all that you are at this time. Essentially, you actually benefitted from that which you despised. Therefore, your years were not as tragic as you allude. Let us continue on with your remaining Epochs.

---

**Chapter 4: Progress of the Human Mind**

My view: You write in your Fourth Epoch that the Greeks gained their religion form their eastern neighbors,
The Greeks had derived from the eastern nations their arts, a part of their information, the use of alphabetical writing, and their system of religion.\textsuperscript{151}

To this I partially agree because is known that the Greeks being great masters of the sea travelled across the Mediterranean regularly and from this were able to have contact with Israel, its people, and its religion. In fact, there are some similarities within Greek myth that are familiar to Israel’s Judaism. One of the names of the Hebrew God’s is El Shaddai and has the meaning of breast or many breasts.\textsuperscript{152} However, these travelling Greeks possibly brought this religious knowledge with them and transferred it to their goddess Demeter where the image of her is a many-breasted body with a female head. Another instance, and this is my personal opinion, is with Elisha in the Book of 2 Kings, chapter 6 (892–832 B.C.) The prophet Elisha had asked his God to open the eyes of his attendant to see the armies of God and how the victory belonged to God and God’s people and not to the enemy from Aram. This seems to have been borrowed by Plato in his \textit{Allegory of the Cave}\textsuperscript{153} in that people chained to the floor within the cave are only seeing and living by images and not reality. For Plato writes that it is by the belief in the message of the philosopher king that people are freed from these false images and can live freely without being deceived. The Form of the Good is true reality and from this belief or understanding there is liberation from the bondage of what is false perception. This too, has similarities to Christianity, as Jesus the Christ proclaims that he is the “way, the truth/reality, and the life.”\textsuperscript{154}


\textsuperscript{152} James Strong LL.D. S.T.D., John R. Kohlenberger III, and James A. Swanson, \textit{The Strongest Strong’s Exhaustive Concordance of the Bible}, (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2001), 1586, 1678.

\textsuperscript{153} Plato, \textit{The Republic}, trans. Benjamin Jowett (Seattle: Amazon Digital Services, Inc., 2008), lines 6803-7267 in Book VII.

\textsuperscript{154} John 14:6 The Oxford Study Bible.
For the authors of the Gospel of Matthew\textsuperscript{155} and the Gospel of John\textsuperscript{156} write that it is only by the saving life of Jesus that humanity can become free of not only the sin within humanity, but the sins that humanity continually commits. The Apostle Paul additionally explains this when he writes in his Epistle to the Romans,

\begin{quote}
For if while we were enemies we were reconciled to God through the death of His Son, it is much more [certain], now that we are reconciled, that we shall be saved (daily delivered from sin’s dominion) through His [resurrection] life.\textsuperscript{157}
\end{quote}

This happens when a person is made aware of God’s saving grace through Jesus Christ and truly believes within the heart. Once this happens, an unseen transformation; a conversion takes place within the believer and the believer upon Christ, as lord is now, “a new creation; the old things have passed away; behold, all things have become new.”\textsuperscript{158} Christ is the person’s life\textsuperscript{159} now. The converted believer is “a sanctuary of the Holy Spirit in you, which you have from God, and you are not of yourselves.” Therefore, inwardly, the person is new with corresponding changes manifest in the outward actions or behavior, though there may not be any change in the person’s outward appearance. It is the internal working externally. This goes along with each believer living through the refinements and trials of finding that there is also the remaining old nature within that needs daily crucifixion or “putting to death the deeds of the flesh,”\textsuperscript{160} which is sinful. It is also written in the First Epistle of John that,

\begin{quote}
\footnotesize
\textsuperscript{155} Matthew 1:21 The Oxford Study Bible. \\
\textsuperscript{156} John 1:29 The Oxford Study Bible. \\
\textsuperscript{157} Romans 5:10 Amplified Bible. \\
\textsuperscript{158} 2 Corinthians 5:17 LITV. \\
\textsuperscript{159} Colossians 3:4 LITV. \\
\textsuperscript{160} Romans 8:13 NASB. 
\end{quote}
If we say that we have no sin, we are deceiving ourselves and the truth is not in us. If we confess our sins, He is faithful and righteous to forgive us our sins and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness. If we say that we have not sinned, we make Him a liar and His word is not in us.\textsuperscript{161}

Note that these verses start off with the reality of sin within each of us and the sins that come forth through us. This is another example of humanity having sin within and sins being the corrupted fruit. It also gives a possible reason for the problem of evil. I say this because in the seventh chapter of Jeremiah, God says to Jeremiah concerning the Israelites,

\begin{quote}
Obey My voice, and I will be your God, and you shall be My people. Also, Walk in all the ways that I have commanded you, so that it may be well with you. But they did not listen nor bow their ear. But they walked in their own plans, in the stubbornness of their evil heart, and went backward and not forward. Since the day that your fathers came out of the land of Egypt until this day, I have even sent to you all My servants, the prophets, daily rising up early and sending. Yet they did not listen to Me nor bow their ear, but they stiffened their neck. They did more evil than their fathers.\textsuperscript{162}
\end{quote}

\begin{footnotes}
\textsuperscript{161} 1 John 1:8-10 NASB.
\textsuperscript{162} Jeremiah 7:23-27 LITV.
\end{footnotes}
The evil comes by way of the freedom of choice that God, who is love, freely offers and since love enables freedom, opposition to God must be possible. That opposition to God, as I stated earlier in the First Epoch, is sin and sin is evil, as it is the direct opposition to God with all of its manifestations. Dr. Peter Kreeft asks, “If there is no God, where did we get the standard of goodness by which we judge evil as evil?” To clarify, when we state that evil exists, this presupposes that a standard of supreme good has to exist too. Christians call this supreme good, God and so did the biblical Jesus when he said, “No one is good, except One: God.”

One last example is in Gideon’s drama from Judges 6 - 8 (1249 – 1247 B.C.) seems to be closely related with the Greeks and their battle with the Persians at Thermopylae in 480 B.C. where the 300 Spartans lost their lives in effort to keep the Persian Empire from taking over Greece. However, in the Biblical tale, the people of God were blessed by God to succeed and defeat their enemy, whereas the Spartans died. Here, I highlight the “LIBERTY, TRUTH . . . and PROSPERITY,” that can come from a life with God through God’s son Jesus.

I will also go back a bit and comment on your writing of this at the end of your Third Epoch, as it relates to what I have just mentioned concerning the divine. You write,

nothing can inform us with precision either in what country, or at what time, alphabetical writing was first brought into use.

The discovery was in time introduced into Greece, among a people who have exercised so powerful and happy an influence on the progress of the human

---

163 1 John 4:8, 16.
165 Luke 18:19 LITV.
species, whose genius has opened all the avenues to truth, whom nature had prepared, whom fate had destined to be the benefactor and guide of all nations and all ages: an honour in which no other people has hitherto shared.\textsuperscript{167}

You surprise me in your writing of a metaphysical source, as you claim “fate had destined to be the benefactor and guide of all nations and all ages.”\textsuperscript{168} I wonder if you are able to describe whether or not fate is a god or force or anything else that you can pinpoint your sensations. I also wonder if you are able to have an intimate relationship with fate or are you merely at the whims of this possibly metaphysical god or force. Here, I am baffled by your seeming change from the empirical to something that you cannot reproduce or experiment with. Nevertheless, I continue to point out the insufficiency of your reasoning and rationale, along with your prejudice throughout the essay to demonstrate the lack in your worldview.

\textbf{Condorcet:} Regardless of what you surmise in relation to fate and the apparent borrowing of religious ideas of the Greeks from the people of Israel, we must continue on with the rest of the essay to persist in the realization that the growing of man’s knowledge and how man can “retain, recognise, combine”\textsuperscript{169} the sensations that he has “the faculty of receiving”\textsuperscript{170} will allow him to rise above all that he has been and reach the highest of heights. Look how I comment in the Fourth Epoch of how with the Greeks,

\begin{flushleft}
their learned men, their sages, as they were called, but who soon
\end{flushleft}


\textsuperscript{168} Ibid.


\textsuperscript{170} Ibid, 9.
took the more modest appellation of philosophers, or friends of science and wisdom, wandered in the immensity of the two vast and comprehensive plan which they had embraced. They were desirous of penetrating both the nature of man, and that of the Gods; the origin of the world, as well as of the human race. They endeavoured to reduce all nature to one principle only, and the phenomena of the universe to one law. They attempted to include, in a single rule of conduct, all the duties of morality, and the secret of true happiness.

Thus, instead of discovering truths, they forged systems; they neglected the observation of facts, to pursue the chimeras of their imagination; and being no longer able to support their opinions with proofs, they sought to defend them by subtleties.\textsuperscript{171}

These men in their immature state moved away from basic facts and instead relied instead upon their own imaginations. This is how mankind stumbles, preventing the attainment of reaching new peaks.

\textbf{My view:} It may be valid that relying solely upon the imagination can prevent further achievements, but to deny the imagination is to close one’s heart and mind to all that may be beyond our limited views. As noted earlier regarding the early Greeks ideas concerning atoms, no person was able to observe atoms at that time, but that does not mean that atoms did not exist. Further, the absence of evidence is not evidence of absence. This means that just because something is not within current knowledge does not necessarily mean that it does not exist and examples are the discoveries of North America by either the Vikings or Christopher Columbus.

\textsuperscript{171}Ibid, 35.
and the furthest planets of the Milky Way galaxy. North America, Uranus, Neptune, and Pluto (though no longer considered a planet – 2006)\textsuperscript{172} all existed prior to their discoveries yet, they had not been found by their acclaimed pioneers. You, dear Condorcet are more than familiar with America, as your own wife has translated some of the writings of American Founding Father, Thomas Paine and you have had friendships with Benjamin Franklin and Thomas Jefferson.\textsuperscript{173}

Besides, you take a step in the opposite direction with your prejudice concerning imagination, as you write of Socrates via Plato with these words,

\begin{quote}
His enchanting stile, his brilliant imagination, the cheerful or dignified colouring, the ingenious and happy traits, that, in his dialogues, dispel the dryness of philosophical discussion; the maxims of a mild and pure morality which he knew how to infuse into them; the art with which he brings his personages into action, and preserves to each his distinct character; all those beauties, which time and the revolutions of opinion have been unable to tarnish, must doubtless have obtained a favourable reception for the visionary ideas that too often form the basis of his works, and that abuse of words which his master had so much censured in the sophists, but from which he could not preserve the first of his disciples.\textsuperscript{174}
\end{quote}

\begin{flushright}
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\end{flushright}
You do not seem to understand that philosophy too, can be a form of religion and that your lauding of the philosophers through the ages is equivalent to making them the high priests. Your cherished Plato wrote *The Republic* yet, in examination of this writing, the public of your day and of my own day, along with the testimony within the New Testament, is awestruck at the misogyny within it. It is fascinating that you esteem him, while at the same time you stand in stark contrast with your own writings on women’s suffrage and with your relationship with your wife. Plato writes,

> We cannot allow men to play the parts of women, quarrelling, weeping, scolding, or boasting against the gods, — least of all when making love or in labour.175

Susan Moller Okin describes more on Plato’s *The Republic* with these words,

> Before the revolutionary idea of including women among the ranks of the guardians is introduced, it is stressed that the impressionable young guardians are at all costs to be prevented from imitating the female sex in what are regarded as its characteristic activities—bickering, boasting, uncooperative self-abandonment, blasphemy, and the frailties of sickness, love and labor. Women, easily deceived by worthless gaudiness, superstitious, prone to excessive grief, lacking in knowledge of what is good for them, and inferior in intellect and in general to

---

men, are no more fit to serve as role models for the chosen youth than are madmen, craftsmen, or slaves.\footnote{Susan Moller Okin, \textit{Women in Western Political Thought}, (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1999), 15-27.}

Looking at the inequality and the problems within his “\textit{The Republic},” as they are many and how America's founding fathers mixed it with Italy's republic and Greece's democracy, we can see that your ideology of equality and fair treatment among people is in sad disarray with this acknowledgment. America, being a democratic republic has only in the 20\textsuperscript{th} and 21\textsuperscript{st} centuries begun to act upon the initial writings of its Constitution regarding human rights. You, Condorcet, are fully aware of America’s slavery and gender inequality from your friendships with Benjamin Franklin and Thomas Jefferson and your wife’s translations of Thomas Paine.\footnote{Joan Landes, “Notes to The History of Feminism: Marie-Jean-Antoine-Nicolas de Caritat, Marquis de Condorcet,” 2010, http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/histfem-condorcet/notes.html.} America has not allowed voting privileges to people of other races, nor to women, prior to the 20\textsuperscript{th} century and is only now, learning to deal with gender changes.

There is also the question regarding your comment of “pure morality.”\footnote{Marie-Jean-Antoine-Nicolas Caritat, Marquis de Condorcet, “Marie-Jean-Antoine-Nicolas Caritat, Marquis de Condorcet, \textit{Outlines of an historical view of the progress of the human mind [1795],}” \textit{The Online Library of Liberty}, (2011) : 37, http://oll.libertyfund.org/title/1669.} What is the foundation for morality if there is no God or Gods? What is the source for morality? Do you base your morals upon whatever you think is right and seems to make logical sense? Basically, you have designated the ideas of one or many people, which seem to make logical sense to be the rule for all. You call this “morals,” but do not understand that people from other areas of the world may not agree with these ideas and have their own. Further, you have initiated pragmatism, where if something works, it is correct and right. However, this is problematic, as history has demonstrated that if war is the only way for a nation or group of people to get what
they want, then it is reasonable despite the horrible circumstances and loss of life. In fact, you “pressed vigorously for the French declaration of war against Austria”\textsuperscript{179} and your own French Revolution is an example with its reign of Terror. Though you decried the execution of Louis XVI, you “proposed the most extreme penalty short of death.”\textsuperscript{180} I am dumbfounded with these contrasts because you do not want Louis XVI killed, but you have no problem with all of the people that will be killed in your war against Austria. It is as if the common people of Austria are of no worth to you as long as the government is changed to fit your socially democratic ideal. Aside from this, let us continue with your version of history.

\textbf{Condorcet:} Sadly, you do not seem to understand why I, along with the Assembly declared war on Austria. I did this because of Austria’s Declaration of Pillnitz.\textsuperscript{181} It was the effort of the European monarchies to ebb the reasoned flow of our revolution and the revolutions within other nations. They were “requesting international consultation over Louis XVI’s role, and suggesting armed intervention to assist the king.”\textsuperscript{182} The monarchs were full of fear and they desired to prevent their overthrow. France needed a revolution to free citizens from the reigns of an unjust monarchy. Mankind needs to be able to be free and make his own decisions without the governance of monarchs. Further, as we continue with the essay, you will learn about that which you have questioned. I give example with these words,

\begin{quote}
Nor had politics yet acquired principles sufficiently invariable not to fear that the legislators might introduce into these institutions their prejudices and their passions.
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{180}Ibid.
\textsuperscript{181}Martin Polley, \textit{An A-Z of Modern Europe Since 1789}, (New York: Routledge, 2000), 53.
\textsuperscript{182}Ibid.
Their object could not be, as yet, to found upon the basis of reason, upon the
rights which all men have equally received from nature, upon the maxims of
universal justice, the superstructure of a society of men equal and free; but merely
to establish laws by which the hereditary members of a society, already existing,
might preserve their liberty, live secure from injustice, and, by exhibiting an
imposing appearance to their neighbours, continue in the enjoyment of their
independence.

As it was supposed that these laws; almost universally connected with religion,
and consecrated by oaths; were to endure for ever, it was less an object of
attention to secure to a people the means of effecting, in a peaceable manner, their
reform, than to guard from every possible change such as were fundamental, and
to take care that the reforms of detail neither incroached upon the system, nor
corrupted the spirit of them.

Such institutions were sought for as were calculated to cherish and give energy to
the love of country, in which was included a love of its legislation and even
usages; such an organization of powers, as would secure the execution of the laws
against the negligence or corruption of magistrates, and the restless disposition of
the multitude.\textsuperscript{183}

\textsuperscript{183} Marie-Jean-Antoine-Nicolas Caritat, Marquis de Condorcet, “Marie-Jean-Antoine-Nicolas Caritat, Marquis de
Condorcet, \textit{Outlines of an historical view of the progress of the human mind [1795]},” \textit{The Online Library of Liberty},
My view: For the first portion with your sentence regarding politics not yet acquiring principles to prevent fear from the legislators. I have to state that this is the common goal of all people. No one wants to live in fear particularly, when concerned with the national authority even though the condition of man will always have the problem of people introducing “their prejudices and their passions,”¹⁸⁴ as history continues to display. Additionally, when we read over man basing his life “upon the basis of reason, upon the rights which all men have equally received from nature,”¹⁸⁵ we need to ask, why men believe that their own reason is uncorrupted, when we continually see the failures within man and what he brings forth because of this corruption. We need to not only ask who men are to be free from, but what man needs to be free from. Are you referring to the perpetual insecurities that we, the members of humanity live with like, approval of our personal appearances as you did when your mother forced you to continue wearing dress at 8 years old while your contemporaries dressed like boys? Are you referring to insecurities from this that made you want to rebel against your mother’s adoration of the Virgin Mary and causes your animosity to religious belief? Is it because of these and other insecurities, that you have lived the life you have, sought after reason and rationale as a saving god, and therefore, written this essay?

Additionally, we need to also ask why laws are needed for men if man is so good and wise. I also ponder if one nation invades another nation and takes rule, will the same rights of the people of that invaded nation still apply? Lastly, laws themselves are vehicles of intolerance. Laws dictate what is tolerable and what is not tolerable. When we humans ascribe rights to ourselves and laws to validate and secure these rights, we automatically pronounce a tolerance based system, which dictates what is allowed and what is not. Therefore, when we claim that something or someone is being intolerant, we are blind to the reality of this attitude being

¹⁸⁴ Ibid.
¹⁸⁵ Ibid.
intolerant too. Tolerance is a two-edged sword that not only cuts to define, but also cuts to kill and we should tread lightly with great wisdom and foresight when establishing ideas and laws that are based upon the concept of pronouncing tolerance.

Chapter 5: Progress of the Sciences

Condorcet: As we continue on with my Fifth Epoch, you will understand more of what I am conveying with my detailed description of history, of how man progresses and it is only by religion that man is inhibited from this progression. Through this portion of my essay, I detail
how Greece grew to its philosophical summit, which then began its division from science. This came about when “Plato was still living when Aristotle, his disciple, opened, in Athens itself, a school, the rival of that of his master.”

Fortunately the era of this division preceded the period in which Greece, after long struggles, was destined to lose her freedom. The sciences found, in the capital of Egypt, an asylum, which, by the despots who governed it, would probably have been refused to philosophy.

Which you will agree to this not only with history regarding the world’s empires, but also concerning that it was in Egypt that science found a refuge. In fact, I write of how “Archimedes discovered the quadrature of the parabola, and measured the surface of the sphere.” There is also the information that “in about 287 B.C., Archimedes traveled to Egypt at the age of 18 to study at the great library of Alexandria” where I am sure many of science and philosophy’s great men spent time.

Similarly, you will note that later in time, Origen, who sadly turned to the superstition of Jesus; detailed later, taught of the great philosophers until he fully gave himself over to the false notions regarding the religion of Jesus. Further, I write of how, it was because of Archimedes the sciences took an even greater hold within man. Regarding him,
He may, in some respect, be considered as the father of rational or theoretical mechanics. To him we are indebted for the theory of the lever, as well as the discovery of that principle of hydrostatics, that a body immersed in any fluid, loses a portion of its weight equal to the mass of fluid it has displaced.\textsuperscript{191}

To go along with this,

The observations of the Chaldeans, transmitted to Aristotle by Alexander, accelerated the progress of astronomy. The most brilliant portion of them was due to the genius of Hipparchus. And if, after him in astronomy, as after Archimedes in geometry and mechanics, we no longer perceive those discoveries and acquisitions which change, as it were, the whole face of a science, they yet for a long time continued to improve, expand, and enrich themselves by the truths of detail.\textsuperscript{192}

Man is seen here to be fully moving in and toward his perfection. His reason is being refined and the dross is removed, but then, a new tragedy arose by,

The inhabitants of conquered nations, the children of misfortune, men of a weak but sanguine imagination, would from preference attach themselves to the


\textsuperscript{192} Ibid, 45.
sacerdotal religions; because the interest of the ruling priests dictated to them that very doctrine of equality in slavery, of the renunciation of temporal enjoyments, of rewards in heaven reserved for blind submission, for sufferings, for mortifications inflicted voluntarily, or endured without repining; that doctrine so attractive, so consolatory to oppressed humanity! 193

This finality was with,

Twenty Egyptian and Jewish sects, united their forces against the religion of the empire, but contending against each other with equal fury, were lost at length in the religion of Jesus. From their wreck were composed a history, a creed, a ritual, and a system of morality, to which by degrees the mass of these fanatics attached themselves. 194

Now, I relate the fullness of the superstitious tragedy with what soon happened,

In proportion as the empire weakened, the progress of this religion of Christ became more rapid. The degraded state of the ancient conquerors of the world extended to their Gods, who, after presiding in their victories, were no longer regarded than as the impotent witnesses of their defeat. The spirit of the new sect was better suited to periods of decline and misfortune. Its chiefs, in spite of their

194 Ibid.
impostures and their vices, were enthusiasts ready to suffer death for their doctrine. The religious zeal of the philosophers and of the great, was only a political devotion: and every religion which men permit themselves to defend as a creed useful to be left to the people, can expect no other fate than a dissolution more or less distant. Christianity soon became a powerful party; it mixed in the quarrels of the Cæsars: it placed Constantine on the thorne; where it afterwards seated itself, by the side of his weak successors.\textsuperscript{195}

As a consequence of this corruption to mankind, Rome soon after fell and this came as a result of “the triumph of Christianity (and) was thus the signal of the entire decline both of the sciences and of philosophy.”\textsuperscript{196} The glory of man had ended for a time when Rome was lost, but man is not dead and as we persist with my essay the realization of man’s evolution will have recognition.

My view: You are correct in discerning my understanding with the world’s empires. Rome grew and took over Greece, as well as many other nations. I see this when I read from the history books that are taught within the public schools and from the prophecy attributed to the prophet Daniel within the Bible. Daniel describes to the Babylonian king Nebuchadnezzar a dream that the king had concerning a great statue that was made of many different materials. Daniel states that the statue has a gold head, a silver chest and arms, an abdomen and thighs of bronze, legs of iron, and feet of iron and clay. An interpretation describes this as the procession of western world


\textsuperscript{196} Ibid, 54.
empires with Babylon being the gold, Medo-Persia being the silver, Greece being the bronze, and the lower legs and feet are Rome. The Roman Empire existed,

Until a stone was cut out without hands, which struck the image on its feet of iron and clay, and crushed them . . . But the stone that struck the statue became a great mountain and filled the whole earth." 197

The Roman Empire was destroyed by not only the invading tribes of Germany and political malfunction, but it was also overturned by God when he sent forth his rock. This rock is God 198 and his life within his people. 199 The Bible describes how the followers of Jesus Christ became part of “a living stone which has been rejected by men, but is choice and precious in the sight of God,” 200 overcoming the Roman Empire. As the Biblical scriptures state, “Not by might nor by power, but by My Spirit,’ says the Lord of hosts.” 201 However, Constantine did merge Rome’s Empire with the Christian faith and assimilation occurred contrary to the New Testament scriptures with the condemnation of and absence of love toward those who were not Christian.

Conversely, I disagree with your concepts regarding Jesus. Obviously, the Bible cites the divinity of Jesus 202 but, in my eyes, as well as in the millions of others, Jesus fully demonstrated his deity with the changing of peoples’ lives in a manner that aligns with New Testament scripture. A way to recognize this is found with these verses,

197 Daniel 2-8 NASB records the vision and eventual fulfillment of prophecy regarding Middle Eastern and Mediterranean Empires.
198 Isaiah 44:8; 1 Corinthians 10:4 NASB and 1 Peter 2:6-8 LITV.
199 1 Peter 2:5 LITV.
200 1 Peter 2:4 LITV.
201 Zechariah 4:6 NASB.
For each tree is known from its own fruit. For they do not gather figs from thorns, nor do they gather grapes from a bramble bush. The good man brings forth good out of the good treasure of his heart. And the evil man brings forth evil out of the evil treasure of his heart, for his mouth speaks out of the abundance of his heart.\textsuperscript{203}

Jesus further references who is good in saying, “No one is good except One, God,”\textsuperscript{204} but it is also revealed that he who is “in Christ, he is a new creation.”\textsuperscript{205} So, from this, it is exclaimed, “Christ in you, the hope of glory.”\textsuperscript{206} Though this can be viewed as arbitrary, world history does demonstrate that something unique has occurred amongst those people, who claim to be followers of Jesus and claim his deity. These Christians have brought about great change to the world and a simple example is the change in the accounting of time, as years are marked regarding the time of Jesus Christ and this still applies with the contemporary notion of the common era and the before common era.

Additionally, Jesus fulfilled the prophecies that were previously written within the Jewish Tanakh: Jewish Bible about the messiah. Further, instead of humanity being stuck with trying to find a method to please the deity, as most all faiths have their followers do, God sent forth his own son as an offering to bring satisfaction to himself. This is because of mankind not living in the perfection that God demands. Man is required with “You must be perfect before your Ever-Living God”\textsuperscript{207} and this is only accomplished by the life of Jesus Christ living within each

\textsuperscript{203} Luke 6:44, 45 LITV.  
\textsuperscript{204} Mark 10:18 LITV.  
\textsuperscript{205} 2 Corinthians 5:17 LITV.  
\textsuperscript{206} Colossians 1:27 LITV.  
\textsuperscript{207} Deuteronomy 18:13The Holy Bible in Modern English.
person, as it reads in Colossians, “Christ in you, the hope of glory.”\textsuperscript{208} Man is not left alone. These verses support this, “And He Who supports us with you in Christ, and sanctifies us, is God; and He attested us, and gave the pledge of the Spirit to our hearts,”\textsuperscript{209} and

The Spirit himself bears witness to our spirit that we are God’s children. And if children, then heirs (namely, heirs of God and also fellow heirs with Christ)—if indeed we suffer with him so we may also be glorified with him.\textsuperscript{210}

Likewise, Romans 5:9 reads that,

Therefore, since we are now justified (acquitted, made righteous, and brought into right relationship with God) by Christ’s blood, how much more [certain is it that] we shall be saved by Him from the indignation \textit{and} wrath of God.\textsuperscript{211}

This is because, “For God is one, also there is one Mediator of God and of men, the Man Christ Jesus”\textsuperscript{212} that has justified and reconciled humanity with God. Humanity does not have to struggle alone to try and conceive ways to progress in ways that continually fail and do not bring continual peace or satisfaction. God is ready, willing, and able to give all of himself to each person and we are given the opportunity to come unto him. This is a free choice to be engaged in the greatest relationship of love that ever exists. The 1st Epistle of John declares that “God is

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{208}Colossians 1:27 NASB.
\item \textsuperscript{209}2 Corinthians 1:21, 22 The Holy Bible in Modern English.
\item \textsuperscript{210}Romans 8:16, 17 NET Bible.
\item \textsuperscript{211}Romans 5:9 Amplified Bible.
\item \textsuperscript{212}1 Timothy 2:5 LITV.
\end{itemize}
and love must have freedom within it or it is not love at all and only a farce; a farce that
godless humanity lives each day. This travesty is called conditional love where people must do
something or many things in order to receive a limited love that is not freely given no matter
what occurs. However, God is agape love and that is unconditional. A recognized definition for
this agape love is “unselfish loyal and benevolent concern for the good of another”\footnote{1 John 4:8, 16 NASB.}

**Condorcet:** Some of what you say seems correct with Christianity taking over and assimilating
into the Roman Empire, as well as our Western world, but the Biblical prophecy is sadly
ridiculous. Our world operates by only what we perceive through our senses and empirical
science verifies this for us. There is not a special, spiritual gifting, though some of what you
mention can come across as authentic. However, your theology sounds wonderful to most any
person blinded by religion and all of the perversion within it. You also seem to forget some of
the more important parts of what I wrote, “the triumph of Christianity was thus the signal of the
entire decline both of the sciences and of philosophy”\footnote{Marie-Jean-Antoine-Nicolas Caritat, Marquis de Condorcet, “Marie-Jean-Antoine-Nicolas Caritat, Marquis de

and that

“Christianity soon became a powerful party; it mixed in the quarrels of the
Caesars: it placed Constantine on the thorne; where it afterwards seated itself, by
the side of his weak successors.”\footnote{Marie-Jean-Antoine-Nicolas Caritat, Marquis de Condorcet, “Marie-Jean-Antoine-Nicolas Caritat, Marquis de
The wonder of Rome; man’s great empire with all of its glory and military victory would still exist to this day if it had not been for your misguided faith in Jesus. Rome brought progression to humanity with the architecture of its domes, which superseded the Greek arch. Its marked road system benefitted transport and travel. Its republican government allowed for the superior of humanity to have its place in ruling authority. Humanity could ask for almost no more, except the continual, progressive growth that is within our very nature. Rome’s empire was the continuation of man’s progression as it overcame the deficiencies of the previous empires. I am baffled that you are not aware of man’s progression and how man pursues in his advancement toward perfection. It is as if your religion has done the exact opposite of what your Bible claims Jesus to have done. Supposedly, Jesus healed many blind people and this was purportedly to fulfill the alleged prophecies of Isaiah with,

The Spirit of the Lord is upon Me, because He anointed Me to preach the gospel to the poor. He has sent Me to proclaim release to the captives, and recovery of sight to the blind, to set free those who are oppressed, to proclaim the favorable year of the Lord. 217

However, you and those who commit to this faith are actually blind to what humanity has done in the past, done within the present, and will do in the future. Your ideas of Jesus have made you blind to who man is.

My view: Despite your lack of toleration toward Christians because of our faith in Jesus, I will address what you claim I have missed concerning “the entire decline both of the sciences and of

217 Luke 4:18, 19 NAS.
philosophy” and Christianity placing “Constantine on the thorne; where it afterwards seated itself, by the side of his weak successors. You may be partially correct with there being an apparent decline in sciences and philosophy, but that is because so much of the records were lost because of the warfare Rome had with the invading Germanic tribes and other issues of that day. Today, we have a greater amount from antiquity available to us and from our current data we are able to learn that there was some progress within the sciences, but it dealt particularly with alchemy. By this, I refer to alchemy’s full definition being,

a medieval chemical science and speculative philosophy aiming to achieve the transmutation of the base metals into gold, the discovery of a universal cure for disease, and the discovery of a means of indefinitely prolonging life.

Frederick Gregory’s *Natural Science in Western History* reads of how,

The medieval theologian Robert of Ketton, who brought the Koran into Latin, translated an Arabic work on alchemy under the title *De compositione alchemiae* (On Alchemical Composition) in 1134. Although this was the first work, many would follow. Within 250 years an enormous number of alchemical materials were accessible.

---
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On the other hand, most all scholars and even those, whom you deem to be less perceptive, acknowledge that Constantine was not truly Christian during his rule of Rome. He may have become Christian near his death, but the way that he lived clearly indicates that he was not Christian by any standard. There was no “love for his neighbor”\(^{222}\) or love for his enemies,\(^{223}\) as these are but two of the foundational stones within the worship of Jesus. So, once Constantine had his apparent vision of a “flaming cross in the sky, with the Greek words en touti nika—‘in this sign thou shall conquer,’” he went on to military battle against Maxentius. Constantine claimed to have had a dream in which “a voice commanded him to have his soldiers mark upon their shields . . . the symbol of Christ” and with this, he defeated Maxentius, resulting in there being only three Caesars instead of four at a time. Later, he and Caesar Licinius issued the Edict of Milan giving toleration to all religions within the empire. Eventually, Constantine went to war with Licinius and won, making him the sole emperor, as Maximinus had previously died. Constantine was no different than any of Rome’s other rulers, as he “surrounded himself with pagan scholars and philosophers,”\(^{224}\) and it can only be asked, was his conversion sincere or “a consummate stroke of political wisdom? Probably the latter.”\(^{225}\) However, it must be noted that Constantine’s version of Christianity did bring about prosperity and relief to Christians, but the apparent blessing has manufactured byproducts. As Will Durant wrote concerning Constantine and Christianity, “by his aid Christianity became a state as well as a church, and the mold for fourteen centuries of European life and thought.”\(^{226}\) Christianity acquired an institutional mutation and moved from the spiritual domain to the secular realm. As you are

\(^{222}\) Leviticus 19:18; Matthew 19:19, 22:39; Mark 12:31; Luke 10:27; Romans 13:9; Galatians 5:14; and James 2:8 NASB.

\(^{223}\) Exodus 23:4, 5; Proverbs 25:21; Romans 12:14, 20 NASB.


\(^{226}\) Ibid, 664.
aware Condorcet, what is called the Church has transitioned into an earthly, governmental
dominion where divine terminology is used, but the source is often not divine. Just as Adam was
tempted to obtain power for himself apart from God, the reality is that man seeks be the source
and distributor of rule. So that because of this, I agree with you on the calamity of what has
occurred from this, but it is also what you desire to manifest within your own essay. Your desire
is the same as Adam’s, to be god.

Further, I will continue to engage with you on more of the things that I find to be errors
within your essay. You make this comment and though it does not necessarily fit into the
timeline of you historical account, it still needs to be addressed. You write,

> It was then impossible that the sciences, arrived at a point in which the progress,
and even the study of them were still difficult, should be able to support
themselves, and resist the current that bore them rapidly towards their decline.
Accordingly it ought not to astonish us that Christianity, though unable in the
sequel to prevent their reappearance in splendor, after the invention of printing,
was at this period sufficiently powerful to accomplish their ruin.²²⁷

It is striking that humanity’s own invention(s), in this case science, cannot withstand what else
man brings forth. Assuming that you would respond that mankind’s creation of science was not
well enough prepared for the declines that man would also bring forth, you validate my own
premise that man cannot bring forth any perfection within himself in the first place.

²²⁷ Marie-Jean-Antoine-Nicolas Caritat, Marquis de Condorcet, “Marie-Jean-Antoine-Nicolas Caritat, Marquis de
Condorcet, *Outlines of an historical view of the progress of the human mind [1795],* The Online Library of Liberty,
Conversely, we must remember that it was a Christian, Johann Gutenberg, who invented the printing press and his first work was a copy of the Bible. Additionally, many of the early scientists were Christian too. Let me remind you of Copernicus who, though being a scientist had “an administrative position just below that of a bishop”\(^{228}\) within the Church. Galileo Galilei was not only a Christian during the theological struggles relating to heliocentrism, but was also a good friend with Pope Urban VIII.\(^{229}\) Tyco Brahe, Isaac Newton, and especially, Johannes Kepler, are noted Christians. We must remember that Kepler originally “began a three-year program to prepare himself for the clergy”\(^{230}\) and that he “remained interested throughout his life in theological issues.”\(^{231}\) Both Kepler and “Newton saw the cosmos as a divine construct.”\(^{232}\) Though these men came later in time from your current Epoch, they still apply to what you write within it and your intolerance toward Jesus Christ and his followers.

**Condorcet:** Though we disagree with much regarding history and our worldviews, we have parallel ways of thinking that contain momentary intersections, which evidence the substructures of our different perspectives. Again, mine is based upon human reason and yours is based upon revelation. Further, we can both agree with Rome’s downfall and the “weak successors”\(^{233}\) of Constantine. So much of what followed him was an outrage and one particular example will lead to the beginning of my Sixth Epoch.


\(^{229}\) Frederick Gregory, *Natural Science in Western History*, (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 2008), 129.

\(^{230}\) Ibid, 105.

\(^{231}\) Ibid, 109.


Chapter 6: Decline of Learning

Condorcet: I write that,

In the disastrous epoch at which we are now arrived, we shall see the human mind rapidly descending from the height to which it had raised itself, while Ignorance marches in triumph, carrying with her, in one place, barbarian ferocity; in another, a more refined and accomplished cruelty; every where, corruption and perfidy. A glimmering of talents, some faint sparks of greatness or benevolence of soul, will,
with difficulty, be discerned amidst the universal darkness. Theological reveries, superstitious delusions, are become the sole genius of man, religious intolerance his only morality; and Europe, crushed between sacerdotal tyranny and military despotism, awaits, in blood and in tears, the moment when the revival of light shall restore it to liberty, to humanity, and to virtue.\textsuperscript{234}

The prime example of this was Theodosius I. This man brought such a horror to mankind with all of his destruction to the treasures of pagan antiquity and how he treated those that did follow his version of Christianity. He worked to eliminate the Arian theology. The emperor Theodosius I

Obliged the church with a new and far sterner law against paganism. The ban on all sacrifice, public or private, was reiterated, and all access to temples now prohibited. It was followed by yet further laws with detailed prohibitions of purely private rituals.\textsuperscript{235}

I am relating how religion, particularly Christianity with its monarchs, has brought an intellectual decline and a tyranny among men. From this there is an inherent social slave system that arises. Some of my other words identify this,

Whenever tyranny aims at reducing the mass of a people to the will of one of its portions, the prejudices and ignorance of the victims are counted among the


means of effecting it; it endeavours to compensate, by the compression and activity of a smaller force for the superiority of real force, which, one might suppose, cannot fail to belong, at all times, to the majority of numbers. But the principal foundation of its hope, which however it can seldom attain, is that of establishing between the masters and slaves a real difference, which shall in a manner render nature herself an accomplice in the guilt of political inequality.\textsuperscript{236}

From these examples, you can readily understand some of the inherent problems with religion and especially, Christianity. It is a tyrannical, superstitious, slave system.

**My view:** You are correct Condorcet on our agreement concerning Constantine’s successors. These men are easily viewed as a tragedy within human history and what they did to people was horrendous. They perpetuated a hierarchal caste system, which continues on through history and still applies within my own day. One situation denoting this current reality is the Occupy Movement’s creation and its protests across the world. The most popularized event from the group has been the initial occupation of New York City’s Wall Street financial district. The Occupy Wall Street demonstrations began on September 17, 2011 and these protestors gathered to demonstrate with their

Fighting back against the corrosive power of major banks and multinational corporations over the democratic process, and the role of Wall Street in creating an economic collapse that has caused the greatest recession in generations.\textsuperscript{237}


I cite this because it relates to the same words that you wrote,

Whenever tyranny aims at reducing the mass of a people to the will of one of its portions, the prejudices and ignorance of the victims are counted among the means of effecting it; it endeavours to compensate, by the compression and activity of a smaller force for the superiority of real force, which, one might suppose, cannot fail to belong, at all times, to the majority of numbers. But the principal foundation of its hope, which however it can seldom attain, is that of establishing between the masters and slaves a real difference, which shall in a manner render nature herself an accomplice in the guilt of political inequality.²³⁸

This battle relates to the growing financial gap across not only my nation, but also the world and the lack of accountability by these corporations in their actions against the ignorant and financially weak. It is not difficult to understand these peoples’ protest, as one of the multinational corporations with whom they are against is Monsanto. Monsanto is a chemical and agricultural biotechnology corporation that not only delivers “agricultural products that support farmers all around the world,”²³⁹ but has also benefited politically from the last four of the United States’ Presidents. The documentary film Food, Inc. proclaims that not only has Monsanto advanced politically in the U. S., but has conversely brought mayhem among farmers. Food, Inc. gives a brief outline of the political history of agribusiness and its relationship with

the USDA (United States Department of Agriculture), the FDA (Food and Drug Administration), and the U.S. Supreme Court. The film documents how Monsanto, this U.S.-based, multinational, agricultural, biotechnology corporation; the largest American genetic engineering agribusiness, has had an intimate relationship with the U.S. government since Clarence Thomas became a Supreme Court Justice. This relationship exists because Justice Thomas was an attorney for Monsanto from 1976 – 1979. While in judicial office, he wrote the majority opinion in a court case that prevented farmers from saving their own seed, which in turn enabled Monsanto to become the exclusive seller of patented seed that has been genetically modified and which cannot reproduce. In fact, “Monsanto’s control of the seed market is so high that 93% of soybeans, 82% of corn, 93% of cotton and 95% of sugar beets grown in the U.S. contain Monsanto’s patented genes.” Furthermore, Monsanto’s seed sterility contains pollen that when blown in the breeze, will infect normal, natural plants and causes them to be sterile as well. Thus, the unknowing farmer is now, forced into relying upon genetically altered seeds and being a Monsanto customer. Presidents Bill Clinton and George W. Bush had officials in their administrations, who were former employees or substantial donation recipients of Monsanto. More so, President Barak Obama has not departed from the intimate relationship that Monsanto has had with the U. S. government, as his Administration has approved not one, but two of Monsanto's Round Up Ready genetically modified (GMO) crops. On January 27, the USDA made the decision, under the directive of the White House, to fully deregulate Roundup Ready
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alfalfa, followed by the partial deregulation of Roundup Ready sugar beets this past Friday, opening the door for the planting of both of these GMO crops this spring.243

My reason for mentioning this relates to some of the same problems that you had in France. There was great struggle against government and how the government was not benefitting the citizenry and at times, distressing or abusing the people. Likewise, there are occurrences of both good and bad science through the ages. I refer to the work of alchemists to achieve the transmutation of the base metals into gold or work wonders of magic. Currently, we have science seemingly more focused upon profits than on bettering humanity and our environment.

Returning to the GMO portion, I note that it is interesting too, that The Farmer Assurance Provision within HR 933 was “signed into law by President Obama on March 26, 2013.”244 The Farmer Assurance Provision is being labeled as the Monsanto Protection Act, because it would limit the ability of judges to stop Monsanto or the farmers it sells genetically modified seeds from growing or harvesting those crops even if courts find evidence of potential health risks.245


These are just two factors describing what has come forth in regards to today’s class oriented and tyrannical slave system. A great deal of citizens, whether American or otherwise, have struggled to afford foods that are organic and not genetically modified. There is debate as to whether or not GMO (Genetically Modified Organism) foods are harmful, but there is evidence to sway opinion against GMO consumption. In fact, the European Union will only allow GMO products into the EU that have met regulations to

Protect human and animal health through stringent safety assessment of GM food and feed before it can be sold; Ensure common procedures for risk assessment and authorisation are efficient, transparent and do not take too long; Ensure clear labelling that responds to the concerns of consumers (including farmers buying feed) and enables them to make informed choices.  

These products must undergo a specific registration process. There is documentation against GMO products, as

Rising levels of food allergies in the United States may be linked to the increase of genetically modified (GM) foods. Data on allergic reactions is difficult to collect as individuals must be exposed to a substance, often more than once, in order to determine if an allergy exists. But there is increasing evidence that at least one GM crop, soy, is linked to the soaring number of allergic reactions to products containing GM soy. The lack of

---


mandatory labeling for GM foods in the United States leaves millions of Americans unaware of the risks within their diet.\textsuperscript{248}

Further, there have been several uprisings across the globe against these GMO businesses.\textsuperscript{249}

\textbf{Chapter 7: First Progress of the Sciences, Their Revival, Printing}

\textbf{My view:} Now, concerning your Seventh Epoch, I find more that I agree with in it and I will elaborate upon it, but I will also continue to point out more of the errors within your version of history. Obviously, history can be taken from different views, but this reaffirms our parallel ways of thinking that contain only momentary intersections and these intersections evidence the substructures of our different worldviews. On the first page of this Seventh Epoch you write of tyranny within the Holy Roman Empire, an Empire started by Constantine and carried onward through the centuries. I stand with your opinion concerning,

The intolerance of priests, their eagerness to grasp at political power, their abominable avarice, their dissolute manners, rendered more disgusting by their hypocrisy, excited against them every honest heart, every unbiased


understanding, and every courageous character. It was impossible not to be struck with the contradictions between their dogmas, maxims and conduct, and those of the evangelists, from which their faith and system of morals had originated, and which they had been unable totally to conceal from the knowledge of the people.

Accordingly, powerful outcries were raised against them. In the centre of France whole provinces united for the adoption of a more simple doctrine, a purer system of Christianity, in which, subjected only to the worship of a single Divinity, man was permitted to judge from his own reason, of what that Divinity had condescended to reveal in the books said to have emanated from him.

Fanatic armies, conducted by ambitious chiefs, laid waste the provinces. Executioners, under the guidance of legates and priests, put to death those whom the soldiers had spared. A tribunal of monks was established, with powers of condemning to the stake whoever should be suspected of making use of his reason.  

Our histories agree that the Holy Roman Empire moved in an “eagerness to grasp at political power” and by the hypocrisy that carried forward. We both understand the contradiction of the Crusades in that the unbiblical clergy excited their followers into a religious frenzy to restore freedom to Jerusalem and all of Israel from the Muslims that overtook it, but it was through warfare, which is in direct opposition to the very life of their claimed leader; Jesus Christ and the
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Bible, which they claim to follow. Both Christians and those who were not, stood against this tragedy. The Waldensians were a group of French Christians whose lives displayed the reality of the Christian faith and this demonstrated the hypocrisy coming from the religious empire. They were known for living like the disciples of Jesus and made their own “translation of the Bible into the French of the region, and . . . applied themselves to reading and preaching on its basis.” You may call them superstitious, but their lives demonstrated a reality that was reminiscent of the first centuries of the Christian millennia with God’s love manifest through them.

In the secular realm, your mention of “Frederic the second” agrees with my own historical understandings. Though he was educated, like your were, within the counsel of the Holy Roman Empire, he chose to take a stand against it and seek his own rule apart from the empire’s authority; the Pope. In this, he meets your own words, “disputes between the clergy and the governments” of his own day and he seems to be aligned with your own writing of Letter from a Theologian to the Author of the Dictionary of Three Centuries, which is “a fiercely anti-clerical call to arms.”

Condorcet: You are correct with some of your thoughts regarding my lack of foresight concerning what science within the hands of irrational governments would produce and you are correct concerning the scientists who partake of your Christian superstition. I, like you, am

---
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disgusted by what took place during the Crusades, as this results from what I wrote concerning Constantine’s successors. I will not address the existence of science benefitting from Christians, as even intellectually advanced people can give themselves over to superstitions. However, during this Seventh Epoch there was,

Such a profusion of labour employed to prove what good sense alone was competent to have taught; but the truths to which I refer, at that time new, frequently decided the fate of a people: these men sought them with an independent mind; they defended them with firmness; and to their influence is it to be ascribed that human reason began to recover the recollection of its rights and its liberty.

In the quarrels that took place between the kings and the nobles, the kings secured the support of the principal towns, either by granting privileges, or by restoring some of the natural rights of man: they endeavoured, by means of emancipations, to increase the number of those who enjoyed the common right of citizens.²⁵⁶

There was the rehabilitation to part of the natural rights of man and citizens appreciated their common rights. No longer was superstitious religion the ruling master over peoples’ minds, as secular governments took a stronger hold. Examples of this are that,

Republics were formed in Italy, of which some were imitations of the Greek republics, while others attempted to reconcile the servitude of a subject people with the liberty and democratic equality of a sovereign one. In Germany, in the north, some towns, obtaining almost entire independence, were governed by their own laws.\textsuperscript{257}

From this, liberty regained its foundation among men and the various forms of slavery began to slowly fade away.

\textbf{My view:} I find it more than interesting that you acknowledge your lack of foresight, but you will not deal with science’s advancement from Christians. Moving forward, I will deal with your concepts referring to the natural rights of man and people being “governed by their own laws.”\textsuperscript{258} I will address one of the foremost men, who wrote about the natural rights of man, which aided the formation of my own nation’s government. John Locke had great influence upon Thomas Jefferson as you also did. Locke developed the constitution for what was called Carolina and is today known as the areas from “Virginia through Georgia.”\textsuperscript{259} His \textit{Second Treatise of Civil Government} has been the “principal proponent of the social contract theory which forms the basis for modern constitutional republican government”\textsuperscript{260} and from which the constitution of the United States sought reference. Locke proposed that,

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{257}Ibid, 67.
  \item \textsuperscript{260}Ibid.
\end{itemize}
Man was originally born into a state of nature where he was rational, tolerant, and happy. In this original existence man was entitled to enjoy the rights of life, liberty and property.\textsuperscript{261}

He also suggested that man was born into a state of equality “where naturally there is no superiority or jurisdiction of one over another.”\textsuperscript{262} Granted, the two of you share many similarities and your joining with d’Alembert’s “LIBERTY, TRUTH . . . and PROSPERITY”\textsuperscript{263} intricately fits with Locke’s influence on Thomas Jefferson. Jefferson’s own version of “Life, Liberty, and the pursuit of Happiness”\textsuperscript{264} is proclaimed in the Declaration of Independence for my own nation. However, we must analyze how these ideas have come about. The natural rights of man, is a concept with historical and wide reception through the centuries but, we must recognize that it is only an idea initiated within minds of people, like Locke, d’Alembert, and Jefferson. So, because of its wide acceptance, it has become a nearly universal law for humanity though, there have been modifications. By its very nature, this concept has led to nations seeking to be “governed by their own laws.”\textsuperscript{265} I am not against “life, liberty and property or “liberty, truth, and prosperity,” but to proclaim that these are rights indwelt by man is pushing the envelope.

The following is a simple rendition to explain what I mean. If one nation invades and conquers another nation, naturally the conquering nation inflicts its own laws and levels of
tolerance upon the conquered people. This is historical through man’s chronology and two examples are what the Spanish, some of them claiming to be Christian, have done during their Age of Exploration and what other Europeans have done to the natives of North America. In both cases, the so-called natural rights of man were completely denied to the native peoples that inhabited the American continents. The natives were not allowed liberty, truth, property, or prosperity and often they were denied their own lives. What has come about with this concept of natural rights is really an excuse to get away with man’s inner pride, self-righteousness, and self-glorification. It is also an idea rooted in fear. We establish these rights to protect ourselves from those we fear will inhibit our liberty in being our own lords. We seek ways to protect ourselves with these rights, but protection is so often based upon fear. If we were to truly believe that these rights were natural to ourselves and that we are really good, we would not need to establish laws to ensure our protection from one another, as we would not need any protection from each other in the first place.

In current times, the United Nations has established its own Universal Declaration of Human Rights and from this, laws are enacted to deal with violations against these rights.

However, the United Nations’ own Repertoire of the Practice of the Security Council consists of articles that enable the Security Council “to use force to maintain or restore international peace and security if it considers non-military measures to be or to have proven inadequate.” This means that this global group of nations has established its own laws to legally allow the use of force against its own or other nations for “the purpose of maintenance of international peace and security.” Oddly, hypocritical to say the least, that a group of nations,
in a limited democratic process have elected themselves to be the social government to the rest of the world. Granted, there is the idea of self defense, but as Jesus stated, “for all those who take up the sword shall perish by the sword”\textsuperscript{268} Besides this, they are also the world’s police force that will use violence to “maintain or restore international peace and security.”\textsuperscript{269} This is particularly true regarding the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, as David Batstone writes that,

\textbf{The International Labour Organization, the eighty-year-old nongovernmental agency tied to the United Nations, reports that forced-labor victims have been denied more than $20 billion in earned wages, and that figure does not include victims of sex trafficking.}\textsuperscript{270}

Batstone notes that this idea of human rights is continually under attack, which verifies that not all people agree to the concept of natural rights in the first place. Though the thought of natural rights seems to be a fair perception for all to believe into and follow, not all people acknowledge this and their lives are an outcry against this view. In fact, this idea of natural rights is essentially imposed upon the rest of humanity by those who bring forth the natural rights concept and enforce their opinions upon the perceived solidarity of the other humans. Another contradictory aspect of the United Nations’ Universal Declaration of Human Rights comes from the Declaration itself, as it reads, “Everyone has the right to life, liberty and security of person,”\textsuperscript{271} but the very use of military force to ensure this can inhibit and deny the very rights that are

\textsuperscript{268} Matthew 26:52 NASB.
declared. Further, no human has the authority, unless there is inherent divinity, to determine what is “life, liberty and property”\(^{272}\) for all people.

Now, it is taken into account that the United Nations’ Security Council is not the same organization as is the United Nations General Assembly, as there are six organizations within the headship of the United Nations. It is like the example of an octopus; an animal with many legs under the headship of one mind. However, this could easily be compared to the Civil Rights Movements in the United States of America during the 1900’s. The State Governments of the South were discriminating against the African-American students by placing them into segregated schools and proclaiming the slogan of “separate but, equal.”\(^{273}\) Yet, it was simply demonstrated that these segregated schools were not equal even though they were each under the same headship of the States’ Department of Education. The African American students were not only kept apart from students of the “white” race but, they were also kept apart from the same levels of education.\(^{274}\) In the same manner, if Florida went to war against Cuba, the entire U.S. would still be libel for the action. Likewise, the UN General Assembly and UN Security Council are not the same organization but, they are each under the same UN headship and therefore, this continues to exhibit that world history has consistently displayed this inequality as humans continue to fight in various ways over what is right.

Other issues pertain to this idea of rights too. New York University’s Frank Henry Sommer Professor of Law and Philosophy, Ronald Dworkin, offers much concerning rights. In his *Taking Rights Seriously*, he writes,


In practice the Government will have the last word on what an individual’s rights are, because its police will do what its officials and courts say. But that does not mean that the Government’s view is necessarily the correct view; anyone who thinks it does must believe that men and women have only such moral rights as Government chooses to grant, which means that they have no moral rights at all.\textsuperscript{275}

This validates my premise that natural rights are only an idea that man has mentally conceived and seeks to impose upon all people. For without governmental authority, there is no one to administer or enforce this idea. As such, people have agreed to this theory and have called upon their governments to manage and oversee this idea of natural rights. In essence, this is a false premise which is tyrannically forced upon other people within governed lands. It appears that if a person does not want to live within a governed land, that person has nowhere else to live on this planet as all lands are currently governed and this person must therefore, submit to this idea of rights, which she/he has had no opportunity to decide upon. We are blind to not see this as a tyrannical imposition; this prison of deemed rights that others have decided upon and to which obedience is required and punishment for violation. Revolution is not allowed. Furthermore,

Even a society that is in principle just may produce unjust laws and policies, and a man has duties other than his duties to the State. A man must honour his duties to

his God and to his conscience, and if these conflict with his duty to the State, then he is entitled, in the end, to do what he judges to be right.\textsuperscript{276}

Besides this, it must be considered, “that men have a duty to obey the law but have the right to follow their own consciences when it conflicts with that duty”\textsuperscript{277} and this adheres to my own supernatural faith, which I am sure you will agree to in a Biblical example. In the Book of Acts, two of Jesus’ Apostles are arrested and imprisoned by the religious authority for “teaching the people and proclaiming in Jesus the resurrection from the dead.”\textsuperscript{278} Nevertheless, during their trial they are ordered not to

Speak or teach at all in the name of Jesus. But Peter and John answered and said to them, “Whether it is right in the sight of God to give heed to you rather than to God, you be the judge; for we cannot stop speaking about what we have seen and heard.” When they had threatened them further, they let them go (finding no basis on which to punish them) on account of the people, because they were all glorifying God.\textsuperscript{279}

This validates the previously mentioned United Nations’ declaration of freedom of speech that is within the acclaimed human rights creed, what professor Ronald Dworkin wrote regarding “A man must honour his duties to his God and to his conscience,”\textsuperscript{280} and my own thoughts concerning the administration of the rights that are enforced by human governments. Man has

\textsuperscript{276} Ibid, 186.  
\textsuperscript{278} Acts 4:2 NASB.  
\textsuperscript{279} Acts 4:18-21 NASB.  
eaten from the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, deeming what is right in his own eyes, and multiple millennia of stringent, tyrannical governments have come forward bringing bloody war in wide array. You can agree with this in France’s monarchy, but this even holds true in America’s democratic republic. Americans, when properly registered, are allowed to vote upon occasional bills to make them law, but the reality is that only the chosen or elected few; the elected have the benefit to create bills for the nation’s law. The reality of every person being allowed to rule oneself is not existent and a form of slavery is the rule, where a price is paid in acquiring these seemingly inalienable and inherent rights. Only the maker of men can create abilities within man and the power or privilege to which man is justly entitled by God himself. God alone has the power to administer what is correct and only he is able to give man the ability to use what is given in a proper manner. Rights can only come from God, as “God is the one who justifies”\(^\text{281}\) and has absolute sovereignty in everything. Therefore, we correctly submit to him.

**Condorcet:** You are correct concerning John Locke with natural rights and his influence, along with my own, on Thomas Jefferson. This is also true with your American Constitution adapting d’Alembert’s “LIBERTY, TRUTH. . . and PROSPERITY.”\(^\text{282}\) You must understand that natural rights are inherent within man and that without them man would continue on in nothing but barbarism; doing nothing more than hunting and gathering. Man’s life would resemble that of children, who do most nothing more than eat, sleep, have the routine display of emotions, and the natural functions of their bodies. That is life outside of the progressive understanding of the natural rights of man. Laws are developed to ensure that these natural rights are withheld, that abuses are prevented, and the administration of punishment for violation of these natural rights.

\(^{281}\) Romans 8:33 NASB.
As we progress, there will be the continual leading of those who are not to par on this, but overall, there is comprehensive development within mankind.

In regards to the U.N., it is most understandable that there are times when violence is required to bring forth peace. Sometimes fire is used to fight fire. Plus, the people of your own time will agree with the progression of natural rights to the U.N.’s *Universal Declaration of Human Rights*. This verifies man’s evolution with his enlightened reason. Further, your quotes from professor Dworkin demonstrate this too, that as time passes, man continues to advance. **My view:** Despite our steady differences regarding mankind, I will continue on with the remaining contrasts to your Seventh Epoch, as again, we continue to demonstrate that we have parallel tracks of worldview with only brief intersections of unity. You write of John Wycliffe, as only a reformer that merely added to the turmoil within England concerning the resuming of natural rights,

> In England the principles of Wickliffe, the reformer, had given rise to one of these commotions, carried on under the direction of some of his disciples, and which afforded a presage of attempts, more systematic and better combined, that would be made by the people under other reformers, and in a more enlightened age.\(^{283}\)

However, I will acknowledge some of our similarities referencing the tyranny which you often mention within religion. I agree that there is tyranny, but that is because of what I see within the heart of mankind and wherever man is there will be the foul fruit; whether it be within religion, philosophy, politics, sciences, or anything else that man is involved. John Wycliffe was a

Christian, who sought to bring clarity pertaining to the scriptures for the whole of the English Church and come forth with a Middle English translation of the Bible for the majority of people who were unable to read the Latin of the Vulgate. He “led a movement of opposition to the medieval Church and to some of its dogmas and institutions, and was a forerunner of the Reformation; on the other, he was also the most prominent English philosopher of the second half of the 14th century”\textsuperscript{284} that debated the “priests and bishops, and then after them the archbishop.”\textsuperscript{285} Wycliffe contested some of the superstitious dogma that had crept into the faith “with the principle purpose to call back the Church from her idolatry”\textsuperscript{286} and “that the Pope hath no more power to excommunicate any man, than hath another.”\textsuperscript{287} Wycliffe, a student of philosophy was also a professor, who had “spent the greater part of his life in the schools at Oxford: he was fellow of Merton in 1356, master of arts at Balliol in 1360, and doctor of divinity in 1372.”\textsuperscript{288} Besides these things, it was because of his love for God that he became a forerunner for the Reformation, as I just mentioned, which helped free Christians from the hierarchy, superstition, and the enforced ignorance that the unbiblical clergy put upon the unbiblical laity. John Wycliffe sought to restore the Church to her initial position of freedom from the ways of the world with love for God and others. He was one, who demonstrated that Christian life is not only of “a more enlightened age,”\textsuperscript{289} but an age that is according to God’s desire. It is because of men like Wycliffe, which you write of, that,

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{285} John Foxe, Foxe’s Book of Martyrs, (Springdale: Whitaker House, 1981), 52.
  \item \textsuperscript{286} John Foxe, Foxe’s Book of Martyrs, (Springdale: Whitaker House, 1981), 52.
  \item \textsuperscript{287} Ibid.
\end{itemize}
To these disciplinarians we are indebted for the greater accuracy that may have been obtained respecting the Supreme Being and his attributes; respecting the distinction between the first cause, and the universe which it is supposed to govern; respecting the farther distinction between mind and matter; respecting the different senses that may be affixed to the word *liberty*; respecting the meaning of the word *creation*; respecting the manner of distinguishing from each other the different operations of the human mind, and of classing the ideas it forms of objects and their properties.\(^{290}\)

However, you also agree with my own worldview with these closing words of your own when you write that the modifications within society continued and this was from people who did not align themselves with your worldview, which also continued with,

The change, confined to courts and castles, reached not to the bulk of the people. There resulted from it a little more equality among the nobles, less persidy (unfaithfulness/disloyalty) and cruelty in their relations with each other; but their contempt for the people the insolence of their tyranny, their audacious robberies, continued the same; and nations, oppressed as before, were as before ignorant, barbarous and corrupt.\(^{291}\)


\(^{291}\) Ibid, 70, 71.
Chapter 8: Printing, Science & Philosophy Throw Off Authority’s Yoke

Therefore, this is another example to display not only our differences, but to also display the reality of how mankind acts apart from the life of God. It also leads us to your Eighth Epoch, which you title From the Invention of Printing, to the Period When the Sciences and Philosophy Threw Off the Yoke of Authority.292

Here, you begin to write of the delay in the creation of the printing press, but then state that this delay was an actual benefit because of your grand assumption that,

Some engravers of plates had doubtless conceived this idea of the application of their art; but they were more struck with the difficulty of executing it, than with the advantages of success: and it is fortunate that they did not comprehend it in all its extent; since priests and kings would infalibly have united to stifle, from its birth, the enemy that was to unmask their hypocrisy, and hurl them from their thrones.

The press multiplies indefinitely, and at a small expence, copies of any work.

Those who can read are hence enabled to furnish themselves with books suitable

---

to their taste and their wants; and this facility of exercising the talent of reading, has increased and propagated the desire of learning it.

These multiplied copies, spreading themselves with greater rapidity, facts and discoveries not only acquire a more extensive publicity, but acquire it also in a shorter space of time. Knowledge has become the object of an active and universal commerce.²⁹³

You speculate that “since priests and kings would infalibly have united to stifle”²⁹⁴ this invention’s creation yet, you choose to disregard that the first printed book by Gutenberg was a Bible, as I noted in discussing your Fifth Epoch. Further, as we discussed your mention of John Wycliffe in your Seventh Epoch, one of his later followers, William Tyndale, also brought forth a version of the New Testament that was “the first translation from Greek into the English language.”²⁹⁵ However, I will concede that the priests and kings did bring about Tyndale’s martyrdom though he too, was also an instructor for the English people at Oxford University, as was Wycliffe. I will also verify with you that, “Knowledge has become the object of an active and universal commerce,”²⁹⁶ which aligns with what the Bible prophetically reads in the Book of Daniel concerning later times in that, “knowledge will increase.”²⁹⁷ So, again, this too, matches your idea of progress, but from a different point of view. Still, I will remind you that just because

---
²⁹⁴ Ibid.
²⁹⁷ Daniel 12:4 NASB.
humanity overall may become more intelligent this, does not mean that people will become better internally. Another prime example of this occurs within the Bible with Solomon. As Solomon began his kingship, he requested of God “an understanding mind and a hearing heart to judge Your people, that I may discern between good and bad.”

For God then responds with,

\[
\text{Behold, I have done as you asked. I have given you a wise, discerning mind, so that no one before you was your equal, nor shall any arise after you equal to you}.\]

Nonetheless, Solomon’s life did not follow the logical pattern that you, Condorcet, have conceived; improving toward betterment as a man. Instead, Solomon turned away from God; he “loved many foreign women,” as they turned his “heart away after other gods,” which caused God to remove most of the kingdom from him. Simultaneously, God rose up adversaries against Solomon and Solomon eventually wrote Ecclesiastes; a book of wisdom that bemoans that “all is futility” and that,

\[
\text{The making of many books is endless, and the excessive devotion to books is wearying to the body. The conclusion, when all has been heard, is: fear God and}
\]

---

298 1 Kings 3:9 Amplified Bible.
299 1 Kings 3:12 Amplified Bible.
300 1 Kings 11:1 NASB.
301 1 Kings 11:2 NASB.
302 Ecclesiastes 1:2 and 12:8 NASB.
303 Granted, the use of the word “books” is a modern interpretation, as translations of necessity have some degree of interpretation because of differences in languages but, it probably refers to the scrolls that were of common use at the time.
keep His commandments, because this applies to every person. For God will bring every act to judgment, everything which is hidden, whether it is good or evil.\footnote{Ecclesiastes 12:12-14 NASB.}

Solomon did not enthrall others to follow in his own footsteps in his turning away from God and seeking wisdom apart from God. Solomon saw that God was his only hope and answer to life. In fact, Solomon confessed before the people of Israel “for there is no man who does not sin”\footnote{1 Kings 8:46 NASB.} and that “in a multitude of dreams there is futility and worthlessness, and ruin in a flood of words. But [reverently] fear God [revere and worship Him, knowing that He is].”\footnote{Ecclesiastes 5:7 Amplified Bible.}

This coincides with “without faith it is impossible to please Him (God), for he who comes to God must believe that He is and that He is a rewarder of those who seek Him.”\footnote{Hebrews 11:6 NASB.} Now, this “faith is the standing ground of the hopeful, the conviction of unseen facts; and our fathers proved it,”\footnote{Hebrews 11:1 The Holy Bible in Modern English.} as is written in the Epistle to the Hebrews. Just because something is not seen or known does not mean that it does not exist and this was verified previously in our conversation in relation to both atoms and the celestial bodies outside our own planet. I stated that, “the absence of evidence is not evidence of absence. This means that just because something is not within current knowledge does not necessarily mean that it does not exist. Some examples are the discoveries of North America by either the Vikings or Christopher Columbus and the furthest planets of the Milky Way galaxy; cosmos. North America, Uranus, Neptune, and Pluto (though no longer considered a planet – 2006)\footnote{Francie Grace, “Pluto Demoted, No Longer A Planet,” CBS/AP, August 24, 2006, accessed Jan. 31, 2014, http://www.cbsnews.com/news/pluto-demoted-no-longer-a-planet/.} all existed prior to their discoveries yet, they had not been found by their acclaimed

\footnotetext[304]{Ecclesiastes 12:12-14 NASB.}
\footnotetext[305]{1 Kings 8:46 NASB.}
\footnotetext[306]{Ecclesiastes 5:7 Amplified Bible.}
\footnotetext[307]{Hebrews 11:6 NASB.}
\footnotetext[308]{Hebrews 11:1 The Holy Bible in Modern English.}
pioneers.”

I noted this in our discussion of your *Fourth Epoch*. Additionally, the Apostle Paul makes God’s existence clearly known within the first chapter of his Epistle to the Romans where he states regarding humanity that,

> The knowledge of God is clear within themselves, God having revealed it to them. For from creating a Universe His unseen attributes, power, and Divine Nature might have been clearly comprehended by means of the created facts. Consequently they are inexcusable. Because knowing God, they did not joyfully honor Him as God; but trifled in their argumentation, and darkened their senseless hearts. Professing to be philosophers, they played the fool; and transformed the majesty of the imperishable God into an image of perishable man, and of birds, and of beasts, and of reptiles. Therefore, God abandoned them in the lusts of their hearts to filthiness, to dishonor their own bodies to themselves; because having changed the truth of God into falsehood, they honoured the Created contrary to the intention of the Creator. . . And as they did not desire to have God acknowledged, God abandoned them to an uninquiring mind, to practise what is loathsome. Filled with all injustice, depravity, greed, evil; crammed with envy, murder, strife, deceit; foul-mannered, libelous, defamers; God-haters, spiteful, envious; imposters, inventors of vice; disobedient to parents; senseless, treacherous, unnatural, merciless; while acknowledging the decrees of God—that they who practice such deserve death—not only do them, but delight in those who practise.  

---

310 Discussed in the Fourth Epoch, page 73 of this thesis.  
311 Romans 1:19-32 The Holy Bible in Modern English.
Going further, you present the ideas that,

The press can diffuse at the same time a pure and independent light. That instruction which is to be acquired from books in silence and solitude, can never be universally corrupted: a single corner of the earth free to commit their leaves to the press, would be a sufficient security. How admist that variety of productions, amidst that multitude of existing copies of the same book, amidst impressions continually renewed, will it be possible to shut so closely all the doors of truth, as to leave no opening, no crack or crevice by which it may enter?\textsuperscript{312}

I can readily agree that it will be nearly impossible for the “all that doors of truth”\textsuperscript{313} to be shut and that the press can bring forth a “pure and independent light,”\textsuperscript{314} but it is odd that you do not consider that error, false testimony, and lies can be broadcast by the press. You even claim that “a single corner of the earth free to commit their leaves to the press, would be a sufficient security”\textsuperscript{315} to prevent universal corruption. This is an assumption and we cannot base our live upon assumptions no matter how glorious and wondrous these assumptions are.\textsuperscript{316} History continues to verify this with the many tyrants that have ruled and some examples are Rome’s

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{313} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{314} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{315} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{316} Faith, by some is taken as assumption but, “Faith is the standing-ground of the hopeful, the conviction of unseen facts” (Hebrews 11:1, 2 The Holy Bible in Modern English). Regarding modern science, “The early scientists shared the outlook of Christianity in believing that there is a reasonable God, who had created a reasonable universe; and thus man, by use of his reason, could find out the universe’s form. As well as Francis Bacon, Copernicus (1457-1543), Galileo (1564-1642), Kepler (1571-1630), Faraday (1791-1867), and Maxwell (1831-1879) looked upon the universe, and carried on this work as scientists, in this framework.” Francis A. Schaeffer, \textit{The Francis Schaeffer Trilogy; Escape from Reason,} (Wheaton: Crossway Books, 1990), 226.
\end{flushright}
Titus and Iraq’s Saladin. These men massacred multitudes of people during their reigns and within the 20th century millions were killed by Adolf Hitler, Joseph Stalin, and Mao Tse Tung. Please note that these last three men were not followers of any religion at the time of their regimes, which is an added strike against your idea that only those who follow religion and superstition are murderous tyrants.

Additionally, you write,

The invention of the art of printing nearly coincides with two other events, of which one has exercised an immediate influence on the progress of knowledge, while the influence of the other on the destiny of the whole human species can never cease but with the species itself. I refer to the taking of Constantinople by the Turks, and the discovery both of the new world, and of the route which has opened to Europe a direct communication with the eastern parts of Africa and Asia.³¹⁷

It is astounding that you believe that the “taking of Constantinople by the Turks, and the discovery both of the new world, and of the route which has opened to Europe a direct communication with the eastern parts of Africa and Asia”³¹⁸ are solely beneficial to the “progress of knowledge, while the influence of the other on the destiny of the whole human species can never cease but with the species itself.”³¹⁹ I agree that there has been enormous amounts of knowledge that have come forth from the spreading of Islam within academia with the bringing

³¹⁸ Ibid.
³¹⁹ Ibid.
of ancient classical wisdom, as well as algebra, and that the “discovery. . .the new world, and of
the route which has opened to Europe a direct communication with the eastern parts of Africa
and Asia.” However, I again refer you back to the murderous tyrannies of Saladin and the
Ottoman Turks. We have the horrific Crusades, which were defeated by Saladin’s rule and the
utter catastrophe to life in the Middle East and Greece by the Ottoman Turks. In fact, the Greeks
have a continual distaste for the Turks as a result of the murder, raping, and pillaging that the
Turks committed against the Greeks for roughly four hundred years. Greece still celebrates their
day of independence from the Ottoman Empire on March 25th. There are also the hundreds of
years of slavery that the Europeans have manifest upon the Africans. You, Condorcet, have
written against slavery in a few of your essays. Additionally, slavery was outlawed in France
(1794), later in Great Britain (1833), and America (1865). However, France’s own Napoleon
reinstituted slavery during his rule (1802) with later abolishment in 1848 and as noted earlier in
our conversation, there are currently more slaves in the world than ever recorded. As we have
conversed, I have learned that the earlier notation of twenty-seven million slaves existing in our
world is now, updated to “more than 30 million.” We both agree that slavery, whether
sexual or otherwise, is a tragedy to humanity yet, it continues on through human history. The
very Bible itself, notes that there will be the continuation of slavery, as it states in the end times
that, “the small and the great, and the rich and the poor, and the freemen and the slaves, it causes

320 Ibid.
321 Anthony G. Ziagos, Sr. “MARCH 25th -- CELEBRATION OF GREEK INDEPENDENCE DAY,” The
322 David Williams, Condorcet and Modernity, (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 139,140
323 David Batstone, Not for Sale: The Return of the Global Slave Trade-and How We Can Fight It (New York:
324 Ibid.
that they give to them all a mark on their right hand, or on their foreheads,” relating to the evil one and his cohorts.

**Condorcet:** You are correct about the catastrophe of slavery, particularly of the sexual slavery and human trafficking that you mention. I wrote earlier, in *On the influence of the American Revolution on Europe* (1786) that,

> It is true that the Negro slavery still exists in some of the United States; but all enlightened men feel its shame, and its danger, and this blemish will not continue to sully the purity of the American laws.\(^{326}\)

Along with, “it is in the name of utility that trade and industry are fettered and Africans enslaved”\(^{327}\) because men have not sought to open their minds to human equality and seeing that are all brethren on this earth regardless of how enlightened we are.

However, your superstitious Christianity and the Bible is full of stories that do not condemn slavery and display its practice throughout the book’s entirety. How do you suppose anyone is to follow such irrationality when mankind is continually progressing toward enlightenment and away from such horrors?

**My view:** You are correct regarding slavery being mentioned throughout the Bible, but I beg to differ on both God’s view of slavery and what is written within the Bible. Though the New Testament does not specifically address abolishing slavery itself, it continually presents this,

---

\(^{325}\) Revelation 13:16 LITV.  
“love your neighbor”\textsuperscript{328} and “love your enemy,”\textsuperscript{329} which I noted in discussing your Second Epoch. A person cannot approve slavery and benefit the slave system, while at the same time love others, as these are in opposition to one another. Further, the Epistle to Philemon acknowledges this, as the Lord writing through Paul states that,

I entreat you concerning my child Onesimus [useful], whom I fathered in my bonds, the one once worthless to you, but now useful to you and to me; whom I sent back to you. Even receive him, that is, my heart; whom I resolved to hold with myself, that for you he might minister to me in the bonds of the gospel. But I was willing to do nothing without your consent, that your good might not be by way of necessity, but by way of willingness. For perhaps for this he was separated for an hour, that you might receive him eternally; no longer as a slave, but beyond a slave, a beloved brother, especially to me, and how much more to you, both in the flesh and in the Lord. Then if you have me as a partner, receive him as me. And if he wronged you in anything, or owes, reckon this to me. I, Paul, wrote with my hand; I will repay (that I not say to you that you even owe yourself to me also). Yes, brother, that I may have your help in the Lord, refresh my heart in the Lord. Trusting to your obedience, I wrote to you, knowing that you will do even beyond what I say.\textsuperscript{330}

\textsuperscript{328} Matthew 19:19, Matthew 22:39, Mark 12:31, James 2:8 LITV.
\textsuperscript{329} Matthew 5:44, Luke 6:27, 35; Romans 12:14, 18-21 LITV.
\textsuperscript{330} Philemon 1:10-21 LITV.
From my opinion, this is clear that the Apostle Paul by Christ in him\textsuperscript{331} has declared slavery to be worthless and that by loving one another by “Christ’s life within,”\textsuperscript{332} we can be useful to God. It is interesting that in these words, the slave was deemed worthless, but there is usefulness in his freedom and this goes along with how love cannot truly be love if there is no liberty within it. Plus, “God is love”\textsuperscript{333} and “the Lord is the Spirit; and where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is freedom,”\textsuperscript{334} for both God and his people.

**Condorcet:** Speaking of freedom for God and his people, let us look at what else I have written within the Eight Epoch and what I present relating to the brief eruptions of freedom within the Christian faith.

Till the present epoch the crimes of the priesthood had escaped with impunity. The cries of oppressed humanity, of violated reason, had been stifled in flames and in blood. The spirit which dictated those cries was not extinct: but the silence occasioned by the operation of terror emboldened the priesthood to farther outrages. At last, the scandal of farming to the monks the privilege of selling in taverns and public places the expiation of sins, occasioned a new explosion. Luther, holding in one hand the sacred books, exposed with the other the right which the Pope had arrogated to himself of absolving crimes and selling pardons; the insolent despotism which he exercised over the bishops, for a long time his equals; the fraternal supper of the primitive christians, converted, under the name of mass, into a species of magical incantation and an object of commerce; priests

\textsuperscript{331} Colossians 1:27 LITV.
\textsuperscript{332} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{333} 1 John 4:8 LITV.
\textsuperscript{334} 2 Corinthians 3:17 LITV.
condemned to the crime of irrevocable celibacy; the same cruel and scandulous law extended to the monks and nuns with which pontifical ambition had inundated and polluted the church; all the secrets of the laity consigned, by means of confession, to the intrigues and the passions of priests; God himself, in short, scarcely retaining a feeble share in the adorations bestowed in prosusion upon bread, men, bones and statues.

Luther announced to the astonished multitude, that these disgusting institutions formed no part of christianity, but on the contrary were its corruption and shame; and that, to be faithful to the religion of Jesus, it was first of all necessary to abjure that of his priests.\(^\text{335}\)

We can easily see that instances of freedom took place among the Europeans and that there was a force of liberty breaking through Christianity. However,

All the christian part of Europe, from Sweden to Italy, and from Hungary to Spain, was in an instant covered with the partisans of the new doctrines; and the reformation would have delivered from the yoke of Rome all the nations that inhabited it, if the mistaken policy of certain princes had not relieved that very sacerdotal sceptre which had so frequently fallen upon the heads of kings.\(^\text{336}\)


\(^{336}\) Ibid.
My view: I fully agree with you on most everything that you have written here! Martin Luther was a main vessel through which God brought some freedom from the snares of false Christianity. People have continually tried to reproduce that which is true and perfect. As I noted earlier with our discussion of Constantine and his implanting Roman rule and authority into the Church, a falsehood has taken power over the minds and wills of Christian people. I am not denouncing those who are part of Catholicism, for only God truly knows who are his, but the evidence of what is true and what is false is discerned when by God’s Spirit and study of the scriptures. A key example of this is found with workers of a nation’s treasury department. These employees study the real money with all diligence and because of the knowledge, are then able to more easily differentiate between what is real currency and what is false. For if they were to continually study false currencies, their minds would filled only with what is false and not with what is true.

Martin Luther studied the scriptures and because of this, he was able to recognize the errors of imitation Christianity. He saw similar things to what you have written about, but the false empire of Christian religion came forth with a vengeance and sadly, violence often followed. This often happens when men’s sense of security is threatened. Fear and anger tend to burst out of people when they realize that what they once held to be true is realized to be false and their false sense of power is exposed. I would say that so much of the world’s violence results from this; a lost sense of security, which brings fear and anger with violent reaction. I will cite you concerning Galileo and how the Spirit of the Lord moved upon this man to bring liberty from men’s false doctrines and beliefs concerning God and scripture.
He called upon men to throw off the yoke of authority, to acknowledge no influence but what reason should avow: and he was obeyed, because he subjected by his daring, and fascinated by his enthusiasm. The human mind was not yet free, but it knew that it was formed to be free.\(^{337}\)

Galileo demonstrated that the counterfeit beliefs and doctrines of false Christianity were wreaking havoc upon men’s minds and lives. Galileo verified that the heliocentrism of Copernicus and others like, Aristarchus of Samos was in fact reality and that “the real issue concerned the correct interpretation of the Bible.”\(^{338}\) Further, part of the issue related to who had sovereign authority. The Medieval church took much of its view from the scholasticism of Thomas Aquinas and Aquinas gained much of his opinion through the rediscovery of Aristotle’s classical works; classical works that purported a geocentric view. Oxford University’s John Lennox notes that,

The issue at stake was clear: Galileo’s science was threatening the all-pervasive Aristotelianism of both academy and church. The conflict was far more between “scientific” world-pictures than between science and religion.\(^{339}\)

The Roman Catholic Church had joined itself with the unbiblical views of the secular world and Galileo demonstrated that the true battle related to whose authority governed Biblical

---


interpretation. Some forms of Biblical interpretation are the literal, the allegorical, the poetic, the accommodated or to the proper meaning of the words, and “according to the common interpretation and understanding of the Holy Fathers and of learned theologians.” 340 So, a key example of whose authority on Biblical interpretation was precedent is from the Bible’s Book of Joshua. Oxford University professor, Alister McGrath notes that,

Galileo’s critics argued that some biblical passages contradicted him. For example, they argued, Joshua 10:12 spoke of the sun standing still at Joshua’s command. Did not that prove beyond a doubt that it was the sun which moved around the earth? In his Letter to the Grand Countess Christina, Galileo countered with an argument that this was simply a common way of speaking. Joshua could not expect to know the intricacies of celestial mechanics, and therefore used an “accommodated” way of speaking. 341

Within my own 21st century, we too, use accommodated language and still, after centuries of knowing about heliocentricism, make statements like, sunrise and sunset. Nevertheless, the authority of the Church did not tolerate this blasphemy to its self-proclaimed sovereignty and sentenced Galileo to “house arrest in his own villa” 342 Here the matter of science and religion were not in dispute, but the problem concerned who wielded power and control. I think that you will certainly understand this Condorcet, as you too, have encountered this very problem within

your own life concerning your king. You were opposed to his assassination, as his monarchy had benefitted you, but you desired him to receive penalty for his crimes against humanity. As I stated earlier, you condemned the execution of Louis XVI, but you also “proposed the most extreme penalty short of death.” You claim that his assassination is too radical, but as we discuss your essay, you present humanity becoming perfect and that is more than radical to say the least.

Lastly, you state, “The human mind was not yet free, but it knew that it was formed to be free.” This deserves a great amount of thinking and analysis. I would surely agree that humanity has excelled in learning about new things and in study of things formerly identified. For example, mankind has known that rocks are hard, but over the centuries, we have ascertained the elements and compositions of the rocks. Granite is harder than chalk and this we have learned through our study and we have learned where certain types of rock are usually located. For instance, obsidian is found near volcanoes and limestone near the oceans. However, I note that within scripture, it reads, “knowledge makes arrogant, but love edifies” and this arrogance relates to man continually enslaving himself to technology like, smart phones and other media devices, while at the same time people in my own nation are suffering from a nearly 50% divorce rate. Additionally, our arrogance leads us to establish and maintain social classes where people are often regarded within a value system relating to their levels of intellect. Thus, the people with the lower intellect are often viewed with a lower social value and need to be influenced or led by those, who are deemed to be of greater social worth. You even mention this in your Ninth Epoch.

---

345 1 Corinthians 8:1 NASB.
Chapter 9: Descartes to French Republic

My view: You state,

And now we arrive at the period when philosophy, the most general and obvious effects of which we have before remarked, obtained an influence on the thinking class of men, and these on the people and their governments, that, ceasing any longer to be gradual, produced a revolution in the entire mass of certain nations, and gave thereby a secure pledge of the general revolution one day to follow that shall embrace the whole human species.\textsuperscript{346}

Here, you note that, “the thinking class of men”\textsuperscript{347} is the elite and specialized citizenry, who are the authority over the rest of mankind, and therefore, our knowledge has brought us many great things, but it has also brought many disadvantages too. A prime example of this relates to your


\textsuperscript{347} Ibid.
reference to Descartes. In his *Discourse on the Method*, he writes, “I think, therefore I am” 348 setting this, “as the first principle of the philosophy of which” 349 he was in search of and from which the Western world has based much of its philosophical foundation. On the other hand, Descartes is countered with the reality that we must exist in order to think. Thinking, along with an array of other activities, only validates that we are alive, as dead men exist regardless of their ability to think or do, and the same applies to all forms of matter. I agree that man himself and not just his mind was formed to be free, but free to love one another as Jesus did and not to the enslavement of our personal insecurities and the devices or gadgets that we form with our minds and hands. Instead, loving one another, where our minds are on the benefit toward others and not the conceited attitudes that often lead to arrogance and depression; depression that is evidenced by the increased amount of television advertisements for antidepressants in my age. This demonstrates the differences in our world views, where your ideal is that man is nearing perfection within himself and I hold that man cannot because mankind is infected with a sinful nature. This sinful nature causes man to deem what is good based upon what is evil instead of deeming what is evil from what is good. Our foundations are in opposition to one another. I agree with Jesus that, “No one is good except God alone” 350 and only God can make that which is good and perfect. From this foundation, we can be “born not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but were born of God,” 351 have the life of Christ in us, 352 and live lives where “the love of Christ controls us.” 353 Granted, man has a dignified existence on this world but, being unborn of God,

348 René Descartes, *Discourse on the Method of Rightly Conducting One’s Reason and of Seeking Truth in the Sciences*, (Seattle: Amazon Digital Services, Inc., 2012), 360.
349 Ibid.
350 Mark 10:17 NASB.
351 John 1:13 LITV.
352 Colossians 1:27 LITV.
353 2 Corinthians 5:14 LITV.
He does not know it, but he is expressing the nature of fallen man, which as created in the image of God is wonderful, yet now is fallen.  

So from this, my view is that we need to have the Deity live within us in order for us to come into any sort of betterment or perfection.

On the other hand, your desire for man to progress establishes that man is not good, as he is and that man needs to work on himself to reach the perfect ideal. Further, if man is not good enough in the first place, how can faulty man make himself better since his foundation is already in error? Nevertheless, let us proceed with your essay and continue with our discussion.

*Condorcet*: Despite the evidence you have presented, I still stand opposed to your acclaimed superstition and I state that religion and science are in contrast to one another and I agree that we may now, continue with my treatise. Looking upon my Ninth Epoch, we can understand what has truly come forth with man’s advancement and how he is moving forward.

We have seen human reason forming itself slowly by the natural progress of civilization; superstition usurping dominion over it, thereby to corrupt it, and despotism degrading and stupefying the mental faculties by the operation of fear, and actual infliction of calamity . . . We have seen reason revolting at, and

---

shaking off part of its chains, and by the continual acquisition of new strength preparing and hastening the epoch of its liberty.\(^{355}\)

Mankind is on its way to the climax of his excellence. He is moving in the natural direction of faultlessness, where he is the sole lord of his own dominion and this Ninth Epoch is the final step forward toward the last Epoch where man is resting in his perfection. By the fiction of our conversation, which is unbound by the restrictions of time, I, Condorcet, will quote from a news article to verify this advancement. It is from an author contemporary to your own epoch, Charli Kerns. Kerns wrote of how “the human brain has evolved from directing mammoth hunts to something capable of orchestrating space shuttle flights”\(^{356}\) and that it is continuing to do so. Kerns notes that the giving of the Raven’s Progressive Matrices standard intelligence test has demonstrated “that test scores increased steadily”\(^{357}\) and that the “pattern can be seen across a variety of tests, all over the world.”\(^{358}\) This demonstrates my own ideas concerning the progression of mankind. People are nearing their perfection with the “infinite perfectibility of the human mind.”\(^{359}\)

\textbf{My view:} I can agree, it appears that the human mind seems to be advancing over time, but because we do not have any adequate data on the intelligence levels of the people of the past, only brief reflections and limited record, we are only able to make inadequate assumptions and

\begin{itemize}
\item \(^{357}\) Ibid.
\item \(^{358}\) Ibid.
\end{itemize}
your essay documents that there have been people that have continually advanced the population’s intellect in various degrees.

On the other hand, I will address some the interesting points in this Ninth Epoch, which authenticate my initial proposal of Christian theism. You continue, again, to subscribe to a hierarchal, class system and promote it throughout this essay. This system regulates people to a fixed order and alignment of who they are and what their destiny is. It stands in opposition to humans being equal to one another and counters your premise of the “infinite perfectibility of the human mind,” as you relegate people, like parts, to a fixed and mechanized order. Where is your acclaimed freedom? In essence, it is difficult to understand human worth outside of its value to the workings of your system. In fact, you even acknowledge my own and the Christ-centered, Biblical perspective when you validate that there are the “evils entailed on our nature.” Earlier, I pointed out in quoting from both King Solomon in 1 Kings 8:46, the Apostle Paul in Romans 1:18 – 32, and 1 John 1:8-10 that man is infected with sin and the contagion of evil within him causes him to regularly commit sins. In essence, we can view the evilness of sin as the infection and the corresponding sins as the symptoms. An example is having a cold, which equals the sin and the coughing and sneezing equaling the sins that result from the infection. R. A. Huebner wrote, “Sin here is the internal enemy from which sins (sinful conduct) spring. Sin is the spring, the root” the source from which, sins bloom. However, because of the nature of our infection, we are unable to cure ourselves and only in a limited sense are we able to limit the amount of sins that we commit. So truly, these evils are actually within our nature, as these men

360 Ibid.
pointed out and not just upon our natures, because if they were upon our natures, we would have to identify their source(s) and justly go to battle against this seemingly exterior malignancy. Therefore, this also aligns with my question to you, on how you regularly note that there are tyrants within the world. If man is continually progressing, how does our population repeatedly have tyrants that arise? Why does this problem constantly appear if man is getting better? Do you see the contrasts in your thinking and what history progressively documents and how you have noted the existence of tyrants throughout your essay? If the “evils entailed on our nature”\textsuperscript{363} were external, we justly and rightly ought to fight against these evils and do all that we can in preventing the evils from attaching themselves to our worldly brethren and ourselves. However, as I have continually pointed out, the evils are within us and we need a savior; someone to free us from this condition. I hold that this savior is Jesus. I offer a statement of faith, that Jesus has taken all of our iniquities, transgressions, sins, and the very sin within us by his death on the cross and enabled us to become children of God, who can live peacefully with one another and God himself. You may hold to this as superstition and in contrast to your own faith in man, but in doing so, you proclaim that the people who wrote and composed the Bible were living in delusion and fabricating fantasy. However, archeology has verified much of Biblical history\textsuperscript{364} to dismantle your opposition to the Christian faith as has logic based thinking. We need a personal, eternal first mover.


\textsuperscript{364}Here, I present the periodical Biblical Archeology Review and 2 published Bibles such as, the Apologetics Study Bible for Students and the Case for Christ Study Bible: Investigating the Evidence for Belief. All three of these publications contain verifications relating to the validity of the Christian faith. Granted, not everything is presently verifiable, but the same can be said concerning much of Condorcet’s essay Outlines of an Historical View of the Progress of the Human Mind; particularly his hopes regarding his Tenth Epoch and that our reason is our salvation.
Condorcet: I will verify to some degree that there appears to be some sense in what you have presented here concerning my statement that there are “evils entailed on our nature”\textsuperscript{365} or as you stated within them because this goes along with what I continued to write, “accident is continually accumulating upon us.”\textsuperscript{366} Conversely, I will comment that since metaphysics, or the study of the fundamental nature of being is a necessary component of natural philosophy in order for humans to understand and find meaning in nature,\textsuperscript{367}

men, like

Descartes had restored this branch of philosophy to the dominion of reason. He perceived the propriety of deducing it from those simple and evident truths which are revealed to us by an investigation of the operations of the mind.\textsuperscript{368}

Therefore, as we learn to accept this reality, mankind is empowered to continue with his progression out and away from the chains that bind him, chains like those which Plato described in his \textit{Allegory of the Cave}.\textsuperscript{369} Because of this, Descartes


\textsuperscript{366}Ibid.


\textsuperscript{369}Plato, \textit{The Republic}, trans. Benjamin Jowett (Seattle: Amazon Digital Services, Inc., 2008), lines 6803-7267 in Book VII.
shewed that by taking one single word to represent one single idea, properly analised and defined, we are enabled to recal constantly the same idea, that is, the same simultaneous result of certain simple ideas, and of consequence can introduce this idea into a train of reasoning without risk of misleading ourselves.\textsuperscript{370}

So, when we look at this reality, we are able to ascertain the steady and consistent flow of human reasoning and that it is progressing toward a great and perfected end.

\textbf{My view:} I am thankful that you are agreeing with some of what I say, but again, this progression that you write of still has not come about as you have predetermined. I agree with you on your comment on Descartes and how it is beneficial for our “by taking one single word to represent one single idea, properly analised and defined”\textsuperscript{371} to “recal constantly the same idea.”\textsuperscript{372} This provides us with the ability to have consistent thoughts and understandings to prevent confusion. However, a sharp contrast to this arrived in the 20\textsuperscript{th} century and has become a foundation for the 21\textsuperscript{st} century. This is postmodernism and it is a philosophy which appears to have shaken our former understandings to the core. Postmodernism is a “relativistic or nihilistic conception that humans are alone in an alien universe with no inherent principles of value or meaning—is both intellectually incomplete and morally dangerous.”\textsuperscript{373} Some of the planks in the


\textsuperscript{372}Ibid.

postmodern platform are the opposition to absolute truth, the ideology of relativism, and an adherence to tolerance; a tolerance that you also propose.

Regarding absolute truth, Professor Paul Brockelman of the University of New Hampshire writes, “no such truth can be absolute, exclusively true, or adequate.”\textsuperscript{374} However, when reading Professor Brockelman’s statement, we need to ask him and ourselves if we are to truly agree that his statement is “absolute, exclusively true, or adequate.”\textsuperscript{375} Do we see the problem here? Can it be absolutely true that “no such truth can be absolute, exclusively true, or adequate?”\textsuperscript{376} This is self-defeating. Dr. William Lane Craig writes that according to Christian theologian and philosopher Dr. Francis Schaeffer,

there can be traced in recent Western culture a ‘line of despair,’ which penetrates philosophy, literature, and the arts in succession. He believes the root of the problem lies in Hegelian philosophy, specifically in its denial of absolute truths. Hegel developed the famous triad of thesis-antithesis-synthesis, in which contradictions are seen not as absolute opposites, but as partial truths, which are synthesized in the whole. Ultimately all is One, which is absolute and non-contradictory. In Schaeffer’s view, Hegel’s system undermined the notion of particular absolute truths (such as “That act is morally wrong” or “This painting is aesthetically ugly”) by synthesizing them into the whole. This denial of absolutes has gradually made its way through Western culture. In each case, it results in despair, because without absolutes man’s endeavors degenerate into absurdity. . .

\textsuperscript{375}Ibid.
\textsuperscript{376}Ibid.
Only by reaffirming belief in the absolute God of Christianity can man and his culture avoid inevitable degeneracy, meaninglessness, and despair.³⁷⁷

Respecting these thoughts from Dr. Schaeffer, Dr. Craig notes that, “Once God is denied, human life becomes worthless” because if there is not absolute truth, nothing has any real or lasting meaning. In fact,

Schaeffer warns that unless Western man returns to the Christian world and life view, nothing will stop the trend from degenerating into population control and human breeding. Only a theistic worldview can save the human race from itself.³⁷⁸

However, this applies to not only Western man, as Dr. Schaeffer noted, but it applies to all of mankind since we equally share this globe and life together. Admittedly, you or any other atheist may disagree with the above statements, but consider this, that without a solid foundation of absolute truth all else is based upon the whims of human minds regardless, of whether some are seemingly more reasoned or not. In fact, this process orchestrates a hierarchy among humanity and places those people deemed more intelligent or reasoned into a place of lordship and even, worship over other people.

Additionally, I relate to morals, as one would be troubled to live in a society that had no morals. However, there is no basis for morals when there is no absolute. There is no reason to be moral or even a standard of what it means to be moral. Some of the only options that we are

³⁷⁸Ibid.
offered for the existence of morals are God, that the public requires them, or because they are part of the dignity of man.\textsuperscript{379} For John Locke and Thomas Hobbes, both of whom, you Condorcet are more than familiar with through philosophical and political history.

Moral rules or duties are the result of human convention or law, to be explained as the result of either social custom and habit (“the public requires it”) or punishment by the state (“the Leviathan will punish you”).\textsuperscript{380}

These two reasons are based upon humanism, which deems man to be the sum of all things, as is your entire essay, but are faulty. Obviously, “human convention” is from humans, who are defective and no one would rightly call oneself perfect, but law outside of human invention are regarded as from nature. Yet, nature has to have a source, as do its laws. Laws cannot be their own source, unless these laws are divine themselves. Still, laws cannot make people internally better or controllable. Can you speak of any law that rules or imprisons your thoughts and keeps you from thinking freely? So with this, we are left with, “punishment by the state,” which tells us that if we do not follow the imposed morals, we have the fear of being punished by a state that acts in a manner of divine authority over us; an authority that we would be hard pressed to say it actually loves us. Instead, we are left in a possible state of fear if we happen to disobey. In his \textit{Essay Concerning Human Understanding}, Locke found that “humans are found to have ‘natural inclinations’ that are essentially contrary to morality.”\textsuperscript{381} He wrote,

\textsuperscript{380}Ibid, 108.
Principles of actions indeed there are lodged in men’s appetites; but these are so far from being innate moral principles, that if they were left to their full swing they would carry men to the overturning of all morality.\textsuperscript{382}

Going back then to Hobbes, we are left with the state, which we are distressed to claim loves us and is therefore assumed to be our reigning deity. This is accentuated when we realize that “only obedience to the political powers can save us;”\textsuperscript{383} save us from others and save us from ourselves in all that these socially given morals demand. Increasingly,

Those who can be convinced that survival is at stake are likely to agree to almost any remedy, since extinction seems worse than all the alternatives. If placing extraordinary powers in the hands of political leaders will truly stave off the ultimate disaster, then those who demur can be made to appear as enemies of the human race. That is why arguments based on survival are so effective in persuading people to permit actions that violate their moral code.\textsuperscript{384}

This lines up easily with your own calls for revolution and war against national monarchies yet, you do not seem to understand that your own moral code of “LIBERTY, TRUTH... and PROSPERITY”\textsuperscript{385} like, Locke’s influence on Thomas Jefferson’s own version of “Life, Liberty,

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{382}Ibid, 210.
\end{flushright}
and the pursuit of Happiness” places innumerable lives at risk and contradicts itself in proclaiming that only the state can save us from the aforementioned restrictions. Therefore, life, liberty, truth, prosperity, and the pursuit of happiness are only for the select few; the elite, while all others seen as meaningless pawns. These meaningless pawns are “made to appear as enemies of the human race” for not submitting to the deified state; the state that violates its own moral code. Similarly, the dignity of man is lost with this ideology and as Dostoyevsky wrote, “If God does not exist, then everything is permissible.”

Now concerning postmodernism’s plank of relativism, we must first understand that relativism is an ideology that should be avoided in a logical and sensible way for full communication and understandings to take place. I say this because we need to understand the concept to which something is relative to, as in relative to what. Further,

Relativism is another aspect of the postmodern movement. Relativism is the view that says that all views are equally true, or equally false. Relativism is usually held, by people for the sake of unity and to promote tolerance. Yet, if this is true, it is self-defeating, because it presupposes that tolerance and understanding are universal, objective moral norms. This is like saying, “There is no right or wrong, and if you disagree with us, you’re wrong!” Moreover, relativism relativizes itself. Relativism offers itself as a moral absolute, but this undercuts its own position. So we are left to ask, “Is your belief in relativism something you believe all people ought to believe, or is it a belief that’s only relative?” If the person adhering to this, the relativist, says it is only

---

relative to them, then relativism is meaningless, because it does not even have the ability to persuade others to believe it.\footnote{Joseph Torres, “Relativism’s Attack on Morality,” KINGDOMVIEW, March 11, 2007, revision accessed December 3, 2009, https://apolojet.wordpress.com/2007/03/11/relativisms-attack-on-morality/}

Thus, relativism proves itself foolishness to adhere to, as it creates individuals who are exclusive to one another in that no one has a set standard base to move from and nothing is certain for one another as everything is only relative. However, we are left to consider the living or working reality of this ideology in daily life. We do not take an amount of pain pills relative to the pain that we may feel for if that were the case, many people would end up in traumatic conditions, dead from over-dosing because they would claim that they took an amount relative to the relative degree of the pain that they felt. Additionally, if a parent were so terribly upset with a child, it too, may lead to the death of the child when a relative or unrestricted amount of discipline or punishment, based upon the parent being so terribly upset was administered to the child. In my time, this is called child abuse and history has provided immeasurable evidence of cases like this where a parent acts in a way that is relative to how the parent felt. A student would not want to receive a grade that was relative to how the teacher may have felt during the time of grading either.

The final plank that I will mention concerning postmodernism is its ideology of tolerance. This too, is both self-defeating and hypocritical when it is applied. Of course, tolerance too, needs to have a foundation from which to function, but in the world’s secular and social climate, there is no solid base to stand upon. So much of what continually comes forth is based upon the relative feelings of the few, who instigate the feelings and emotions of others. Therefore, bills are
drawn up in an effort to bring forth laws, which are standards of intolerance themselves. A simple example is that it is Constitutional law in the United States in Amendments 1 & 2 that,

Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting
the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or
the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for
a redress of grievances.390

And that,

A well regulated Militia, being necessary to the security of a free State, the right
of the people to keep and bear Arms, shall not be infringed.391

Within these two law-based Amendments from the Bill of Rights, there is intolerance. However, there are limitations to these rights. These two Amendments justify intolerance because U. S. citizens are not free to proclaim, as the law allows them to, that there is a fire in a location like, a movie theater, when there is not a fire in the first place.

Similarly, “the right of the people to keep and bear Arms, shall not be infringed”392 is violated when a U. S. citizen is not rightfully free to own any arm or weapon that is available for sale. In fact, most of the States require a license or permit to own a weapon and there are also

392 Ibid.
restrictions on the usage of the weapon(s). One example is that no person is legally allowed to use chemical weapons upon other people in the United States, regardless if the person that the weapon is used upon is a U. S. citizen or not.

   Obviously, I am not promoting the use of chemical, nuclear, or illegal weapons. In fact, I am against the use of weapons in most all circumstances in relation to my position in Christ. However, the above commentary demonstrates the infringement and an intolerance leveled against these two of these Bill of Rights Amendments. It displays intolerance and restrictions toward U. S. citizens from speaking freely or owning and using arms or weapons. These Amendments have been amended which can show a growth in human awareness or thought, but it also demonstrates that the very laws that we conceive will never be good enough to deal with the inherent problem within man in the first place.

   This is also validated by Biblical Scripture, as the Epistle to the Hebrew states that, “the Law made nothing perfect.”\(^{393}\) Of course this scripture relates to the Law given to Moses by God, but similarly, no other law can make man perfect. Law states what is expected and assumed for the common good since only God is omniscient and the law condemns violation. Law does not have ability or power to change the hearts, minds, or attitudes of people though law may issue fear for prevention of violation, but the person is not inwardly changed by law. If law had this power, there would be no need for the police, our numerous prisons, the military, or even the locks on the doors to homes. Why do we have all of these mentioned things, particularly the rights and the laws, if we did not have reasons for them?

   Interestingly too, the argument presented by the postmodernist is contradictory or double-sided concerning its toleration movement. For the postmodernists urge people to be tolerant of the current issue(s) and they call people to tolerate the choices or lifestyles of those that are

\(^{393}\) Hebrews 7:19 NASB.
different from the norms within society. On the other hand, these same postmodernists both voice and work to prevent the opposite points of view from existing and consequently, these postmodernists are intolerant of that which is intolerant to their ideology. Therefore, this plank too, is both self-defeating and in hypocrisy when it is applied to life, as there have to be occasions when tolerance is not accepted. Correctly, humans should not allow for the toleration of pedophilia or bestiality or a range of other things, like murder. Murder seemingly ought not to be tolerated, but the world’s war machine and my own nation’s death penalties are viewed as legalized amendments to this. The afore mentioned golden rule, treating another person as you want her/him to treat you, is in fact a high-minded ideal that humans throughout history have continually warred against. It is only by the indwelling life of the Son of God; Jesus the Christ,\textsuperscript{394} that man can not only choose to, but actually love God\textsuperscript{395} and love one another.\textsuperscript{396}

\textbf{Condorcet:} Regardless of the postmodernist’s idea of tolerance, which has turned into intolerance at times and that the tolerance idea can have hypocrisy, we must understand that humanity has natural rights and the enforcement of these rights ensures that humanity will continue to advance toward its natural excellence. Further, though the postmodern ideology seems to have some deep seated issues that are discovered when the ideology is analyzed, my own words verify and prophetically emphasize why we need clarity in our communication. For example, I note that,

\textsuperscript{394} Galatians 2:20; Philippians 1:21; and Colossians 1:27 NASB. 
\textsuperscript{395} Ephesians 5:2; 2 Thessalonians 1:3; 1 Timothy 6:11; 1 John 4:7; 1 John 4:11; 1 John 4:21 LITV. 
\textsuperscript{396} Matthew 5:44, 19:19, 22:39; Mark 12:31; Luke 6:27, 35; Romans 12:14, 18-21; James 2:8; 1 Peter 2:17; and 1 John 4:7 LITV.
If our words do not represent fixed and definite ideas, they will at different times suggest different ideas to the mind and become the most fruitful source of error.\textsuperscript{397}

Otherwise, confusion will reign forth and there will be continual determent to our expected outcome of perfection.

Conversely, concerning natural rights, I have

Linked rights to the process of enlightenment, thereby identifying the enemies of enlightenment as the enemies of those rights\textsuperscript{398}

This has been part of my life’s ambition and career in enlightening mankind toward our escalating benefit. In my \textit{Lettres d'un citoyen des Etats-unis, a un français, sur les affaires présentes}, I write that,

In every civilized nation with a moderately sized population there can be no enjoyment of natural rights without enlightenment; the enemies of enlightenment are thus enemies of men’s freedom to enjoy their rights.\textsuperscript{399}

To think otherwise is to return to the wild nature from which man has emerged, but even within that primordial state, man was a political creature within whom these eternal and inalienable

\textsuperscript{399} Marie-Jean-Antoine-Nicolas Caritat, Marquis de Condorcet, \textit{“Lettres d'un citoyen des Etats-unis, a un français, sur les affaires présentes."} IX:105, 6 from A. Condorcet O'Connor and ET M. F. Arago, \textit{“Works of Condorcet,” Firmin Didot Brothers, Booksellers, Printers, the Institute}, 1847.
rights reside. To think otherwise, is to be blind to who man is and what man is able to become and leaves man to a state of continual depravity and immaturity, whereby a fixed status of ambiguity reigns.

My view: I am gladdened by your understanding that postmodernism has its faults. This is a key concept to learn because if we do not understand that man can only produce that which decays, fails, and tarnishes, we will forever be locked into the false idea that man can be matured into a status of imaginary perfection. You, yourself do not seem to grasp the problems within your own idea of human perfection though, you actually admit to the very problem(s) within humanity in the first place. Baffling as this is, this comes from a delusional concept initiated by the sin within humanity. I will cite some of your own words and point out the tragedy within your idea. You write that,

Linked rights to the process of enlightenment, thereby identifying the enemies of enlightenment as the enemies of those rights

And

In every civilized nation with a moderately sized population there can be no enjoyment of natural rights without enlightenment; the enemies of enlightenment are thus enemies of men’s freedom to enjoy their rights.

---

If we analyze what you said in these two phrases, we see that you have equated these natural rights with enlightenment and thereby, you devalue those who are not considered enlightened. You prevent these rights, which you call natural, from being realized within the people whom you deem lower in both social and intellectual value. This is a striking contrast to your claim of equality to all people and is a continuation of the hypocrisy within your essay. The concept of natural rights is therefore, false and only an idea created within the minds of men and propagated upon populations to give a sense of security from the fears that we have of each other. Thomas Hobbes noted in his work, *Leviathan*, that we need the commonwealth; a sovereign monarch or assembly of men to administer our laws for us, our peace, our protection, and our freedoms. Hobbes states this because,

> There Is Alwayes Warre Of Every One Against Every One Hereby it is manifest, that during the time men live without a common Power to keep them all in awe, they are in that condition which is called Warre; and such a warre, as is of every man, against every man.  

With this, we can know that we are wrong and sinful before God, always missing his mark. We do not only not love God, we do not love one another. In various ways and means, we “are in that condition which is called Warre; and such a warre, as is of every man, against every man.” Out of fear from our due punishment for not loving God or one another, we live by the delusion that we deserve special treatment and walk in continual self-justification. I will cite your own words to validate this premise. You state that,

---

404 Ibid.
By analysing the faculty of experiencing pain and pleasure, men arrived at the origin of their notions of morality, and the foundation of those general principles which form the necessary and immutable laws of justice; and consequently discovered the proper motives of conforming their conduct to those laws, which, being deduced from the nature of our feeling, may not improperly be called our moral constitution.  

Here, we can see that these morals and laws are based upon the sensations and feelings, as in pleasure and pain. With this in mind, we perceive that the acclaimed natural rights and the laws established to protect them result from these inherent perceptions and consciousness. We are to recognize that our emotions, like fear, and our considerations are the foundation for so much of our created laws and rights? Nevertheless, our thoughts, emotions, feelings, sensations are all changeable; they shift like waves of the ocean. They are not solid, like a rock and are therefore, not feasible for life’s foundation. Again, we live by the mistaken idea from Thomas Aquinas that “the will of man was fallen, but the intellect was not.”406 In fact, Dr. Schaeffer presents these words, “From this incomplete view of the biblical Fall flowed subsequent difficulties. Out of this as time passed, man’s intellect was seen as autonomous.”407 Yet, this does not work because our intellect cannot be autonomous, for if it was, it would be independent from us and in one sense

406Francis A. Schaeffer, The Francis Schaeffer Trilogy; Escape from Reason, (Wheaton: Crossway Books, 1990), 211.
407Ibid.
deified. Therefore, I noted this earlier, as we discussed your Fifth Epoch that we need a solid foundation for our lives and our morals.

When we look over history, even the very days we live within and consider the rampant chaos that result from following only our thoughts and feelings, we can ascertain the ingrained problem(s) within this false basis and within humanity. For within the Bible’s Book of Jeremiah, it reads,

“So says Jehovah, Cursed is the man who trusts in man, and who makes flesh his arm (strength), and who turns aside his heart from Jehovah.” 408

From this, I also mention the story of Cain and Abel from Genesis 4. Cain murdered Abel out of jealousy, self-justification, pride, self-righteousness, guilt, and fear. Cain was jealous of Abel because Abel’s sacrifice was accepted by God and his was not. Cain was walking in guilt concerning his incorrect offering, and he was in fear for his fault. Because of these multiple issues, he moved in anger and killed Abel. Tremper Longman III, a Robert H. Gundry Professor of Biblical Studies at Westmont College writes,

God’s rejection of his sacrifice should have led him to change his behavior in positive directions, but his actions get much worse. The sin that was waiting to overtake him ravages his heart. Cain kills his brother, who had received God’s favor. 409

---

408 Jeremiah 17:5, 6 LITV.
So from this, Cain was seeking self-justification and self-righteousness before his own eyes and not God’s. Now, this may seem to be only a fable to you, but when we acknowledge your own writings Condorcet and current news reports, we are confounded with the very same types of actions coming forth from people of an enlightened age. Cain wanted acceptance for doing things his way; making a sacrifice according to his desires and not according to what God had previously demonstrated toward Adam and Eve. Longman also mentions that,

The token of grace is the clothes that God fashions for Adam and Eve out of animal skins. God encourages them in the area where they express most vulnerability.\textsuperscript{410}

This indicates that Cain’s parents were shown by God that a sacrificial atonement was made for them and their sin with the life of another, but Cain’s own sacrifice came from the already cursed earth with his fruit of the ground offering and his own self-righteousness. God was not pleased by Cain’s sacrifice which came from both the cursed earth and from Cain’s disobedient labor. With this example, we can see that humans cannot live autonomously and try to live lives disobediently, nor independently of God.

\textsuperscript{410} Ibid, 114. The New English Translation Bible’s (The NET Bible is a completely new translation of the Bible with 60,932 translators’ notes! It was completed by more than 25 scholars – experts in the original biblical languages – who worked directly from the best currently available Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek texts. ) note regarding the skin in the garments God made for Adam and Eve reads, “The Lord God made garments from skin. The text gives no indication as to how this was done, or how they came by the skins. Earlier in the narrative (v. 7) the attempt of the man and the woman to cover their nakedness with leaves expressed their sense of alienation from each other and from God. By giving them more substantial coverings, God indicates this alienation is greater than they realize. This divine action is also ominous; God is preparing them for the more hostile environment I which they will soon be living (v. 23). At the same time, there is a positive side to the story I that God makes provision for the man’s and woman’s condition.” “Genesis 3,” https://net.bible.org/, accessed 2/23/2015, https://net.bible.org/#!bible/Genesis+3:17.
Likewise, you, Condorcet, “pressed vigorously for the French declaration of war against Austria”\(^{411}\) because of Austria’s stance on maintaining a monarchy and you opposed people that differed from your own thoughts and feelings. Similarly, current news reports illuminate the same type of thinking that you demonstrate in waging war against those who hold different ideologies and thinking. On August 20\(^{th}\) the Thomson Reuters news agency reports on how the Islamic State,

A militant group that witnesses and officials say has executed hundreds of members of Iraq’s Yazidis, has released a video that seeks to show it enlightened hundreds of members of the religious minority by converting them to Islam.\(^{412}\)

Now, it is seemingly obvious that the Yazidis converted to Islam by compulsion. It is more than likely that they were compelled into making this conversion, as they were held in custody to the Islamic State militants who, “storm into villages armed with machine guns and give Yazidis a simple choice: convert to Islam or die.”\(^{413}\) The Muslims that compose the Islamic State claim that they are enlightening the Yazidi people to Islam, but the reality is this enlightenment, which comes in the face of a do or die choice is far from civil behavior and is strikingly similar to your proposition against Austria. You declared death to a nation of people simply because they held to a different opinion than you. These Austrians were choosing to live in a manner different from what you believe to be a better way of life and because of your attitude toward them, you


condemn them to death. I am baffled by murdering people, merely because they think differently to you. You feel that it is necessary to slaughter men, women, and children because they live under the authority of a monarch, whereas you believe that they are ignorant of your understandings and are unequal to you. What happened to the claimed natural rights of life and liberty, which “are inalienable and imprescriptible”\(^{414}\) that you adamantly propose within the face of your own belligerence toward these people? What of the lives of the soldiers? Are they too low in your scale of class to be worthy of life aside from fulfilling your goals? Are they forced to not only kill innocent people, but to also suffer from the stress disorders that often besiege them when they are called to kill?

Besides these actions, what about the Native Americans who lost their properties, possessions, and lives to those colonizing the new world? What of the Africans too, who also lost these and were forced into lives of not only physical slavery, but typically kept from any formal education outside of their bound duties? Do you see how fraudulent your ideology is? You write of “men’s freedom to enjoy their rights”\(^{415}\) yet, you do not allow all humans to do this. You designate only certain people to have rights while others people you deem as justified collateral damage to the cause of the enlightened. These ideas and the actions that come from them are more than unloving, they are elitist, and brutal toward those deemed less on your social scale. This demonstrates the brutality within your atheism. I also quote Herbert H. Bork in relation to your belief or faith in man perfecting himself through science. Bork writes,

---


Those who do not accept a God who stands outside of “natural” processes have no more reason for their faith than Christians who believe that Jesus rose on the third day or Jews who believe God made them His chosen people. Many people have a sort of vague idea that one day science will reveal everything, but that rests upon a number of assumptions essentially taken on faith, among them that there is a natural world independent of the mind that purports to observe it and that that universe is ultimately reducible to laws the mind can discover. Perhaps these things will ultimately prove to be true but at the moment they are taken on faith.\footnote{Robert H. Bork, preface to Idols for Destruction: The Conflict of Christian Faith and American Culture, Herbert Schlossberg (Wheaton: Crossway Books, 1990), xix.}

Your faith, in not only science but, in man’s reason; man himself, rests upon ideas that history continually proves faulty. Your atheism proclaims that Christians cannot prove that God exists, but by the same token, unbelievers cannot prove that God does not exist. This makes your reliance upon empiricism useless. I agree that we cannot see God, but historically, we did see Jesus Christ, his son. Further, you cannot show me reason itself, only the workings of it. So, just as we each walk by faith; you by appearance or sight and Christians by the lack of seeing God himself, the overwhelming evidence has been displayed through history. Most followers of God in Christ, so often live in quiet, inconspicuous humility with love as our goal\footnote{1Timothy 1:5 NASB} while man, with reason alone as his lord, has brought nearly nothing except continual striving, fighting, political stalemates, and discontinuous peace. Man’s inventions always need to be replaced because they do not last and because man is never satisfied. Nevertheless, please offer your reply.
Condorcet: It is more than apparent that you do not seem to understand the reason behind much of what I propose. You do not understand the horrors of monarchies and how they naturally oppose and prevent the use of our natural rights. You are so caught up in your religious theocracy that you cannot reason your way out of the ignorance that you live and walk in. Speaking of being baffled, I too, propose that you are caught within the bonding trap of superstition. Can you not see that without natural rights, we would be imprisoned by the treacheries of tyrannical monarchs? You seem to understand the horrors that Machiavelli presented in his book, *The Prince* yet, so much of the violence described within that book has taken place across Europe and we can both recall the terrors brought about by the religious fanatics during the years of the Reformation. Again, by the fiction of our debate, which is not restricted by the limits of time, I note a contemporary author of your time and cite words from his book, *Did Calvin Murder Servetus?*. From the author Standford Rives,

It is also a fact that Calvin remained unrepentant as of 1561 about his role and responsibility for the death of Servetus. In 1561, Calvin wrote a letter to the Marquis Paet, chamberlain to the King of Navarre, in which Calvin said:

“Honour, glory, and riches shall be the reward of your pains; but above all, do not fail to rid the country of those scoundrels [Anabaptists and others], who stir up the people to revolt against us. Such monsters should be exterminated, as I have exterminated Michael Servetus the Spaniard.”

This is the kind of example that corroborates my own stance against religion and other forms of superstition, as they are so filled with hypocrisy and a class system that essentially devalues

---

members of their own societies. Therefore, when man lives by his natural rights and uses the reason within his mind, he will walk freely by his rights and move toward an everlasting peace.

    In relation to proving and disproving God’s existence and your claim that my reliance upon empiricism is useless only presents the reality of your superstition blinding your reason and henceforth limiting your progression and further benefit to man.

**My view:** Here again, I am utterly amazed at your reasoning, as you seem completely unaware of your own hypocrisy and do not see that you validate my own claims. You proclaim natural rights because of your fear of humanity’s capabilities. This claim to natural rights allows you to establish laws, which then give the idea that man will live by these laws and cause humanity to be safe amongst one another. This authenticates both the Biblical stance and my own that there is something wrong within humanity in the first place and humanity tries to shield itself from this problem by creating laws. These laws are an attempt to prevent man from being who he really is outside of the love that God is. In fact, your own quotation regarding John Calvin verifies that man is a lost sinner who, is in need of becoming a new creature in Christ Jesus, where God is now living within man and the fruit of God’s Spirit are manifest through the born-again man. Further, these fruits of the Spirit are “love, joy, peace, patience, kindness, goodness, faithfulness, gentleness, self-control”\(^{419}\) and “against such things there is no law”\(^{420}\) because these are the very things that man tries to do on his own anyway, but is unable to do. The very essence of our very law systems and the prisons retaining the offenders confirm this. Again, “the Law made nothing perfect.”\(^{421}\)

    Nevertheless, I will proceed with our conversation, as we have parallel ways of thinking that only have momentary intersections evidencing the substructures of our different worldviews.

---

419 Galatians 5:22, 23 NASB.
420 Galatians 5:23 NASB.
421 Hebrews 7:19 NASB.
It is acknowledged that yours is based upon your understanding of reason and mine is based upon both reason and divine revelation. From this, I move to my next areas of discrepancy with you. I find that on the 98th page of your Ninth Epoch, there is much to consider in regard to hypocrisy and I will elaborate in detail. You write that,

The art of printing had been applied to so many subjects, books had so rapidly increased, they were so admirably adapted to every taste, every degree of information, and every situation of life, they afforded so easy and frequently so delightful an instruction, they had opened so many doors to truth, which it was impossible ever to close again, that there was no longer a class or profession of mankind from whom the light of knowledge could absolutely be excluded. Accordingly, though there still remained a multitude of individuals condemned to a forced or voluntary ignorance, yet was the barrier between the enlightened and unenlightened portion of mankind nearly effaced, and an insensible gradation occupied the space which separates the two extremes of genius and stupidity.422

Again, you fail to mention that the Bible was the first book to be printed and continues to be one of the most widely printed and sold books in the world. You fail to mention that though you claim, “that there was no longer a class or profession of mankind from whom the light of knowledge could absolutely be excluded,”423 you grant yourself the agility to cover for the illiterate. You do this by stating,

423 Ibid.
There still remained a multitude of individuals condemned to a forced or voluntary ignorance, yet was the barrier between the enlightened and unenlightened portion of mankind nearly effaced, and an insensible gradation occupied the space which separates the two extremes of genius and stupidity.\footnote{Marie-Jean-Antoine-Nicolas Caritat, Marquis de Condorcet, “Marie-Jean-Antoine-Nicolas Caritat, Marquis de Condorcet, \textit{Outlines of an historical view of the progress of the human mind [1795]},” \textit{The Online Library of Liberty}, (2011) : 98, http://oll.libertyfund.org/title/1669.}

However, you seem to be in a dream world, filled by your own arrogance. Who gives you the right to determine who is really stupid or who is genius? Are you able to look over the whole of a person’s life to determine whether or not the person is truly genius or stupid? Supposing that a person continually makes failures, do we determine what may be the cause of these failures or do we just label the person stupid? What about the factors of circumstance, age, upbringing, or genetics? If a person struggles with failures, does that mean the person is of less value? If this be the case and the person is deemed to truly be of less value, what then is to happen to the person? Is she or he allowed to live or is the person relegated to a lifestyle determined by those who are deemed superior? Essentially, the seemingly superior people then act as gods over the inferior? If this be the case, how is love administered to the stupid and how is arrogance prevented by the superior? Further, what if a person willingly chooses to commit failures in an effort to demonstrate the false superiority complex within the claimed genius? Again, this presents a class system within humanity and predetermines a value upon people. This is continually established by those who claim to be at the top levels of this class system.
Similarly, you validate my own words concerning natural rights, as you write that, “the natural rights of man; the opinion even that these rights are inalienable and imprescriptible”\(^{425}\) with my example. This contradicts your earlier attitude regarding the natural rights of man. Here, you state that these rights are of the opinion that they are “inalienable and imprescriptible”\(^{426}\) and that means that they are not official or eternal. Instead, they are only of opinion and therefore, are only of mental thoughts that have been either forced upon humanity or willingly accepted because these natural rights appear to bring freedom and to be correct. You claim this when you wrote in your *On the Society of 1789*, “One attempts not to prove truths (still less to discover new ones), but to impress other minds and rally opinion one’s favor”\(^{427}\) thus, endorsing what I proclaimed. However, God has given rights to man and since God is God, it makes more sense, is more reasonable to submit to the divine than to the earthly. These rights are listed in both the Old and New Testaments of the Bible; for the Jews and for the Gentiles.\(^{428}\) They include the right to human life from God’s authority over creation, the right to have authority over the earth and other life forms, and the right to reproduce. All of these are mentioned in Genesis 1. God also gave the “rights of the poor,”\(^{429}\) from those who try to oppress them to those who are “the needy of justice,”\(^{430}\) and “through Him [Jesus] we both have our access in one Spirit to the Father. So then you are no longer strangers and aliens, but you are fellow citizens with the saints, and are of


\(^{426}\) Ibid.


\(^{428}\) The first instance of rights given is the right to choose and this is in Genesis 1:26, 28 – 30, and thereafter. Further, there are more instances of rights being given and these include personhood (Genesis 16:5, Exodus 21:10, Exodus 28:30, Psalm 82:3, Proverbs 29:7, Proverbs 31:5, Proverbs 31:8, Proverbs 31:9, Isaiah 5:23, Isaiah 10:2, Jeremiah 5:28, Nehemiah 5:18, Matthew 9:3, 1 Corinthians 7:3-5, 1 Corinthians 9:18, 1 Corinthians 13:5, Ephesians 2:12, Ephesians 2:19, 1 Peter 4:15 ), property (Genesis 25:31, Exodus 22:1, Exodus 28:30, Matthew 9:3, 1 Corinthians 13:5, Ephesians 2:12, Ephesians 2:18, 19; 1 Peter 4:15). There are more areas where rights are listed within scripture, but I hold that enough are given to verify the claim that God has given certain rights to humanity.

\(^{429}\) Proverbs 29:7 NASB

\(^{430}\) Isaiah 10:2 NASB
God’s household.” These encompass some of what mankind truly needs, as they are given by mankind’s own creator. Further, if we look at when the rights of man were revisited to the social forefront, we can understand that they were re-evaluated in the coming forth of the social contract theories. Machiavelli, Hobbes, and Locke were all familiar with Christianity and its influences upon society and because of this, the ideas relating to the rights of man were not unfamiliar to them. In fact, John Locke was raised in a Puritan home and attended Westminster School, which is located in the walled area of the Westminster Abbey. These men; Machiavelli, Hobbes, and Locke, used their God given right to make choices, but they chose to follow a liberal rationalism whose,

> Essence lies in a respect for the autonomy of the individual. Because liberalism starts with the individual, the most characteristic liberal political doctrines are the social contract as the foundation of legitimate government and individual rights as the basis of liberty.

Note that this liberty is not the liberty given by God, but from the conceptions of men who, are relying on their own ideas, which are continually demonstrated to be false foundations. Retired UC Berkeley law professor, Phillip E. Johnson writes that,

> Because liberalism starts with individual rights and autonomy, its morality tends to become progressively more relativistic and even permissive. The exercise of

---

431 Ephesians 2:18, 19 NASB.
the individual freedom is limited primarily by the rights of others, and to a lesser extent by abstract social policies, which are usually debatable.\textsuperscript{433}

Most anyone can look over human history and validate that Western culture and society have progressed in this liberal mentality and I will identify several indications of how social morality has leaned more permissive as a result of this liberally progressive ideology, an ideology that you promote Condorcet. Further, you comment that for humanity,

almost all the opinions, almost all the judgments that direct our conduct, rest in a greater or lesser probability, always evaluated according to a vague and almost mechanical sentiment, or on the basis of crude and uncertain guesses.\textsuperscript{434}

Your own statement verifies not only what I have continued to present regarding the fault within mankind, but what God has repetitively presented throughout scripture. Though you write that these circumstances are listed with approximations by your use of the term “almost,” the reality is truly validated when looking upon the course of human history.

I will also counter your idea that my belief in God blinds my reason and limits my progression and benefit to humanity. I cite these words from the Acts of the Apostles, as Apostle Paul made his defense before Porcius Festus the Roman procurator, King Herod Agrippa II, and Bernice. During the arraignment, Festus “called out loudly, Paul, you are mad! Your great learning is driving you insane; turning you to madness! But Paul replied, I am not mad, most

noble Festus, but I am uttering the straight, sound truth; words of truth and rationality." These words seek to demonstrate that not only was the Apostle Paul proclaiming that he was living and speaking in reasoned, rational truth but, successive Christians too, are not believing into false events or superstitious ideas, as you claim. We are agreeing with and witnessing to the historical accounts concerning Jesus being the Christ, Jesus’ resurrection, and what was accomplished by Jesus’ life, death, and resurrection. Each of us are given the liberty to adhere to what is set before us and our lives demonstrate these choices.

**Condorcet:** Though what you present is debatable, I confess that Machiavelli, Hobbes, and Locke most certainly had adequate knowledge of Christianity and the Bible as these are nearly inescapable throughout the entirety of Europe. Further, it is beneficial that you and your dogma are able to account for and understand the reality concerning the rights of man. Though you do not respect them as being natural, you are at least able to claim them henceforth, proving your ascension from the lower levels of man’s initial steps of progress. In essence, you validate my own words that,

Thus there prevailed a general knowledge of the natural rights of man; the opinion even that these rights are inalienable and imprescriptible; a decided partiality for freedom of thinking.  

Here forward, man truly began to see who he really is and man is able to live accordingly. You confirm these words of my doctrine,

---

435 Acts 26: 24, 25 Amplified Bible and NASB.
These principles, passing by degrees from the writings of philosophers into every class of society whose instruction was not confined to the catechism and the scriptures, became the common creed, the symbol and type of all men who were not idiots on the one hand, or, on the other, assertors of the policy of Machiavelism. In some countries these sentiments formed so nearly the general opinion, that the mass even of the people seemed ready to obey their dictates and act from their impulse.\textsuperscript{437}

Your agreeing with me ratifies my sentiment and certifies my canon regarding who man is and who he will become. So, respecting this let us step forward and move on to my Tenth Epoch and discuss the \textit{Future Progress Of Mankind}.\textsuperscript{438}

\textsuperscript{437} Ibid, 98.
\textsuperscript{438} Ibid, 119.
Chapter 10: Future Progress of Mankind

Condorcet: Here, I write that,

If man can predict, almost with certainty, those appearances of which he understands the laws; if, even when the laws are unknown to him, experience or the past enables him to foresee, with considerable probability, future appearances; why should we suppose it a chimerical undertaking to delineate, with some degree
of truth, the picture of the future destiny of mankind from the results of its history? The only foundation of faith in the natural sciences is the principle, that the general laws, known or unknown, which regulate the phenomena of the universe, are regular and constant; and why should this principle, applicable to the other operations of nature, be less true when applied to the development of the intellectual and moral faculties of man? In short, as opinions formed from experience, relative to the same class of objects, are the only rule by which men of soundest understanding are governed in their conduct, why should the philosopher be proscribed from supporting his conjectures upon a similar basis, provided he attribute to them no greater certainty than the number, the consistency, and the accuracy of actual observations shall authorise?

Our hopes, as to the future condition of the human species, may be reduced to three points: the destruction of inequality between different nations; the progress of equality in one and the same nation; and lastly, the real improvement of man.

Will not every nation one day arrive at the state of civilization attained by those people who are most enlightened, most free, most exempt from prejudices, as the French, for instance, and the Anglo-Americans? Will not the slavery of countries subjected to kings, the barbarity of African tribes, and the ignorance of savages
gradually vanish? Is there upon the face of the globe a single spot the inhabitants of which are condemned by nature never to enjoy liberty, never to exercise their reason?\(^\text{439}\)

This first page of my Tenth Epoch signifies the coming reality of who man is and what he is to become, as it is only by the use of his reason that his perfection shall come about and it is more than obvious that this progression is of full certainty when looking upon all that man has performed thus far.

**My view:** You provide some shocking statements within this first page of the Tenth Epoch to which I think you are unaware. Though perhaps, you are aware, but do not realize the very hypocrisy that you produce here. Just within the first paragraph of this first page of your Tenth Epoch, you ask the following question but do not seem to grasp your own misunderstandings relating to logic and the necessity for the Divine. You ask,

The only foundation of faith in the natural sciences is the principle, that the general laws, known or unknown, which regulate the phenomena of the universe, are regular and constant; and why should this principle, applicable to the other operations of nature, be less true when applied to the development of the intellectual and moral faculties of man?\(^\text{440}\)


Looking over your question, we must ascertain the truth and depth of the real foundation within this reasoning. To start, how do you imagine that these laws are regular and constant throughout the entirety of the universe when you are obviously ignorant of that outside of our own cosmos? Or in other words, how do we know that the things which apply to our visual experiences also apply to that outside of our visual experiences? Are differentiations not allowed?

Further, how do you suppose that these laws came about? I give the simple example of a watch. A watch is not created on its own initiative and it is not eternal, as rust and decomposition demonstrate. It needs a watchmaker for it to exist and to set its parts into place so that the watch functions properly and keeps accurate time. A watch is no accidental device that suddenly appears on its own, has perfect working order, and power source. It needs a watchmaker and likewise, these general laws that you refer to and “which regulate that phenomena of the universe”\(^{441}\) also require a being that not only created these laws, but makes certain that they are “regular and constant.”\(^{442}\) This is logical and so much so that even a mere child finds this to be more than obvious.

By reckoning upon your mention of these laws being “applicable to the other operations of nature”\(^{443}\) and being “less true when applied to the development of the intellectual and moral faculties of man,”\(^{444}\) we need to understand that you are essentially proclaiming that these laws, to which you give no founder for them, are effectively the very Deity or governor of the universe. Unless, you are stating that reason is the founder of the laws. I ask whose reason? My responses seek to show that both humanity’s and your individual reason are corrupt and faulty.

\(^{441}\) Ibid.
\(^{442}\) Ibid.
\(^{443}\) Ibid.
So that leaves us with some concept of reason as some sort of being or essence or some other, unidentifiable thing, aside from reason being reason itself. Yet, reason continues to display itself, whatever it is, as impersonal. I say impersonal because I am not aware of anyone ever having personal communication with reason outside of the seemingly reasoned thoughts and actions that come through people. But again, I ask, reason according to whom? So much of what people, like yourself, call reason is qualified as a “foundation of faith in the natural sciences . . . when applied to the development of the intellectual and moral faculties of man.” This is similarly based upon the “opinions formed from experience” and is “the only rule by which men of soundest understanding are governed in their conduct.” That is your foundation for reason. This demonstrates not only an elitism, but an arrogance for those claiming that only they have the correct “opinions formed from experience” in the “faith in the natural sciences . . . when applied to the development of the intellectual and moral faculties of man.”

Along with this,

The idea that a scientist simply studies ‘what is,’ as John Dewey has argued, is a parochial conception of science . . . As Dewey said forcefully on another occasion: ‘Anything that obscures the fundamentally moral nature of the social problem is harmful.’

---

445 Ibid.
446 Ibid.
447 Ibid.
448 Ibid.
449 Ibid.
450 Howard Brick, Daniel Bell and the Decline of Intellectual Radicalism: Social Theory and Political Reconciliation in the 1940’s, (Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1986), 7.
Similarly, you end this paragraph in a manner that affirms your own belief in a social class system which automatically regulates inequality amongst people and in essence, adheres to the law system that you have noted in dealing with “the development of the intellectual and moral faculties of man.”\textsuperscript{451} You state this closing question,

In short, as opinions formed from experience, relative to the same class of objects, are the only rule by which men of soundest understanding are governed in their conduct, why should the philosopher be proscribed from supporting his conjectures upon a similar basis, provided he attribute to them no greater certainty than the number, the consistency, and the accuracy of actual observations shall authorise?\textsuperscript{452}

It announces exactly what I have verified, a social class system that separates people into hierarchal categories and declares that only the educated, particularly the more highly educated, are able to reign. Your corrupted reason shines forth by these words,

Opinions formed from experience, relative to the same class of objects, are the only rule by which men of soundest understanding are governed in their conduct.\textsuperscript{453}


\textsuperscript{452} Ibid.

Therefore, “men of soundest understanding are governed in their conduct,”\textsuperscript{454} by “opinions formed from experience, relative to the same class”\textsuperscript{455} but, in opposition and distinction from people who are not of this degree of intellect or experience. You do not seem to understand that it is typically these same, often high-minded people, who are in the upper classes of society and often within government administration, that are also the very same people that enshroud nations in both political and social bedlam. These are so very often the people that drive nations into wars, just as you and some of your contemporaries “pressed vigorously for the French declaration of war against Austria.”\textsuperscript{456} Do you see the elitist, social-class system that you put forth? Where is the claimed equality that you write of? May I inform you that over the course of history, nations have continually placed the intellectuals into places of leadership, but when we look at our histories, these are the very same people that have not benefitted the very nations that they were called to lead and have instead, only left their populations with the continued hope that maybe, the next leader(s) will make life better for them. It makes one wonder why we so often forget about examining character rather than achievements when considering nominees for leadership. I continue with,

All such visions are freighted with religious content, although this is often not recognized. They contain at least some of the components we expect to find in religions: a theory of knowledge, an authoritative literature, a theory of historical relationships, a cosmology, a hierarchy of values, and an eschatology . . . What more could anyone ask of a religion? Well, it might be said that a religion should

\textsuperscript{454}Ibid.
\textsuperscript{455}Ibid.
have a God as its end. But anyone with a hierarchy of values has placed

*something* at its apex, and whatever that is is the god he serves.\textsuperscript{457}

The questions that I just asked in relation to your ideology are in complete opposition from my

own, Christ-centered worldview where people are to not only love God with all that they are, but
to also love one another. A hierarchy amongst Christians is not of God but, of men.

**Condorcet:** Obviously, you are unable to ascertain that if nations were ever ruled by those, who

are of limited, malfunctioning intellect or experience, sheer disaster and absolute mayhem would
arise with an anarchy that brings forth tremendous tumult. Nothing but calamity would ensue and
this is why I wrote that it is the natural order for man to progress into a state of perfection. Notice
how the next paragraph announces that,

> Our hopes, as to the future condition of the human species, may be reduced to
> three points: the destruction of inequality between different nations; the progress
> of equality in one and the same nation; and lastly, the real improvement of man.\textsuperscript{458}

As man continues with the growth of his intellect, continually progressing in his advancement,
all social and political ills will be wiped away like, an infectious disease by the overcoming
antidote of man’s supremacy. Surely, you can conceive of the three points that I have listed. The
very elimination of slavery in both economic and social settings reduces these inequalities and
that is why I have pushed for their elimination. Similarly, I was “one of the founders of a Society


of the Friends of the Negro” and I wrote many papers against this tragedy. Only an imbecile would counter this. Regarding the “real improvement of man,” I ask,

Will not every nation one day arrive at the state of civilization attained by those people who are most enlightened, most free, most exempt from prejudices, as the French, for instance, and the Anglo-Americans? Will not the slavery of countries subjected to kings, the barbarity of African tribes, and the ignorance of savages gradually vanish? Is there upon the face of the globe a single spot the inhabitants of which are condemned by nature never to enjoy liberty, never to exercise their reason?

These are the more heartfelt and endearing questions that need answering and my essay voices that coming reality of man’s soon perfection.

My view: I cherish your stance and work against slavery particularly that related to the Negro. I admire your dedication even though you encountered trouble with your good friend, Thomas Jefferson. Jefferson began translating your Reflections on Negro Slavery “into English but, symbolically, completed only a few paragraphs,” as he “believed at heart that Negroes were not the intellectual equals of whites.” It is difficult to stand against the thoughts and behaviors

460 David Williams, Condorcet and Modernity, (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 139-58.
462 Ibid.
464 Ibid.
of friends. Further, it is a formidable work, in helping your nation abolish slavery from both its continental lands and its colonies.465

However, we have to perceive what occurred after your death, as this solidifies that your essay is nothing more than a hopeful dream and does not face the reality of which, man really is apart from God. Looking over your last quote, we need to analyze not only its problems, but what later history reveals concerning man and his ways. Understandably, it is a virtuous ideal to eliminate prejudices, but when we reflect on intolerances, as we did earlier, we ascertain that life itself requires both tolerances and intolerances. Simple logic displays that we cannot have one without the other. We must evaluate your own prejudices too, those against monarchs and in essence, against those who intellectually support or are forced to defend them militarily. We have already mentioned the trauma of slavery to some degree; how it ended for the most part in the world, and how it has returned in a greater way than ever before with more than 30 million466 people trapped in human trafficking and slavery. I return to Scripture in citing that the Bible’s last book, Revelation, notes that in the times of the Armageddon, slavery has resumed.467 Verses include, “And the small and the great, and the rich and the poor, and the freemen and the slaves, it causes that they give to them all a mark on their right hand, or on their foreheads”468 and to all of the birds “that you may eat the flesh of kings, and the flesh of chiliarchs, and the flesh of strong ones, and the flesh of horses, and of the ones sitting on them, and the flesh of all, both freemen and slaves, even of the small and great.”469

465Ibid.
467Revelation 13:16, 18:13, and 19:18 LITV.
468Revelation 13:16 LITV.
469Revelation 19:18 LITV.
Obviously, Armageddon lies ahead, but the parallel of slavery cannot be dismissed after its absence and its tremendous return. We cannot fully answer the final question you ask in this paragraph, “Is there upon the face of the globe a single spot the inhabitants of which are condemned by nature never to enjoy liberty, never to exercise their reason?” All that can be said is that, I do not agree that nature itself is divine nor, does it have the power to condemn people to never enjoy freedom or the exercise of reason. I do state that humanity does regularly implement situations where people are not free. The government of North Korea administers one of the closest forms of slavery on the planet. There have also been various governments and philosophies that put immense restrictions upon the people. Two examples are the Communism governments of the former U.S.S.R, China, Vietnam, the previously mentioned North Korea among others, and the Communist philosophy of Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels. Let it be known again, that Karl Marx easily adapted New Testament life and history to a governmental philosophy that forces citizens to care for one another regardless of inner emotion. In a sense, people are turned into robotic beings that are forced to supply unto one another so that all of the people are leveled to an equal status. However, humans are not robotic and great strife and turmoil manifests itself from these conditions. Further, the people of the Communist nations validate the sin, opposition to God, and the corrupt reasoning within humanity as Marx’s Communism never played out according to its standards. Communist rulers moved in the manner of seeing themselves as being better than the other citizens and did not live in the same ways as the rest of their nations’ people. If equality occurred among the citizenry, we should easily ask

where the governmental officials were during the bread lines of the Soviet Union and why did these officials have more costly clothing, homes, cars, and other benefits that the rest of their nations’ peoples?  

Paul Gregory and Barbara Dietz comment that,

Presumably, the Soviet leadership had its own perceptions of economic conditions during this period and was becoming increasingly influenced by public concerns about deteriorating economic conditions.  

This is in analyzing surveys of former U.S.S.R. emigrants who departed from the mid-1970’s to the mid-1980’s and referencing their viewpoints of Soviet reality. They remark that because of political differences, “Soviet statistical authorities do not publish data on privileges (such as access to closed shops, clinics, state cars).”  

Gregory and Dietz also note that,

Unsurprisingly, privileges appear to be an urban phenomenon in the Soviet Union. Of the urban respondents, between 3% and 6% had access to each type of privilege. The fact that two disparate surveys yield a fairly narrow band of privilege access suggests that this band characterizes the privileged population of the USSR.
Though these results are from people who emigrated, they do give glimpse to the Soviet reality and how the Communist system did not bring equality to the people of the U.S.S.R., as was hoped for and in the writings of Marx & Engels, as well as the nations’ leaders.

An insight into North Korea’s conditions is another view into what man’s sin brings. Once the Korean Revolution ended the new regime modified the *Communist Manifesto*. Just as the *Manifesto* turned away from religion, the Hermit Kingdom followed this point and forced foreign missionaries out of the nation and closing existing religious buildings to their former use. CNN describes that,

> In 1945, North Korea had an estimated 50,000 Catholics, according to the South Korean Catholic Bishops Conference of Korea (CBCK). Around 20,000 are believed to have defected to China before Japan's long occupation of the Korean peninsula was ended at the end of World War II. There was also around 300 foreign and local clergy in the North during the time, most of whom went missing, were executed or died in prison, according to the CBCK.\(^{476}\)

---

North Korea is accused of widespread religious persecution and the United States claims its few state-run churches exist simply to give the appearance of religious freedom.\footnote{K.J. Kwon and Paula Hancocks, “Hopes that Christianity is coming in from the cold in North Korea,” CNN, August 18, 2014, accessed 10/7/2014, http://www.cnn.com/2014/08/18/world/asia/north-korea-catholic-church/index.html.} You, Condorcet, would greatly appreciate North Korea’s stance against religion because, in the 1970s, Pyongyang proudly insisted that the country was "free from religious superstitions," according to South Korea's Unification Ministry. The reclusive regime is officially atheist.\footnote{Ibid.}

However, the Hermit Kingdom developed its own religion, which developed out of the Revolution and it is based upon the Juche philosophy. In Juche, \footnote{“Juche Ideology,” Korean Friendship Association (KFA), accessed 10/7/2014, http://www.korea-dpr.com/juche_ideology.html.}

The philosophical principle that man is the master of everything and decides everything. It is the man-centered world outlook and also a political philosophy to materialize the independence of the popular masses, namely, a philosophy which elucidates the theoretical basis of politics that leads the development of society along the right path.\footnote{Ibid.}
Nevertheless, a religion does exist within North Korea and both secular and faith organizations document that nation’s ruling faith. The God of North Korea is former President Kim Il-sung and that his son, Kim Jong-il is the son of God. This is similar to Christianity in having a Father God and a Son of God to whom people are to worship and this is also surprising, as Christianity had a strong presence in Korea before the revolution. The BBC mentions that,

His worshipping at the palace, which symbolizes Pyongyang's propaganda, can be interpreted as praising and propagating the North's ideology.\(^{480}\)

Prior to the Revolution, it is known that,

A little over a hundred years ago, Pyongyang—which is today the capital of North Korea—was the site of a revival so large that the city came to be known as the “Jerusalem of the East.” The revival occurred in January 1907 during a prayer meeting at what was then the largest church in Korea, the First Church of Pyongyang.\(^{481}\)

This is contrast to what occurs in North Korea today. Today, North Korea remains as an authoritarian regime that is ruled by the Kim dynasty. Further, North Korea is the last communist dictatorship, but


\(^{481}\) Bae and Rev. Eric Foley, \textit{These are the Generations}, (Colorado Springs: W. Publishing, 2012), 113.
With its Juche ideology which institutionalizes the worship of the Kim family, it may actually be the most religious country on earth. Citizens are required to attend regular “self-criticism” meetings which include the singing of songs of praise of Kim Il Sung from a 600 song hymnal, readings from the writings of Kim Il Sung (including Sung’s “Ten Principles,” reminiscent of the Ten Commandments), and emotional professions of faith to the Kim leadership.\footnote{Bae and Rev. Eric Foley, “These are the Generations,” Press Kit, (Colorado Springs: W. Publishing, 2012), accessed 10/8/2014, 5, http://www.seoulusa.org/generations/}

We must understand this dynamic, that a nation claiming to be atheist actually enforces a philosophical system that modifies other ideals and Christianity to form its own belief system with the dictatorial dynasty being the deity. In an article relating to churches buildings being renovated while missionaries are jailed, Reuters reported that, “They have attempted to replace religion with a cultish dynastic ideology.”\footnote{James Pearson, “In North Korea, a church renovated, missionaries jailed,” Reuters, August 12, 2014, accessed 8/12/2014, http://news.yahoo.com/north-korea-church-renovated-missionaries-jailed-211401245.html} Along with this, the Associated Press writes of how, Choe Myong Nam, a North Korean foreign ministry official in charge of U.N. affairs and human rights issues, said at a briefing with reporters that his country has no prison camps and, in practice, "no prison, things like that." But he briefly discussed the "reform through labor" camps. "Both in law and practice, we do have...


“To be a Christian in North Korea is extremely dangerous, and many Christians who are discovered end up in the prison camps or, in some cases, executed,” said Benedict Rogers of Christian Solidarity Worldwide, which campaigns for religious freedom.\footnote{“US’s John Kerry urges North Korea to close ‘evil’ labour camps,” \textit{BBC}, 23 September 2014, accessed 9/23/2014, \url{http://www.bbc.com/news/world-asia-29334168}.}

And similarly, both the “American Secretary of State, John Kerry, has told North Korea to shut down its prison camps - describing them as an evil system” and the United Nations has claimed in its human rights report on North Korea that,


In addition to these brutal crimes, the vast majority of North Korea’s people are starving. On February 18, 2014, CNN reported on the “mass starvation”\footnote{Michael Pearson, Jason Hanna and Madison Park, “‘Abundant evidence’ of crimes against humanity in North Korea, panel says,” \textit{CNN}, February 18, 2014, Accessed 10/23/2014, \url{http://www.cnn.com/2014/02/17/world/asia/north-korea-un-report/index.html}.} that North Korean leaders employ
upon the country’s population. Germany’s international broadcaster, Deutsche Welle, reports on the sale of giant rabbits to the “People's Republic to help fill empty stomachs,” as North Korea’s population suffers from chronic food shortages and where, although hard information is nearly impossible to get, malnutrition and even starvation are believed to be common.488

The organization North Korea Now, documents the starvation of North Korea too, as it reports that,

In the 1990s, widespread famine devastated North Korea, killing over 2.5 million, and perhaps upwards of 3.7 million, North Koreans, more than 10 percent of the population.489

North Korea Now references the writings of Oh and Hassig and Havel, Bondevik, Wiesel with these statements,

The [North Korean] government has acknowledged that 220,000 North Koreans died of starvation between 1995 and 1998, the height of the catastrophe. At the other end of the spectrum, Hwang Jong Yup, the highest-ranking defector from North Korea, has stated that North Korean agricultural officials estimated internally to the government itself that 2.5 million people perished between 1995 and 1997, including 500,000 in 1995, one million in 1996, and another one

million in 1997. Andrew Natsios’s review of several independent studies concludes that there is significant evidence to support Hwang Jong Yup’s estimates. There have been plausible, fact-based estimates as high as 3.5 million deaths, although these estimates are regarded with skepticism by several scholars.\(^ {490} \)

Havel, Bondevik, and Wiesel are sourced by the New York Times with their article, *Turn North Korea Into a Human Rights Issue*,\(^ {491} \) in which they describe that despite North Korea’s nuclear threat, the nation is responsible for some of the most extreme human rights and humanitarian catastrophes in today’s world. This is the prime description of what an intolerant, semi-atheistic, and man-centered worldview produces. North Korea is a military threat to all of its neighbors too, as it is one of the few nations that has the devastating power of nuclear weapons and has often threatened other nations with an attack.\(^ {492} \)

Obviously, I need to inform you about what I mean when I discuss nuclear weapons. Basically, humanity progression in the sciences brought the development of technology that enables people to use the power held within the atoms of certain elements. Lise Meitner was the sole discoverer of nuclear fission, but her information was credited to two other men; Otto Hahn and Fritz Strassmann. Because of Otto Hahn’s dishonesty, he was awarded with the Nobel Prize for the achievement in 1944. From the research and the consequential developments, nuclear technology is used in medicine and is used as a power source. However, nuclear technology is


currently the most destructive technology that man has used alongside his chemical weapons.

The American Nuclear Society offers this information,

Although not a Nobel-winner, Meitner was quite famous enough for U.S. President Truman in 1946 to quip, “So, you’re the little lady who got us into all of this!” Meitner and Hahn had little idea that their basic research would turn out to be useful in making weapons of awesome destructive force, however. When asked to join the Manhattan Project in 1943, she replied, “I will have nothing to do with a bomb!”

Thousands of people are virtually eliminated when nuclear weapons are used and not only are people wiped off the face of the earth, but the environment also suffers substantially. All forms of life are forever is erased when this happens. The United States dropped two atomic bombs upon the cities of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, putting an end to World War II, but “the condition of this world is the after effect of science’s harmful power.” This again displays that,

Cursed is the man who trusts in man, and who makes flesh his arm, and who turns aside his heart from Jehovah. For he shall be like a juniper in the desert, and shall not see when good comes. But he shall live in parched places in the wilderness, in a salt land that is not inhabited.

---

495 Jeremiah 17:5-7 LITV.
Besides this, the Bible relates that, “The heart is deceitful above all things, and it is incurable; who can know it?” and this too, comes from the Jeremiah’s writings. It also verifies that “Knowledge puffs up, but love builds up” when examining what humanity regularly does with increased knowledge, as so often mankind’s pride looks down upon others and even damns one another to death.

So, my mentioning of North Korea and the use of nuclear weapons are just two examples of mankind’s continual drive for “might makes right” and this occurs by both the use of force and even within voting, as the mightier always takes precedent. I state this also, in relation to the minority votes, as the majority opinion within minority takes lead over the other opinions within the minorities. Majority wins.

Also, you mention that if nations were ever ruled by those, who are of limited or malfunctioning intellect, sheer disaster and absolute mayhem would arise with an anarchy that brings forth tremendous tumult. Are we to assume that anarchy would arise if we were ruled by people of limited or malfunctioning intellect? Not only does this point to the discrepancies in your own arrogance, but you are claiming that only those whom you deem to be of an enlightened intellectual status are worthy of leadership. You claim that without the laws that you presume worthy, anarchy and ignorance are the only result. You assume that there is no God, that somehow the laws which govern the universe established themselves, and that this seemingly uncreated reality of existence is all that there is. Your circular reasoning states that, somehow, these laws created themselves, because there was a need for the existence of these laws. Yet, how did these laws know that there was a need for themselves, unless of course, there

---

496 Jeremiah 17:9 LITV.
497 1 Corinthians 8:1 LITV.
is a pre-existing, uncreated, and personal God, who is wise enough to bring forth a universe that intelligently works, like the clock I mentioned at the beginning of our Tenth Epoch debate.

These assumptions express your own unfounded omniscience which makes you at least partially divine and that you are fully aware of everything, but we all know that this is unfounded ludicrous.

**Condorcet:** Though you state the dilemmas of one nation, this does not disrupt the reality that “the perfectibility of man is indefinite.” As I have repeatedly issued throughout this essay, that man is continuing to break free from the chains of superstitions, the hindrances of the past, and the bonds of tyrants. Man is moving into the “perfectibility of the species” to which he is part. Though you begin to document some of the misfortunes that man has brought from science and particularly the nuclear, you miss all of the benefits that science brings forth. We are learning to live longer with more prestigious lives and health has benefitted by medical science. Our advances in technology are easing our ways and profiting man both financially and simplifying our lives. I ask,

*Will not every nation one day arrive at the state of civilization attained by those people who are most enlightened, most free, most exempt from prejudices, as the French, for instance, and the Anglo-Americans?*

I also ask,

---


500 Ibid, 119.
In sine, may it not be expected that the human race will be meliorated by new discoveries in the sciences and the arts, and, as an unavoidable consequence, in the means of individual and general prosperity; by farther progress in the principles of conduct, and in moral practice; and lastly, by the real improvement of our faculties, moral, intellectual and physical, which may be the result either of the improvement of the instruments which increase the power and direct the exercise of those faculties, or of the improvement of our natural organization itself?501

**My view:** To that, I am overwhelmed, as I struggle to grasp how you do not seem to understand the bigotry you hold against those whom you deem to be less intelligent than yourself and less free than you think you are. You do not understand that as you proclaim freedom, you are actually in deep bondage to your own mockery of those whom you see as less than yourself and that you are living in an overwhelming state of pride. You exclaim that the French and the Anglo-Americans are essentially the divine of the earth and that all others need to work their way up to your status, but you do not give the answer on how to become as you claim you are except to deny religious practice and hold bigotry against those who recognize the divine. You are also unaware of how the prediction of your second question has continually proven false for the majority of people. There is a growing return to the Feudal system of the Middle Ages and there are continual reports on the separation between the lack of wealth for the majority and the wealthy 1% in my nation. This divide is slowly wiping away the economic middle class.

---

You write of the “farther progress in the principles of conduct, and in moral practice” yet, this has not actualized in the last two centuries. People are not getting better in their “principles of conduct, and in moral practice.” Crimes continue throughout France and America, as well as the rest of the world. It is reported that the “past 40 years have seen the United States become home to more prisoners than any other country in the world.” It is also noted by a Christian prison ministry that,

As of 2006, it is estimated that at least nine million people are currently imprisoned worldwide. However, it is believed that this number is likely to be much higher, in view of general under-reporting and a lack of data from various countries, especially authoritarian regimes. Since the beginning of the 1990s, the prison population in most countries has increased significantly.

In fact, during the last 15 years, from 2014 and prior, America has experienced multiple crimes by murderous children and research confirms that “Violent Media Increase Child Aggression.” Along with this, the June 10, 2014 issue of U.S. News and World Report communicates that a current federal report of growing, “School Crime and Violence Rise.” Additionally, the Center for Disease Control found that in 2012, “Homicide is the 2nd leading

503 Ibid.
cause of death for young people ages 15 to 24 years old.” They also report that, “During the 2009-2010 school year, 17 homicides of school-age youth ages 5 to 18 years occurred at school.” Further, there have been multiple massacres at U.S. schools since the 1999 tragedy at Columbine High School in Littleton, Colorado where 2 young boys killed 12 students and one of the teachers from their school. Along with these tragedies, another incident has taken place in the midst of our conversation. A student was shooting others at Marysville-Pilchuck High School in Washington State. It is reported that,

A student opened fire at his Washington state high school on Friday, killing one person, wounding at least four others and spreading panic among students who scrambled across fields and parking lots to safety, police and hospital officials said.

So, not only are children becoming more violent, but adults are also becoming more violent too, and this is the exact opposite of what you have predicted within your essay. I give such an immense amount of examples to fully demonstrate that your idea regarding, “the human race will be meliorated . . . farther progress in the principles of conduct, and in moral practice” is blatantly inaccurate and a delusional hope.

---

509 Ibid, 2.
Signifying this, enlightened America’s national history confirms that this young nation has participated in at least 20 military encounters since its inception as a national state. These include, the Revolutionary War (1775-1783), the War of 1812, the Civil War (1861-1865), which was anything but civil, the Spanish - American War (1898), World War I (1917-1919), World War II (1941-1945), the Cold War (1946-1991), the Korean War (1950-1953), the Vietnam War (1961-1973), warfare in Lebanon (1982-1984) along with partnering France and Italy, Grenada (1983), warfare in Nicaragua (1980’s), Libya (1986), Panama (1989-1990), the Persian Gulf War (1990-1991), Somalia (1992-1994), Haiti (1994-1996), war in Bosnia/Croatia/Serbia (1995), war in Afghanistan (2001-present), and war in Iraq (2003-2011). To note, this is just the U.S. in our mere, 240 years with the average warfare occurring every 12 years. Now, we are currently involved in bombing a Muslim group, called ISIS, which is terrorizing people in Syrian and Iraq.

I will also mention several snipers from the American military, a Canadian, and a British one. These men are all trained by their governments to assassinate fellow human beings and they do so with weapons specifically designed to enforce the power of death. American Carlos Hathcock II (1942-1999) “was credited with 93 confirmed kills in Vietnam.” Next, “No other Marine sniper in Vietnam had more confirmed kills of Viet Cong and North Vietnamese Army regulars than” Charles “Chuck” Mawhinney, who “killed 103 of the enemy.” However, it is estimated that “Another 216 kills were listed only as probables because it was too risky to take

515 Ibid.
time to search the bodies for weapons and documents.”

There is John Ethan Place, who “had 32 confirmed kills, from April 11 to April 24” of 2004 in Fallujah, Iraq. Place killed 32 people in 13 days. With these men, there is U.S. Navy SEAL sniper Chris Kyle, who “racked up a record 160 kills” while in Iraq. Canadian Robert Furlong, killed another human being from 2,430 m, the rough equivalent of standing at Toronto’s CN Tower and hitting a target near Bloor Street. It was — and still is — the longest-ever recorded kill by a sniper in combat, surpassing the mark of 2,250 m set by U.S. Marine Gunnery Sgt. Carlos Hathcock during the Vietnam War.

Furlong set his record in 2002. Lastly, there is Craig Harrison, who now, has the furthest recorded kill and this was in 2009. Harrison, a British army sniper helped save his commander and set a new sharpshooting record after killing two Taliban machine gunners in Afghanistan from a mile-and-a-half away.

The above mentioned soldiers are trained to kill those labeled as enemies and they do so with great accuracy. This is done in both the number of enemies that have been killed and with the
extreme distances between the assassin and human target. Along with this, audiences are paying to watch the glorified story of Chris Kyle, the above mentioned U.S. sniper in the film *American Sniper*. Americans are particularly aligned with this film, as Kyle is working to eliminate America’s enemies. However, humans are often blind to the reality that each side claims that the other side is the enemy and this leaves one thinking, who is impartial, to rightly and justly determine who the bad guy is and by what standard(s) is this measured. These sniper accounts are prime examples of humanity’s specialty in death, aside from the mayhem of arson, beatings, bombings, rapes, the overabundant return of human slavery, and the thefts that is continually reported in the daily news. Our news outlets emphasize human disorder. This too, presents a worldview that is not only ungodly, but inhumane. It makes me wonder if you, Condorcet, think that you and the philosophes, who partner with your reasoning, think that you are humanity’s salvation and that if you eliminate monarchies and governments that you despise, in order to bring your form of government, that people will actually become better people, or perfect as you have written in the Tenth Epoch? It appears that you think changing the outward will change the inward, but as Jesus said to the religious Pharisees,

> For you cleanse the outside of the cup and of the dish, but within they are full of robbery and excess. Blind Pharisee! First cleanse the inside of the cup and of the dish, that the outside of them may become clean also. Woe to you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! For you are like whitened graves which outwardly indeed appear beautiful, but within are full of bones of the dead, and of all uncleanness.
So you also indeed outwardly appear righteous to men, but within are full of hypocrisy and lawlessness.\textsuperscript{523}

Besides these horrors, you write of the “farther progress in the principles of. . . moral practice”\textsuperscript{524} yet, you wrote earlier that, along with “metaphysics, logic, and morals of which the science of politics formed a part”\textsuperscript{525} that morals are amendable. This is because of what is regarded as moral is actually “that attained by the generality of thinking men, whose sentiments, when imbibed by the multitude, form what is called the public opinion.”\textsuperscript{526} So in this case, these morals can always display that mankind progresses and this goes along with our supposed improvement. This is because the morals can be changed by public opinion and public opinion regularly changes it is like the tossing waves of the ocean where the only constant is inconsistency. Therefore, as humanity changes the definition of what is moral, mankind never has to abide by what was formerly considered moral. There is a slowly changing goal for behavior and no standard is set. Mankind does not have to abide by a moral law because the morals consistently change. So, along with morality; the rightness or wrongness of conduct, we get ethics, which are the standard, the line, that which ought to be. Ethics are principles of conduct governing a person or group of people. All you have given is an idea of what freedom is, but not what we are to be free from aside from some externals and to what standard of freedom we are to achieve. Similarly, morals and ethics relate to both personal and social values, but if

\textsuperscript{523} Matthew 23:25-29 LITV.
\textsuperscript{525} Ibid, 43.
“values did not exist, then the society of scientists would have to invent them to make the practice of science possible.”

Granted, we can easily understand that we are to have freedom from the absolute control of other people, unless we choose that, and we are free to at least think as we please. Yet, what of freedom from the very thoughts that we know are wrong, though they consistently plague us? I give contemporary examples of these speculations which include, adultery and the continual thoughts concerning fornication or lasciviousness, that is now, called sexual addiction. In fact, XXXChurch.com\(^{528}\) is a Christian, non-profit organization, one of the most widely featured in the media,\(^{529}\) that brings aide to this current issue.\(^{530}\) XXXChurch.com is just one of many organizations in this growing struggle. It along with the Pink Cross Foundation\(^{531}\) work to bring relief to those suffering from these burdens. This may appear as being too much, or irrelevant information, but we need to analyze the current state of affairs if your claims concerning humanity being “meliorated . . . farther progress in the principles of conduct, and in moral practice”\(^{532}\) has actualization.

---

\(^{528}\) “XXXChurch,” *Truth Web Design*, 2015, accessed 2/20/2015, http://xxxchurch.com/. XXXChurch.com is a Christian, non-profit organization. Their “About Us” section reads, “Porn addiction is one of the most difficult addictions to overcome, but XXXChurch is your resource online for pornography addiction help. We prevail over sex and porn addiction through awareness, prevention, and recovery.”  
\(^{531}\) “Pink Cross Foundation,” *A Code Work Designs Website*, 2013, accessed 2/27/2015, https://www.thepinkcross.org/. Pink Cross Foundation is a faith-based IRS approved 501(c)(3) public charity dedicated to reaching out to adult industry workers offering emotional, financial and transitional support. We largely focus on reaching out to the adult film industry offering education and resources to victims of sex trafficking and violence in the workplace. Pink Cross Foundation also reaches out to those struggling with pornography addiction offering education and large doses of truth to recover.  
Besides these, there is idolatry, which even atheists, like you, partake in because in essence, you worship certain things, as a god. However, you claim that there is no God, which supposes your omniscience, even deity. In fact, you blindly worship your self-righteousness and pride, an identity of enlightened intelligence, and philosophy, which actually means, the love of wisdom. Yet,

Philosophy is the systematic examination of basic concepts such as truth, existence, reality, freedom, etc. In fact, the 1828 Webster’s dictionary defines philosophy, as the objects of philosophy are to ascertain facts or truth, and the causes of things or their phenomena; to enlarge our views of God and his work. Similarly, true religion and true philosophy must ultimately arrive at the same principle and this is true reality.

Nevertheless, I have already noted the increase in hatred, but even this year, the white supremacist,

Ku Klux Klan continues its efforts to expand its ranks in Alabama. For the second time in recent months, recruitment fliers have been passed out in a local town and the group's leader says their operation in the state is growing steadily.

This is occurring not only in the clichéd south, but this chapter states that,

---

533 The Truth Project, directed by Dr. Simon Scionka (2007; Palmer Lake, CO: Cold Water Media, 2006), DVD.  
Applications have been coming in from potential new members in other southern states as well as in Northern states like Pennsylvania and New York.\textsuperscript{535}

There is the cited violence in schools and my own nation’s participation in warfare, as humanity continues to disprove what you have written. I mention the furtherance of emulation,\textsuperscript{536} which is ambitious or envious rivalry and the ambition or endeavor to equal or excel others and that, is pride. In fact, a film which is a production of moving pictures accompanied by sound, called Wall Street, emphasized this verbal line, “Greed is good!”\textsuperscript{537} This too, aligns with envy, which perplexes hearts and minds, but what we also need freedom from. C.S. Lewis comments in the Preface to \textit{The Screwtape Letters} that,

\begin{quote}
We must picture Hell as a state where everyone is perpetually concerned about his own dignity and advancement, where everyone has a grievance, and where everyone lives the deadly serious passions of envy, self-importance, and resentment.\textsuperscript{538}
\end{quote}

This is strikingly similar to the attitudes and lifestyles of many people, particularly those, who are glorified in public approval and opinion, but internally, they are self-consumed and wretched within. What of murder, which you devised within your own heart, as you appealed for the war


\textsuperscript{537} \textit{Wall Street}, directed by Oliver Stone (1987; Los Angeles, CA: 20\textsuperscript{th} Century Fox, 2000), DVD.

against nations maintaining monarchies? These are examples of freedom that you have not thought of and to which God wants to give you in his son, Jesus Christ and as scripture relays, “where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty.” You can have that Spirit of the Lord living within you and the Lord’s Spirit working to bring you the internal freedom that is of greater value than the external freedom. I ask you, who is free, the man free from a prison cell, but cannot escape his insecurities and the carnal, earthly thoughts of his mind or the person, who is locked in a prison cell, but whose mind is not hindered by any barrier or bondage and is able to think and imagine anything? I again, reference Plato’s Allegory of the Cave to emphasize this. The story’s central character needed freedom in mind and thought to have freedom in external life. One citation of this relates to people with addictions, but who are in locations where the addiction cannot be fulfilled. A prime example of this, relates to your own life. Your friends locked you into their house, removing your physical freedom so, that you would be kept safe, but while you were imprisoned externally, you wrote this essay, your masterwork. However, you escaped from the house and were later captured by those who thought you were of nobility and imprisoned you in a cell. From this, your life was lost and you have no more freedom. Which situation gave you more freedom?

**Condorcet:** Despite the tragedies that you mention, you do not seem to understand the furtherance of current and future benefit. I cite the

---


The cultivation of the sugar cane, which is now establishing itself in Africa, will put an end to the shameful robbery by which, for two centuries, that country has been depopulated and depraved.\textsuperscript{541}

I also mention that,

Already, in Great Britain, some friends of humanity have set the example; and if its Machiavelian government, forced to respect public reason, has not dared to oppose this measure, what may we not expect from the same spirit, when, after the reform of an object and venal constitution, it shall become worthy of a humane and generous people? Will not France be eager to imitate enterprises which the philanthropy and the true interest of Europe will equally have dictated?

Then will the inhabitants of the European quarter of the world, satisfied with an unrestricted commerce, too enlightened as to their own rights to sport with the rights of others, respect that independence which they have hitherto violated with such audacity. Then will their establishments, instead of being filled by the creatures of power, who, availing themselves of a place or a privilege, hasten, by rapine and persidy, to amass wealth, in order to purchase, on their return, honours and titles, be peopled with industrious men, seeking in those happy climates that ease and comfort which in their native country eluded their pursuit. There will they be retained by liberty, ambition having lost its allurements; and those

settlements of robbers will then become colonies of citizens, by whom will be planted in Africa and Asia the principles and example of the freedom, reason, and illumination of Europe.\footnote{542 Marie-Jean-Antoine-Nicolas Caritat, Marquis de Condorcet, “Marie-Jean-Antoine-Nicolas Caritat, Marquis de Condorcet, \textit{Outlines of an historical view of the progress of the human mind [1795]},” \textit{The Online Library of Liberty}, (2011) : 121, http://oll.libertyfund.org/title/1669.}

This is the enlightened and highlighted glory that comes forth from mankind’s liberty and use of his reason. This is despite the times when,

There exists then a necessary cause of inequality, of dependence, and even of penury, which menaces without ceasing the most numerous and active class of our societies.\footnote{543 Ibid, 124.}

Nonetheless, even these situations regarding inequality may be destroyed over the progress of time and the furtherance of mankind’s enlightenment and reasoning.

\textbf{My view:} I agree with you concerning the elimination of slavery in Africa and from the European colonies. This is a tragedy within humanity and as I have already noted earlier in our conversation regarding your Third Epoch. It still exists and in an even greater extent than ever before. I also noted from my own perspective that I see that it is spoken against in the New Testament with Paul’s letter to Philemon. Here again, I quote Paul in his words regarding Philemon’s escaped slave. Onesimus ran away from his master Philemon and had stayed with Paul, but Paul mentored Onesimus in Christ and persuaded him to return to his master with this epistle which sought to enlighten Philemon on the love that God requires. It states,
For perhaps for this he was separated for an hour, that you might receive him eternally; no longer as a slave, but beyond a slave, a beloved brother, especially to me, and how much more to you, both in the flesh and in the Lord. Then if you have me as a partner, receive him as me. And if he wronged you in anything, or owes, reckon this to me.  

Still, the sugar trade did not put an end to the abuse of the African people. Instead, the sugar trade made European men wealthy, aided in the first steps to the Industrial Revolution which some claim as the reason for climate change,\textsuperscript{545} and for the Africans, it made them international slaves. The Age of Exploration and the development of the sugar trade with its triangle of commerce, also brought about the dividing of Africa into nations with borders created by European men that had little to no knowledge of the land or the people. From this, the Africans were established into national communities that forced non-communing tribes into situations that often led to conflict and war. Batstone writes of how,

The Acholi people have long felt abused by the more prosperous tribes in the south and west of Uganda. It’s a legacy that goes back to nineteenth-century British colonial social policies that unevenly disadvantaged northern tribes.  

\textsuperscript{544} Philemon 1:15-18 LITV.  
Not only did this take place in Uganda, but across the African continent. The genocide in Rwanda which killed hundreds of thousands of people is attributed to the colonizing Belgians. The Belgians promoted the minority Tutsi Africans that resembled the Europeans, to places of authority over the majority Hutu Africans, but when an aircraft carrying the current Hutu ruler was shot down from the sky and all of the occupants were killed, retaliation occurred that incited not only warfare, but a genocide that killed hundreds of thousands of people.\textsuperscript{547}

There are also the troubles which the enlightened Europeans created in Asia. European reasoning divided the peoples of India into two nations and continual conflict is the norm because of this. India was separated into the nations of India and Pakistan and the nation of Kashmir often suffers from this forced divide which the British and the forces of various groups like, the Sikhs, Punjabis and Afghans created. The north of India has a Muslim majority over the Hindu, Sikh, and Jain peoples. Above and east of this, Kashmir sits and is basically a nation divided both physically and ideologically by Hindu and Muslim peoples to which confrontation is the norm. To the west, both India on the south and Pakistan on the north, rest with conflicts similar to those in Kashmir.\textsuperscript{548} Kashmir has been a melting pot of ideas and races. It received every new creed with discrimination and enriched it with its own contribution, without throwing away its earlier accretions.\textsuperscript{549} Another stress to these altercations is that both India and Pakistan have nuclear weapons, which as mentioned before, are capable of horrific destruction to earth’s people and the planet. These partitions, which were created by the British, have brought


intermittent strife concerning the divide and the four Indo-Pakistani wars resulted.\textsuperscript{550} Still, a form of peace holds among these people, but tempers are easily flared.

Another war in Asia came from humanity’s changing ideals and this war resulted from France’s colonizing. Vietnam suffered from 1946 to 1954 in the First Indochina War which engaged battle between the French and loyal Vietnamese against the independence seeking communist forces of the north. The war raged across the entire nation and even extended into France’s other provinces of Cambodia and Laos. It is noted that,

The conquest of Vietnam by France began in 1858 and was completed by 1884. It became part of French Indochina in 1887. Vietnam declared independence after World War II, but France continued to rule until its 1954 defeat by communist forces under Ho Chi Minh.\textsuperscript{551}

Here is another example of the enlightened French bringing their ideals to those whom they deemed deficient to their arrogance and self-righteousness and because of this, the nations of Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos endured not only colonization, but the tragedies of war. Imagine what could have occurred, the lives saved, and the unthreatened resources and monies, if France did not act in an imposing manner toward those they deemed less than themselves. This highlights the hubris in some of your own words,

Then will the inhabitants of the European quarter of the world, satisfied with an unrestricted commerce, too enlightened as to their own rights to sport with the

---


rights of others, respect that independence which they have hitherto violated with such audacity. Then will their establishments, instead of being filled by the creatures of power, who, availing themselves of a place or a privilege, hasten, by rapine and persidy, to amass wealth, in order to purchase, on their return, honours and titles, be peopled with industrious men, seeking in those happy climates that ease and comfort which in their native country eluded their pursuit.\textsuperscript{552}

And,

There exists then a necessary cause of inequality, of dependence, and even of penury, which menaces without ceasing the most numerous and active class of our societies.\textsuperscript{553}

Further, the Americans also participated within a war with the former Soviet Union and China that split Korea into two nations and just after the First Indochina War, they engaged in another war in Vietnam that lasted 20 years. This war involved numerous nations, cost multimillions of dollars, destroyed vegetation through the use of Agent Orange, and wiped out the lives of hundreds of thousands people. Other wars have begun and continued across the globe since your death Condorcet and this process has not relented. In essence, rebellion against God and among men, which is war, is mankind’s destiny. Man has increased in technical knowledge, but a great


\textsuperscript{553} Ibid, 124.
portion of this knowledge he uses in creating weapons for use against one another. As Hobbes wrote within his *Leviathan*,

There is always warre of every one against every one hereby it is manifest, that during the time men live without a common Power to keep them all in awe, they are in that condition which is called Warre; and such a warre, as is of every man, against every man. For warre, consisteth not in Battell onely, or the act of fighting; but in a tract of time, wherein the Will to contend by Battell is sufficiently known: and therefore the notion of time, is to be considered in the nature of Warre; as it is in the nature of Weather. For as the nature of foule weather, lyeth not in a showre or two of rain; but in an inclination thereto of many dayes together: So the nature of War, consisteth not in actuall fighting; but in the known disposition thereto, during all the time there is no assurance to the contrary.\(^{554}\)

Therefore, mankind’s sole initiative is might makes right, whether this be by majority rule, like in voting or judicial decision, through enforced laws from man-made rights, and by conflict. Our very law and prison system verifies the inner warfare within humanity. Though not all people are physically imprisoned, we all have the inner captivity and turmoil that induces us with our corrupted reason to think in the ways that we do and enact our distorted ideas of authority to subdue one another. As I mentioned earlier, the United Nations, the organization aimed for world

peace, will use force to subject those who oppose them and their standards. Discerning through this mayhem, it becomes more than obvious that love for one another is not man’s destiny, it is power through warlike means and humanity’s entire political system displays this. This discernment demonstrates the stark difference between our worldviews, though we do have some parallels in our thinking, the outcomes are opposed. Your understanding is based upon your ideas of human reason, while mine comes from not only my reason, but by divine revelation. The evidence of these two is confirmed through history. I ask you, what happens if a person or people choose not to submit to your ideas and your laws? You force them to submit, whether this is by judicial authority, which may lead to imprisonment or by violence, where lives are killed because they would not agree to your premises. Man-made law is the dictatorial authority to which all are forced to submit and this reveals, as I have said, that mankind’s destiny is not love for one another, it is power through war.

There is one last area to cover from your essay, but first I want to join you in agreeing with your some of your words from the Tenth Epoch. You write,

> We might shew how much this equality of instruction, joined to the national equality we have supposed to take place, would accelerate those sciences, the advancement of which depends upon observations repeated in a greater number of instances, and extending over a larger portion of territory; how much benefit would be derived therefrom to mineralogy, botany, zoology, and the doctrine of meteors; in short, how infinite the difference between the feeble means hitherto enjoyed by these sciences, and which yet have led to useful and important truths,
and the magnitude of those which man would then have it in his power to employ.\textsuperscript{555}

There is a greater equality amongst people when not only are the sciences made more available for people to study and work in, but also for the discoveries and products of science made more freely available to people. Current examples relate to the cures for polio and the Ebola viruses. As people are enabled with education and able to more easily study and work in sciences, like mineralogy, botany, zoology and medicine, a greater harmony and a surer possibility for people living longer, healthier lives may come about. I cite more of your words to verify not only what might come about, but what actually has in many portions of the earth with,

This improvement in industry and happiness, where the wants and faculties of men will continually become better proportioned, each successive generation possess more various stores, and of consequence in each generation the number of individuals be greatly increased.\textsuperscript{556}

World population has increased and so has the access to industrial benefits.

\textbf{Condorcet:} I am glad that your reason has enabled you to see and understand what mankind is capable of and how we are on our way to perpetual success. We continue to


\textsuperscript{556} Ibid, 128.
shew how much this equality of instruction. . . would accelerate those sciences, the advancement of which depends upon observations repeated in a greater number of instances, and extending over a larger portion of territory; how much benefit would be derived.\textsuperscript{557}

All of these are because of mankind’s use of reason and I will cite my own words regarding this and the continuation of this progression. I write that,

If instruction become more equal, industry thence acquires greater equality, and from industry the effect is communicated to fortunes; and equality of fortunes necessarily contributes to that of instruction, while equality of nations, like that established between individuals, have also a mutual operation upon each other.\textsuperscript{558}

So that,

The advantages that must result from the state of improvement, of which I have proved we may almost entertain the certain hope, can have no limit but the absolute perfection of the human species, since, in proportion as different kinds of equality shall be established as to the various means of providing for our wants, as to a more universal instruction, and a more entire liberty, the more real will be


\textsuperscript{558} Ibid, 125.
this equality, and the nearer will it approach towards embracing every thing truly important to the happiness of mankind.\textsuperscript{559}

This is what is coming about, as mankind progresses forward and continually demonstrates the wonder and perfection of his reason. We are on our way to becoming transcendent as opposed to all that the superstitious priests speak of in relation to their foolish ideas of the divine. We are becoming the personification deity.

\textbf{My view:} Here, we truly see the differences in our world views. On the one hand, we both agree upon man using his reason. On the other hand, we disagree on where this leads and I argue that divine revelation is required to fully understand who man is and the destinies available to him.

You elaborate on “the absolute perfection of the human species,”\textsuperscript{560} whereas I speak of the exact opposite of this. I cite that only Elohim; the triune God of the Bible is perfect and only He can conform us to the image of His son, Jesus. Humanity has and continues to display imperfection, which results from the sin within mankind. Form this, only deficiency and flaw come forth and as we look over humanity’s history, we would be blind to ignore the results of man’s sin. As Jesus stated, “But the things that proceed out of the mouth come from the heart, and those defile the man”\textsuperscript{561} and this applies to not only what comes out of man’s mouth, but also what comes forth from the workings of his life. Looking over the history of the world’s warfare, by the militaries, by politics, by attitudes that humans often have toward one another and you are able to see that love is not the presiding thought or behavior among us.


\textsuperscript{560} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{561} Matthew 15:18 NASB.
Nevertheless, I reference one of your own questions to demonstrate the reality of sin within humanity and what it has and continues to bring forth. You ask, “Is not a mistaken interest the most frequent cause of actions contrary to the general welfare?”\textsuperscript{562} To this, I fully agree, as love is not the dominant interest of humanity. You also ask,

In manner as the mathematical and physical sciences tend to improve the arts that are employed for our most simple wants, so is it not equally in the necessary order of nature that the moral and political sciences should exercise a similar influence upon the motives that direct our sentiments and our actions?\textsuperscript{563}

Again, when we look upon history and what lies before us, we are continually bombarded with fighting, with warfare, with most everything that is opposed to people laying aside their own wants and desires in effort to love one another. Globally and even within my own nation morals and the behaviors amongst politicians have run astray from that which was once called civil. Each election year, the continual claims of the politicians are aroused and the same issues are repeated, but not much change takes effect and the casual observer is doomed to witness the mayhem in the political games. Americans are often forced to choose between the lesser of two evils concerning candidates.

Further, you state these words,


\textsuperscript{563} Ibid, 131.
Nations will know, that they cannot become conquerors without losing their freedom; that perpetual confederations are the only means of maintaining their independance; that their object should be security, and not power. By degrees commercial prejudices will die away; a false mercantile interest will lose the terrible power of imbuing the earth with blood, and of ruining nations under the idea of enriching them. As the people of different countries will at last be drawn into closer intimacy, by the principles of politics and morality, as each, for its own advantage, will invite foreigners to an equal participation of the benefits which it may have derived either from nature or its own industry, all the causes which produce, envenom, and perpetuate national animosities, will one by one disappear, and will no more furnish to warlike insanity either fuel or pretext.\textsuperscript{564}

Yet, I wonder how, where, or when nations or more so, people, can have security without power. Obviously, your hope that “commercial prejudices will die away”\textsuperscript{565} cannot actualize, as this is a prime factor for profits to continually flow and businesses to persist.

However, the idea that, the causes which produce, envenom, and perpetuate national animosities, will one by one disappear, and will no more furnish to warlike insanity either fuel or pretext,\textsuperscript{566}

\textsuperscript{565} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{566} Ibid.
has not come into effect, but by confederations regarding war and security. Examples of these are the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, the South Atlantic Peace and Cooperation Zone, the former Southeast Asia Treaty Organization and the former Central Treaty Organization, and the extinct Warsaw Pact. Granted, there are organizations that work to promote peace and well being amongst humanity like, Goodwill, the Salvation Army, and 2nd Harvest which was America’s Second Harvest and is now, part of Feeding America were all founded by Christians. The Peace Corps., which sadly had revelations concerning abuse and rapes, the United Way, Habitat for Humanity, and countless others exist. Yet again, Jesus’ words aptly apply, “But the things that proceed out of the mouth come from the heart, and those defile the man” and it is not just the words out of mankind’s mouth, it is the attitudes and the actions that proceed forth from what the prophet Jeremiah wrote about humanity’s heart, “The heart is more deceitful than all else, and is desperately sick; who can understand it?”

Additionally, you write that,

All the causes which contribute to the improvement of the human species, all the means we have enumerated that insure its progress, must, from their very nature; exercise an influence always active, and acquire an extent for ever increasing. The proofs of this have been exhibited, and from their development in the work itself

---

570 Matthew 15:18 NASB.
571 Jeremiah 17:9 NASB.
they will derive additional force: accordingly we may already conclude, that the
perfectibility of man is indefinite. Meanwhile we have hitherto considered him as
possessing only the same natural faculties, as endowed with the same
organization. How much greater would be the certainty, how much wider the
compass of our hopes, could we prove that these natural faculties themselves, that
this very organization, are also susceptible of melioration? . . . The organic
perfectibility or deterioration of the classes of the vegetable, or species of the
animal kingdom, may be regarded as one of the general laws of nature. This law
extends itself to the human race; and it cannot be doubted that the progress of the
sanative art, that the use of more wholesome food and more comfortable
habitations.\textsuperscript{572}

There is much to say concerning your words, but first I will address the current problem
regarding “the use of more wholesome food.”\textsuperscript{573} At this time, the world is experiencing distress
with what is being called wholesome food. Currently, we are besieged with genetically modified
foods, which are fruits and vegetables that have endured not only the trials of climate and
weather, but also undergo manipulation in laboratories. This is with the hope to increase not only
the production of the plants, but also the flavor, nutrition, and prevent destruction from all sorts
of pests. The anguish relates to the fact that,

\textsuperscript{572} Marie-Jean-Antoine-Nicolas Caritat, Marquis de Condorcet, “Marie-Jean-Antoine-Nicolas Caritat, Marquis de
Condorcet, \textit{Outlines of an historical view of the progress of the human mind [1795]},” \textit{The Online Library of Liberty},

\textsuperscript{573} Ibid.
Rising levels of food allergies in the United States may be linked to the increase of genetically modified (GM) foods. Data on allergic reactions is difficult to collect as individuals must be exposed to a substance, often more than once, in order to determine if an allergy exists. But there is increasing evidence that at least one GM crop, soy, is linked to the soaring number of allergic reactions to products containing GM soy. The lack of mandatory labeling for GM foods in the United States leaves millions of Americans unaware of the risks within their diet."

Moreover, it must be recognized that allergies can debilitate those who suffer from them. Likewise, if a sufferer is debilitated by the allergy(s), little to no physical exercise will ensue, which in turn, will lead to increased health risks such as these consequences,

High blood pressure, high cholesterol, and type 2 diabetes mellitus, asthma, hepatic steatosis, sleep apnea, higher risk for other debilitating chronic conditions such as stroke; breast, colon, and kidney cancers; musculoskeletal disorders; and gall bladder disease.

---


The world’s people are not only suffering from the distresses of military wars, but also from the attitudes and actions of one another. Your idea that, “commercial prejudices will die away” seemingly works, but there is the recognition that your question “Is not a mistaken interest the most frequent cause of actions contrary to the general welfare?” holds true. The mistaken interests of trying to get more out of what God has created from vegetation and then cursed because of man’s sin, continues with man’s sinful behavior and this effects humanity in numerous ways.

Still, you continue to ignore the events of history and the wretchedness within your own heart and mind, but instead, you write,

> It is manifest that the improvement of the practice of medicine, become more efficacious in consequence of the progress of reason and the social order, must in the end put a period to transmissible or contagious disorders, as well to those general maladies resulting from climate, aliments, and the nature of certain occupations. Nor would it be difficult to prove that this hope might be extended to almost every other malady, of which it is probable we shall hereafter discover the most remote causes. Would it even be absurd to suppose this quality of melioration in the human species as susceptible of an indefinite advancement; to suppose that a period must one day arrive when death will be nothing more than the effect either of extraordinary accidents, or of the slow and gradual decay of

---
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the vital powers; and that the duration of the middle space, of the interval between
the birth of man and this decay, will itself have no assignable limit? Certainly
man will not become immortal; but may not the distance between the moment in
which he draws his first breath, and the common term when, in the course of
nature, without malady or accident, he finds it impossible any longer to exist, be
necessarily protracted?\textsuperscript{581}

Essentially, this concludes your entire sentiment, “that the perfectibility of man is indefinite”\textsuperscript{582} and your essay is the Bible for humanism, where man is virtually divine. Your ideology is that
man is the sum of all things and that most everything exists for him. He is the summit,
everything else is below him, and only by the active use of his reason will he reach the fullness
of the glories, which he has imagined within his mind.

However, I begin my final explanation which thoroughly opposes your premise, as man
has always been and will always be imperfect. I present this in reflecting on much of what has
occurred since your death in 1794. I have agreed with you on the tragedy relating to human
slavery and about slavery’s legal removal, but as I have previously noted, slavery not only
reappeared in France during Napoleon’s rule, but since then, it has returned in a most extreme
manner where presently there are more slaves than there ever has been in human history.\textsuperscript{583}
Batstone notes that his earlier notation of twenty-seven million slaves existing in our world\textsuperscript{584} is

\textsuperscript{581} Marie-Jean-Antoine-Nicolas Caritat, Marquis de Condorcet, “Marie-Jean-Antoine-Nicolas Caritat, Marquis de
Condorcet, \textit{Outlines of an historical view of the progress of the human mind [1795]},” \textit{The Online Library of Liberty},
\textsuperscript{582} Ibid, 135.
\textsuperscript{583} David Batstone, \textit{Not for Sale: The Return of the Global Slave Trade-and How We Can Fight It} Revised and
\textsuperscript{584} Ibid.
now, updated to “more than 30 million.” This is one of the world’s top crimes. Further, your promotion of war against monarchies has occurred on most of the planet with most of the world choosing another type of government, but some nations choose to retain them. In fact, Europe’s Liechtenstein not only maintains its monarchy, but “Liechtenstein actually voted to increase the powers” of its monarch. This prince can “veto any legislation and dissolve the parliament at will, among other powers” despite, not having full sovereignty within Liechtenstein. A 2013 Washington Post article notes there are eleven nations with sovereign monarchies and these include the Vatican. There are also five nations that give their monarchs some political power and these include Bhutan, Monaco, Thailand, Tonga, and the already mentioned Liechtenstein.

I comment again on how enlightened Europe has worked to keep Africa a dark continent and this is not only by its efforts to create nations without knowing the peoples or their cultural histories, but in also treating the peoples as lower creatures than the seemingly reasoned Europeans. One example relates to the current Ebola crisis. Typically, if such an outbreak occurred within Europe or the United States, action would be quick and responsive because of the advancement in modern medicine and the claimed, enlightenment of the European and American peoples. Yet, an AFP video article documents that,
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The United Nations' Ebola response coordinator on Wednesday said that slow progress is being made in tackling the virus in West Africa, while calling for people not to stigmatize those from countries affected by the disease.\textsuperscript{589}

This “slow”\textsuperscript{590} progress is not something new to Africans. Africa has quietly suffered from the blindness and abuse of 1\textsuperscript{st} world nations, as well as the horror coming from its own troubles with the Lord’s Resistance Army. The Lord’s Resistance Army is a militia that has used guerrilla tactics since “its inception in 1986.” Along with their leader, Joseph Kony, the Associated Press notes that,

At the peak of its powers the Lord's Resistance Army was notorious for taking girls as sex slaves and boys as fighters, one of the reasons the group attracted global attention.\textsuperscript{591}

However, this tragedy has occurred for decades and little attention is given and as author David Batstone comments,

Most westerners know next to nothing about it, and our governments do little to stop it. Frankly, the region holds no strategic geopolitical interest for us. We treat it as just another story of Africans killing Africans in endless guerrilla warfare—a

\textsuperscript{590}Ibid.
Darfur in slow motion. Perhaps if the rebels were stealing oil rather than children, the world would pay more attention.\textsuperscript{592}

This comes from his 2007 book, while the AP article is from 2014. In these seven years, countless children have been abducted, the boys becoming soldiers and the girls turned into sex slaves. There are the killings of innumerable parents by the boys, as “when the LRA abducts children, they frequently force the kids to kill their own parents.”\textsuperscript{593} The nightmare continues and virtually, few acknowledge it or do anything about it. Batstone’s comment, “Perhaps if the rebels were stealing oil rather than children, the world would pay more attention”\textsuperscript{594} sadly holds true and Africa is left a dark continent outside of its monetary benefits.

I also refer back to the Industrial Revolution; the fruit of the Enlightenment. Of course, people want products for lower prices and cherish having quality goods that are either the same as those which the wealthy have or at least having goods that are similar to those of the wealthy, but factual acknowledgment and the passing changes in man’s philosophies brought another counterpoint and this was the Arts & Crafts Movement. This Movement came from those, who rebelled against the tragedies of the Industrial Revolution. Upton Sinclair wrote in a section of his book, \textit{The Jungle}, about those accidentally killed in slaughterhouses. These men fell into the vats and were added to the outgoing meat yet, customers were left ignorant of what they were buying to eat.\textsuperscript{595} Gustav Stickley wrote in \textit{The Craftsman} magazine on \textit{The Use and Abuse of Machinery}. He stated, 

In the revolt against the utter lack of vitality or of artistic quality in the great mass of machine-made products that owe their existence solely to the artificial demand created by commercialism, enthusiasts for the revival of the handicrafts have not only allowed themselves to be carried to an extreme in the opposite direction, but have fallen into the selfsame sin against true craftsmanship by encouraging the making of things for which there is no manner of need, and which, not being the outgrowth of a fundamental necessity, have in them no element of living art.\textsuperscript{596}

They worked to bring quality products to those, who were ripped off by the industry’s inferior products and against the mistreatment and employee deaths that the industry brought. Though, as Stickley wrote, the utopian idea of bringing art back into the craftsman world and to draw customers away from the poor quality of products from the Industrial Revolution failed and people continue to purchase products that have no art or individuality to them, much less being cheaply made. He further wrote in September of 1915, that,

I believe that this early association with Nature, this learning the art of living, is bound to develop in young people sincerity and a profound recognition of the fact that only absolute truth is worth taking into consideration in life.\textsuperscript{597}

Yet, to humanity’s dismay, WWI had begun, the romanticism regarding nature passed, and the reality of “only absolute truth is worth taking into consideration in life” seems to have faded for many too, when looking at what is truly necessary for human life and the working of love.

Nonetheless, these are just three of the previously mentioned subjects that we have covered. I press on with other areas regarding racism, egoism, and condescension. Throughout your essay, you have continually affirmed both France and America as being the standard of Enlightenment and reasoned thinking, the measure to which others are judged and are called to reach. However, Charles Taylor describes this problem through the chapter, *The Politics of Recognition* in his book *Multiculturalism*. He writes,

> The standards we have, however, are those of North Atlantic civilization. And so the judgments implicitly and unconsciously will cram the others into our categories. For instance, we will think of their “artists” as creating “works,” which we then can include in our canon. By implicitly invoking our standards to judge all civilizations and cultures, the politics of difference can end up making everyone the same.

> In this form, the demand for equal recognition is unacceptable. But the story doesn’t end there. The enemies of multiculturalism in the American academy have perceived this weakness, and have used this as an excuse to turn their backs on the problem. But this won’t do. A response like that attributed to Bellow which I quoted above, to the effect that we will be glad to read the Zulu Tolstoy when he comes along, shows the depths of ethnocentricity. First, there is the implicit assumption that excellence has to take the forms familiar to us: the

---

Zulus should produce a *Tolstoy*. Second, we are assuming that their contribution is yet to be made (*when* the Zulus produce Tolstoy. . .). These two assumptions obviously go hand in hand. If they have to produce our kind of excellence, then obviously their only hope lies in the future. Roger Kimball puts it more crudely: “The multiculturalists notwithstanding, the choice facing us today is not between a ‘repressive’ Western culture and a multicultural paradise, but between culture and barbarism.”

This ideology, which professor Taylor and author Kimball speak against, displays the arrogance of Western culture, the culture that exclaims itself as humanity’s perfection and deems others as deficient. Specifically, Taylor argues for a greater understanding and manifestation of multiculturalism which considers whether the institutions of liberal democratic government make room—or should make room—for recognizing the worth of distinctive cultural traditions. Yet, even this dialogue presents an air of supremacy in that these scholars act as judges in proclaiming who they discern correct in manifesting the proper way in which not only governmental and educational institutions should work, but also how humanity should peacefully and correctly operate for all to benefit. This returns to my earlier arguments regarding the supposed authority that men have claimed and which has worked out in the ideas on not only which things are our rights, but also the laws that have been put into effect to uphold these rights. Taylor notes that, “

---

[Jürgen] Habermas argues that equal protection under the law is not enough to constitute a constitutional democracy. We must not only be equal under the law, we must also be able to understand ourselves as the authors of the laws that bind us. “One we take this internal connection between democracy and the constitutional state seriously,” Habermas writes, “it becomes clear that the system of rights is blind neither to unequal social conditions nor to cultural differences.” 600

Yet, this does not cover all of the problems and Taylor continues with,

What count as equal rights for women or for ethnic and cultural minorities cannot even be understood adequately until members of these groups “articulate and justify in public discussion what is relevant to equal or unequal treatment in typical cases.” 601

However, this indicates some of the noted problem within the whole of humanity. In our post-enlightened age, we are still dealing with what is “relevant to equal or unequal treatment in typical cases.” 602 People are still living with unequal treatment amongst one another and this perpetuates our inability to love one another, as not only Jesus and Paul spoke of, but the very history of humanity proclaims this. I mention a tragic incident that reveals the often hidden reality within man. In 1991, an African-American was pulled over by Los Angeles police and

601 Ibid.
602 Ibid.
then the “Four police officers, all of them white, struck King more than 50 times with their wood batons and shocked him with an electric stun gun.”603 In 1992, the officers were acquitted and this led to a week of deadly race riots in the metropolis. These riots even included a similar incident in which a white truck driver, named Reginald Denny, was beaten by at least four African American males. In response to the ongoing tragedies that involved not only King, Denny, and nearly all of Los Angeles, CNN reports that,

On the third day of rioting, King emerged from seclusion to make a plea that echoes to this day: “People, I just want to say, can we all get along?” he said. “Can we get along?”604

Yet, this man’s cry still echoes across the world, as people continually treat one another unequally, unfairly. Man’s first thought is not to love his neighbor, for if it was the first thought within humanity, the continual crimes, wars, and violence, which are essentially the foundation for news, would not occur in their incessant rate and power. Here, we have a continuation of what Charles Taylor wrote, “The enemies of multiculturalism in the American academy have perceived this weakness, and have used this as an excuse to turn their backs on the problem.”605 It also coordinates with Habermas’ words,

604 Ibid.
Equal protection under the law is not enough to constitute a constitutional democracy. We must not only be equal under the law, we must also be able to understand ourselves as the authors of the laws that bind us.  

Still, the 1992 race riots of Los Angeles contradict both America’s and Habermas’ ideal of “equal protection under the law.” The riots expressed the rightful outrage that America’s blacks suffer, but America’s blacks are not the only suffering people. Cases abound for people suffering at the hands of others, and in similar ways to those enduring the misery of human trafficking and slavery. A famous incident occurred in Cleveland, Ohio on May 7, 2013. Three young women were freed from forced imprisonment within the home of a local community. The women were each kidnapped, repeatedly “raped, starved, beaten and kept in chains” by what appeared to be an average man, yet the façade was that Ariel Castro, a local school bus driver, had abducted these women in 2002, 2003, and 2004. However, these women were rescued by neighbors Charles Ramsey, Angelo Cordero, and the police. This incident is not unfamiliar to America nor, the rest of the world, as the F.B.I. has an entire unit dedicated to the crime of kidnapping and this was begun “in response to the Lindbergh kidnapping case and other high profile kidnappings.”

---

607 Ibid.
610 Ibid.
Shocking as it may seem, this is nothing new to humanity and the media in various forms has regularly presented works which proclaims the failures of and within humanity. I mention two more situations that display the normal standard for our cultural and racial problems. The first situation concerns a young African American that was shot to death by a security guard. This incident brought great attention and fury because the security guard was quickly presumed to be Caucasian and the immediate presumption was that this was another occasion of whites dominating blacks. Despite the security guard being of Hispanic origin, this was still considered, a race related crime.  

The second involves a confrontation involving an African American youth, who was killed by a Caucasian police officer. The jury’s indictment for the case reached a verdict of not finding fault with the officer, but emotions surrounding the case reached an all time high with protests and riots, lasting three days. However, it is foolish to think that only white police officers are involved in what appear as racially charged incidents. To think otherwise, is racist, intolerant, and blinds the minds of public. Examples are the killings of a white, unarmed teen by a black policeman in Alabama and the killing of an unarmed white 20-year-old by a “non-white” policeman in Salt Lake City, Utah. The officer was not indicted and thankfully, no riots ensued with more deaths and destruction.

---

These are only a few of the continual and multiple examples of humanity proving itself as not only being far from perfect, but nowhere near perfection. The one area that humanity has continually progressed is death. The populations of the world have striven from the very beginnings in the development of killing; killing not only vegetation and animals for food, but also in killing one another. Previously, I elaborated not only America’s affinity for wars, but also the devastation of nuclear weaponry. However, not only are nuclear and chemical weapons a passé subject, but currently, humanity is developing within the militaries, cloaking technology to prevent enemies from seeing each other, bullets that can shift direction when a sniper happens to have bad aim so the target is still killed, and laser weapons capable of destroying targets. You died Condorcet and we are not sure as to how. You may have been killed by your political enemies, by common people, who thought you were of nobility and that you needed to be killed with the rest of the bourgeoisie, or you killed yourself. It is a mystery as to how you died. Nevertheless, your death is the epitome in displaying that man is not perfect, is not near perfection, and will never come to a living perfection on his own apart from perfecting his methods of death and destruction. I mentioned how the 20th century is known as humanity’s bloodiest century and that the 21st is well on its way to becoming even bloodier. I agree that mankind can and has done some wonderful things, but these wonderful things are overshadowed by the reality, the dying reality in how man is continually developing and perfecting his methods in death and destruction. Humanity is not perfecting itself in loving one another. Love is not the first thought that goes through the minds of people when they think about humanity and

humanity’s history. I do agree that there have been people, particularly from religious or faith-based organizations, that do live and work to change this tragic reality.

In contrast, nearly all people can think on the endless tragedies, crimes, and the horrors of war that have not stopped besieging us. We continue with these actions and behaviors and thus, we individually and equally fulfill these scriptures,

There is a way that seems right to a man; but the end of it is the ways of death, 620
And Jehovah saw that the evil of man was great on the earth, and every imagination of the thought of his heart was only evil all the day long, 621 along with, And the earth was corrupt before God, and he earth was filled with violence. 622

Obviously, centuries have passed since these scriptures were written and extraordinary changes have developed in what humanity brings forth and invents, but the reality is, the very heart and life of man has not changed at all. Mankind truly fulfills this scripture, “the heart is deceitful above all things, and it is incurable; who can know it?” 623 You, Condorcet began your essay describing the “art of fabricating arms”, 624 and “the necessary consequence was a violent enmity, and a desire of vengeance not to be extinguished, against the enemies.” 625 Do we not see that just these two initial instances reference a problem within humanity? There has to be a reason why we, from the very beginnings of our history and henceforth, continue to develop the

620 Proverbs 14:12 and 16:25 LITV.
621 Genesis 6:5 LITV.
622 Genesis 6:11LITV.
623 Jeremiah 17:9 LITV.
625 Ibid, 17.
“art of fabricating arms” and why we so desperately strive to fulfill this twice repeated scripture, “There is a way that seems right to a man; but the end of it is the ways of death” We are in a battle for life yet, our history and even our present shows that we rather choose death toward those we consider enemies and that enemy is a completely subjective term. This exists because we individually think that our own ways, means, and thoughts are better than those from others and we seek rather to be right or correct, rather than loving each other through our errors and mistakes. True, there are times when we act in humility and compromise with one another, but again, the sad truth is we, as a whole, do not live our lives in love for one another. Instead, we put ourselves as first, internally claiming ourselves as godly or superior, and move by the feelings that we think best. The best in our actions and thoughts are expressed in the tragic history of humanity and that history cannot be called love.

Lastly, Professor Keith Michael Baker of Stanford University and an expert on France and Condorcet’s life comments that, your Sketch for a Historical Picture of the Progress of the Human Mind or also known as, Outlines of an Historical View of the Progress of the Human Mind was “hastily written while he was in hiding from his Jacobin enemies, was in part an ironic by-product of the author’s political defeat.” Authors McLean and Hewitt include more,

As a speaker, Condorcet was a hopeless failure, a serious problem in a Revolution where so much hung on oratory. ‘The speed with which he spoke prevented us from catching what he said’, reported the shorthand-writers.

---

626 Ibid, 16.
627 Proverbs 14:12, 16:25 LITV.
Likewise to your struggles and bureaucratic failure, your wife Sophie’s divorce from you during the Reign of Terror, presented the complete opposite of what you hoped for in your essay. In fact, the Terror would “claim an estimated 18,500 - 40,000 lives before its end in July 1794.”

Baker also cites Emma Rothschild’s reflection on the Enlightenment. She states that,

> The world that the Enlightenment took form was an insecure and unpredictable one. It was a world (like our own) still haunted by collective memories of fanatical violence and wholesale slaughter, a world (like our own) undergoing rapid change fed by processes of globalization, a world in which proposals for reform regularly met dire predictions of social convulsion. In such a world, wagering that a peaceable social order might derive from the exercise of individual freedom guided by reasoned choice, both individual and collective, was (and is) still a daring bet.

Reflecting upon these words, it is enlightening to think that you, Condorcet, proposed an infinite hope and wager by way of your “faith” in humanity, when you are more aware of your own troubles in France and the world that you live in. You desire humanity to rest in a supposed progress of the human mind when history before your essay and history during the writing of the essay, clearly demonstrates the exact opposite of your hope. Similarly, the history that has proceeded from your writing has continually displayed that humanity; the people themselves,

---

have not progressed in an enlightened and benevolent manner. Our corrupted reason has instead,
brought persistent crime and warfare. This, in no way, matches your published oasis regarding
humanity’s progress. I also offer that your essay is highly influenced by your internal
psychology. You were probably taunted for still being “kept in white dresses until the age of
eight,” while your peers had progressed into wearing the appropriate clothes for their age and
gender. You were without your father to intervene for you and raise you with his influence.
Instead, you were solely formed by your mother’s devotion and dedication to the Virgin. I
understand your frustrations toward both religion and your peers because, as Monsieur FranÇois
Arago wrote,

Little boys wore dresses like their sisters until they were breeched at about
5 or 6 years. The clothes they wore after breeching were much like their
fathers, a jacket and knee breeches.

Yet, you were stuck with your mother’s religious ideas and probably your compatriot’s torment.
It seems that you did not get the affirmation that you needed and as a result, you summarized
your life’s hope with this essay, which has tragically proven faulty. Instead, I offer a worldview
and faith that is based upon reason and revelation; the revelation of Jesus Christ.

---

634 Christopher Wagner, “Historical Boys’ Clothing,” *HBC*, accessed 3/30/14,
Conclusion

In the end of this thesis I leave you, Condorcet, with the dreadful reality that humanity has not progressed toward any perfection except in the ways and means of death and devastation. True, there are a multitude of things that have seemed pleasant to our senses, but just because something seems pleasant does not mean that these things were truly what they appeared to be. Basing truth upon appearances and only by the use of our sense can lead to drastic and tragic outcomes. Hence, the meaning of the word façade is applied and the usage of covert or undercover techniques enables traitors to manifest themselves and for coups to occur. Besides the continual development of our military’s weapons emphasizes this, as we strive in perfecting defeat and even death to our claimed enemies.

Each of us would rather do what is right in our own eyes than humble ourselves to benefit and willfully love others. Our first thoughts are not love and blessing toward others. Instead, we think of ourselves foremost and, like the mythical Greek gods, we use tactics and whatever power possible to advance our own lives and ego. Our technologies and many of our inventions have advanced over time, but as we look across the history of humanity, we see that man has not advanced and there has been no change within him aside from getting worse in his behavior toward others. Just glancing across the daily news displays that crimes continue to plague humanity and often, they become more horrid. One example comes from Iraq, where,

Anbar provincial council chairman Sabah Karkhout said he was advised by his field commanders near the al-Baghdadi front line that ISIS militants killed at least
40 police officers and tribesman, and that most of the victims were “burned to
death.”

I again note that, “Man's undoing is found in his own ingenuity,” as our continual
advancement, production, and use of weaponry consistently demonstrates our inherent problem
of sin within. I reflect upon these words from Jesus,

But the things which come out of the mouth come forth from the heart, and these
defile the man. For out of the heart come forth reasonings, evil things, murders,
adulteries, fornications, thefts, lies, blasphemies. These things are the things
defiling the man.

Scripturally, the people that Jesus was speaking to were God fearing Jews and were generally
following after Jesus as their Messiah though both the Bible and history show that Jesus did
not meet their presumptions for a Messiah that would bring a return to the kingdom of Israel.

Mankind has and continues to move by his heart and soul, a soul made up of his mind, his
emotions, and his will. The will of man is to do what is right in his own eyes, of his own
thoughts and opinions, regardless of what may come forth. Man views himself as autonomous
and even though he is not omniscient, omnipotent, nor, omnipresent, he still justifies his

---

636 T. Austin-Sparks, The Cross, the Church, and the Kingdom (Tulsa: Emmanuel Church, 2008), 14.
637 Matthew 15:18-20 LITV.
638 “Messiah being the ‘anointed one’ that would be an eschatological king who, will put an end to sin and war and usher in universal righteousness and through his death will make vicarious atonement for the salvation of sinful people.” Strong, James LL.D, S.T.D., The Strongest Strong’s Exhaustive Concordance of the Bible, ed. John R. Kohlenberger and James A. Swanson (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2001), 164. Messiah was also the hoped for king who would free Israel from all of her enemies and establish Israel as the reigning and divine nation.
reasonings within himself or others and only when results falter or guilt may set in, is there
remorse.

However, remorse cannot justify and our legal courts validate this. No one is acquitted
just because of her or his remorse. If that were the case, everyone could either be truly
remorseful or even pretend to be remorseful and the entire legal defense and prison systems
would be extinct. Therefore, remorse is not enough to justify our actions of thoughts. We need
another life to aide us in our journey upon this earth.

Through the debate within this thesis, we have had parallel ways of thinking that only
have momentary intersections evidencing the substructures of our different worldviews. Your
worldview is based upon your understanding of reason and mine is based upon reason and
revelation. Condorcet, you had walked in your own version of truth, instead of resting upon and
within the one who called himself the truth. 639 I also cite Zoltán Haraszti’s essay, John Adams
Flays a Philosophe: Annotations on Condorcet’s Progress of the Human Mind, which relates
writings from the former President’s diary. Haraszti documents that,

Condorcet had an un-bounded faith in genius; he thought, indeed, that men of
genius were the chief moving force of progress. Adams was enraged by the idea.
"Oh Vanity of Genius what Mischiefs have you not done!" he exclaimed. He
could not see the word without an angry protest. It became for him the symbol of
all the "pretensions" of the philosophers, men who had no practical experience,
and even boasted of it. "He was as mere a Monk as Loyaula," Adams wrote with
exasperation. Once he cried out: "Thou art a Quack, Condorcet!" and he soon
called him "arrogant," "wicked," and a "mathematical Charlatan." Condorcet's

639 John 14:6 LITV.
attribution of certain features of the American constitutions to "prejudices of education" was more than galling. "Fool! Fool!" Adams exploded.640

These words describe the thoughts and feelings of one of America’s forefathers, a lawyer, and a President, who was no intellectual feeble. Adams looked with disdain upon Condorcet’s essay and humanity too, may consider the reality that has come forth through history and where we are today. I end with these words which summarize reality and not the falsehood that man continually walks in,

Because when they knew and recognized Him as God, they did not honor and glorify Him as God or give Him thanks. But instead they became futile and godless in their thinking [with vain imaginings, foolish reasoning, and stupid speculations] and their senseless minds were darkened.

Claiming to be wise, they became fools [professing to be smart, they made simpletons of themselves].

And by them the glory and majesty and excellence of the immortal God were exchanged for and represented by images, resembling mortal man and birds and beasts and reptiles.

Therefore God gave them up in the lusts of their [own] hearts to sexual impurity, 
to the dishonoring of their bodies among themselves [abandoning them to the 
degrading power of sin].

Because they exchanged the truth of God for a lie and worshiped and served the 
creature rather than the Creator, Who is blessed forever! Amen (so be it).^641

So, in concluding this thesis, I find that the reality of Condorcet’s Outlines of an 
Historical View of the Progress of the Human Mind with humanity becoming perfect has proved 
to be an illusion. Condorcet’s “faith”^642 in humanity and his foundation of faith in the natural 
sciences . . . when applied to the developement of the intellectual and moral faculties of man^643 
has not come to fruition. I cite Bork’s words,

The belief that science will ultimately comprehend the nature of reality at both the 
 micro and macro levels is no less founded on faith than the belief that there is a 
God and that Jesus was His son.^644

Brick’s words also apply,

It should be remembered that the belief in the value of scientific truth is the 
product of certain cultures and is not a product of man’s original nature.^645

^641 Romans 1:21-25 Amplified Bible.
^642 Marie-Jean-Antoine-Nicolas Caritat, Marquis de Condorcet, “Marie-Jean-Antoine-Nicolas Caritat, Marquis de 
Condorcet, Outlines of an historical view of the progress of the human mind [1795],” The Online Library of Liberty, 
^643 Ibid.
^644 Robert H. Bork, preface to Idols for Destruction: The Conflict of Christian Faith and American Culture, Herbert 
Schlossberg (Wheaton: Crossway Books, 1990), xix.
I reference these statements because I find that reason, rationality, and science can help humanity to a degree, but they leave us failing when we look over human history and our daily news. Yes, we are continually advancing with our inventions, science, and technology but, we are not becoming better people. They are not making us perfect either. It is more than obvious, that imperfect cannot make perfect. Therefore, we need divine revelation to guide us into a livelihood that is “able to do exceedingly above all that we ask or think.” I state this because I have continuously and experientially found that the following words from the Apostle Paul are so active,

How I long for you to grow more certain in your knowledge and more sure in your grasp of God himself. May your spiritual experience become richer as you see more and more fully God's great secret, Christ himself! For it is in him, and in him alone, that men will find all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge.

Humanity becoming perfect is only possible through a faith that has an active and personal relationship with God through Jesus Christ and is manifested in a new human nature.

---

645 Howard Brick, *Daniel Bell and the Decline of Intellectual Radicalism: Social Theory and Political Reconciliation in the 1940’s*, (Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1986), 44.
646 Ephesians 3:20 LITV.
647 Colossians 2:2, 3 The New Testament in Modern English.
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