

Dr. R. Satish Kumar
Srinivas Ranjan

SURVEY OF CHALLENGES OCCURRED IN THE 21ST CENTURY



ALEXIS PRESS
JERSEY CITY, USA

**SURVEY OF CHALLENGES
OCCURRED IN THE 21ST CENTURY**

SURVEY OF CHALLENGES OCCURRED IN THE 21ST CENTURY

Dr. R. Satish Kumar
Srinivas Ranjan





ALEXIS PRESS

Published by: Alexis Press, LLC, Jersey City, USA
www.alexispress.us

© RESERVED

This book contains information obtained from highly regarded resources.
Copyright for individual contents remains with the authors.
A wide variety of references are listed. Reasonable efforts have been made
to publish reliable data and information, but the author and the publisher
cannot assume responsibility for the validity of
all materials or for the consequences of their use.

No part of this book may be reprinted, reproduced, transmitted,
or utilized in any form by any electronic, mechanical, or other means,
now known or hereinafter invented, including photocopying,
microfilming and recording, or any information storage or retrieval system,
without permission from the publishers.

For permission to photocopy or use material electronically
from this work please access alexispress.us

First Published 2022

A catalogue record for this publication is available from the British Library

Library of Congress Cataloguing in Publication Data

Includes bibliographical references and index.

Survey of Challenges Occurred in the 21st Century by *Dr. R. Satish Kumar, Srinivas Ranjan*

ISBN 978-1-64532-479-9

CONTENTS

Chapter 1. Technological Challenge: Disillusionment.....	1
— <i>Dr. R.Satish Kumar</i>	
Chapter 2. A Brief Introduction on Work: Physical and Cognitive	11
— <i>Dr. Anantha Subramanya Iyer</i>	
Chapter 3. A Brief Discussion on Universal	19
— <i>Dr. Raja Sankaran</i>	
Chapter 4. Role of Liberty in 21 st Century	27
— <i>Prof.Suparna Ghosal</i>	
Chapter 5. Equality: Data Owners Control the Future	39
— <i>Dr Xavier V.K</i>	
Chapter 6. A Brief Discussion on Political Challenge: Community	47
— <i>Dr Hemanth Kumar.S</i>	
Chapter 7. A Brief Discussion on Civilisation	55
— <i>Dr Sarangapani Nivarthi</i>	
Chapter 8. Nationalism: Global Issues Need Global Solutions.....	65
— <i>Dr L. Sudershan Reddy</i>	
Chapter 9. A Study on Religion	75
— <i>Dr Navaneetha Kumar</i>	
Chapter 10. A Brief Discussion on Reasons of Immigration	83
— <i>Dr Jaykumar Padmanabhan</i>	
Chapter 11. A Brief Discussion on Terrorism.....	94
— <i>Dr Yavana Rani.S</i>	
Chapter 12. War: Never Underestimate Human.....	102
— <i>Dr G.S.Vijaya</i>	
Chapter 13. A Brief Discussion on Humility	109
— <i>Dr S.Yogananthan</i>	
Chapter 14. A Study on Belief in God	119
— <i>Dr Ravishankar S Ulle</i>	
Chapter 15. A Brief Description on Secularism	128
— <i>Dr Vinoth Kumar.V</i>	
Chapter 16. A Brief Introduction about Truth.....	139
— <i>Mr Srinivas Ranjan</i>	
Chapter 17. A Brief Discussion on Justice.....	149
— <i>Mr Sachin Pandey</i>	
Chapter 18. Post-Truth: Some Fake News Lasts for Ever.....	158
— <i>Mr Pankaj Azad</i>	
Chapter 19. A Study on Science Fiction: The Future Movies.....	168
— <i>Mr Pankaj Azad</i>	

Chapter 20. A Brief Discussion Education: Change is the Only Constant.....	177
— <i>Subhranshu Panda</i>	
Chapter 21. A Brief Discussion on Meaning of Life.....	192
— <i>Mr. Rajkumar Bargujar</i>	
Chapter 22. A Brief Discussion on Meditation: Just Observe.....	205
— <i>Mr Vikrant Meshram</i>	

CHAPTER 1

TECHNOLOGICAL CHALLENGE: DISILLUSIONMENT

Dr. R.Satish Kumar, Professor,
Department of Marketing, CMS Business School, Jain (Deemed to be University), Bangalore,
Karnataka, India,
Email Id:dr.satishkumar@cms.ac.in

ABSTRACT:

Numerous advantages and significant changes to society have been brought about by the rapid development of technology. However, a rising number of people are becoming disillusioned as technological advancement quickens. This chapter scrutinizes the idea of technological disillusionment, as well as its underlying origins and possible effects. It also emphasizes the need of taking preventative action to deal with this issue and guarantee a more impartial and human-centric approach to technology development.

KEYWORDS:

Human Rights, Information, Liberal Narrative, Technology.

INTRODUCTION

The more straightforward the tale, the better, since humans think in stories rather than in facts, figures, or mathematics. Every individual, community, and country has its own myths and legends. However, three big narratives the fascist tale, the communist story, and the liberal story were developed by the world's elites in New York, London, Berlin, and Moscow throughout the 20th century. These narratives purported to explain the whole of human history and to foretell the future of the entire planet. The fascist narrative was destroyed by globe War II, and from the late 1940s until the late 1980s, communist and liberalism fought for control of the globe. Then, when the communist tale crumbled, the liberal story seemed to the world's elite to be the dominant explanation of human history and the essential guide for the future of the planet [1], [2].

The liberal narrative honors the importance and influence of liberty. It claims that for thousands of years, humans endured repressive governments that severely curtailed people's freedom of movement and their access to political, economic, and personal freedoms. But when people struggled for their independence, it gradually expanded. Cruel dictatorships were replaced by democratic governments. Economic limitations were overcome by free entrepreneurship. Instead of mindlessly following racist clerics and tradition-bound customs, people learnt to think for themselves and listen to their feelings. Walls, moats, and barbed-wire fences were replaced with wide highways, sturdy bridges, and active airports.

The liberal narrative accepts that there are still many obstacles to overcome and that not everything in the world is perfect. Tyrants rule a large portion of our earth, and even in the most liberal nations, many people experience tyranny, brutality, and poverty. But at least we know how to solve these issues: by giving individuals greater freedom. We must uphold human rights, ensure that everyone has the right to vote, promote free markets, and ensure that people, ideas, and things may travel as freely as possible around the globe. This liberal panacea holds that if we simply keep liberalizing and globalizing our political and economic institutions, we will bring about peace and prosperity for all a view shared, with minor

changes, by George W. Bush and Barack Obama. Countries would sooner experience peace and prosperity if they embrace this irresistible march of change. Until other nations see the light, open their borders, and liberalize their society, governments, and markets, those who attempt to fight the inevitable will pay the consequences. Even North Korea, Iraq, and El Salvador will someday resemble Denmark or Iowa, albeit it may take some time.

This tale spread around the world in the 1990s and 2000s. In an effort to follow history's unstoppable march, several countries from Brazil to India embraced liberal policies. Those who refused to do so seemed to be relics from an earlier time. Bill Clinton, then-president of the United States, firmly reprimanded the Chinese government in 1997, saying that it was "on the wrong side of history" because it refused to liberalize Chinese politics. However, since the global financial crisis of 2008, the liberal narrative has been losing its appeal to people all around the globe. Firewalls and barriers are now again fashionable. Immigration and trade accords are under increasing opposition. Governments that present themselves as democratic undercut the independence of the courts, impose restrictions on press freedom, and characterize any dissent as treason. Strongmen experiment with new varieties of illiberal democracies and outright dictatorships in nations like Turkey and Russia. The Chinese Communist Party is not on the right side of history, although few people today would firmly say so.

This tidal wave of disenchantment hit the core liberal nations of Western Europe and North America in 2016, which was highlighted by the Brexit vote in Britain and the emergence of Donald Trump in the United Nations. Many people in Kentucky and Yorkshire today see the liberal goal as either undesirable or unrealistic, in contrast to a few years ago when Americans and Europeans were still using force to liberalize Iraq and Libya. Some people have grown fond of the previous hierarchical society and just do not want to give up their advantages based on their race, country, or gender. Others have come to the (correct or incorrect) conclusion that globalization and liberalization are gigantic scams that benefit a few elite at the cost of the majority. Humans had a choice of three different world narratives in 1938, two in 1968, one in 1998, and now there is just one, as of 2018.

It is understandable that the liberal elites, who governed a large portion of the globe in recent decades, are in a state of shock and confusion. The most comforting scenario of all is having only one narrative. Everything is extremely obvious. It's unsettling to find yourself suddenly without a narrative. Nothing is coherent. Liberals don't comprehend how history diverged from its predetermined route and they don't have an alternate lens through which to see reality, similar to the Soviet elite in the 1980s. They think apocalyptically because they are disoriented, as though history's inability to reach the anticipated joyful conclusion can only indicate that it is speeding towards Armageddon. Because the mind is unable to do a reality check, it tends to focus on dire situations. Many liberals worry that Brexit and the emergence of Donald Trump herald the demise of Western civilization, much like someone who imagines that a terrible headache indicates the presence of a fatal brain tumor.

DISCUSSION

The speeding up of technology disruption adds to the impression of confusion and approaching disaster. In order to govern a world of steam engines, oil refineries, and television sets, the liberal political system was developed during the industrial period. It finds it challenging to cope with the current information technology and biotechnology revolutions.

Politicians and people struggle to understand the new technology, much alone control their potentially explosive potential. The Internet has undoubtedly had the greatest impact on the globe since the 1990s, but technologists rather than political parties were more responsible for the internet revolution. Have you ever cast a ballot over the internet? The democratic system still finds it difficult to comprehend what happened, and it is ill-prepared to handle the next shocks, such as the emergence of AI and the blockchain revolution [3]–[5].

The financial system has already been designed by computers to be so complex that few people can comprehend it. As AI develops, we could soon arrive to a stage where humans will no longer be able to understand money. What effect will it have on the political system? Can you picture a government that meekly waits for an algorithm to approve its spending plan or a brand-new tax law? Radical tax changes will unavoidably be necessary as a result of peer-to-peer blockchain networks and cryptocurrencies like bitcoin that may entirely alter the monetary system. For instance, since most transactions won't entail a clear exchange of national currency or any money at all, it could become impractical or useless to tax dollars. Governments may consequently need to create whole new levies, such as a tax on information which will soon become the economy's most valuable asset as well as the sole item traded in a variety of transactions.

The simultaneous information and biotechnology revolutions have the potential to fundamentally alter not just economies and civilizations, but also our own bodies and brains. We humans have developed the ability to manipulate the world around us, but our capacity to influence the world inside of us has been severely limited. We were able to construct a dam and stop a river from flowing, but we had no idea how to halt the aging process in the body. We were capable of creating irrigation systems, but we were clueless when it came to creating brains. The majority of us did not know how to destroy a thought that buzzed in our minds and kept us awake at night, but we knew how to kill mosquitoes that buzzed in our ears and stopped us from sleeping.

We will be able to construct and create life thanks to the biotech and information technology revolutions, which will give us power over the world inside of us. We shall discover how to create brains, lengthen lives, and, at our discretion, annihilate ideas. Nobody is aware of the potential outcomes. Humans have always been more better at creating tools than effectively utilizing them. Building a dam across a river is a simpler way to control it than it is to foresee all the complicated effects this will have on the larger biological system. Similar to this, it will be simpler to change the way our thoughts work than to predict how it would affect our societal structures or personal psyches. We once had the ability to alter the environment around us and the whole planet, but since we were ignorant of the intricacy of the global ecology, the changes we made unintentionally upset the entire ecological system, and as a result, we are now facing an ecological collapse. Biotechnology and information technology will offer us the ability to remake ourselves in the twenty-first century, but since we are not yet aware of the intricacy of our own thoughts, the modifications we make might lead our mental system to become irreparably damaged.

Engineers, business owners, and scientists who rarely understand the political ramifications of their choices and who most definitely don't speak for everyone are responsible for the biotech and information technology revolutions. Can parties and parliaments take action on their own? It doesn't appear that way right now. The political agenda does not even include technological disruption as a top priority. Since Hillary Clinton's email scandal dominated discussion of disruptive technology throughout the 2016 US presidential campaign, neither candidate specifically mentioned the possible effects of automation, despite much discussion

of job losses. Donald Trump advised people to build a wall along the Mexican border in order to protect their employment from Chinese and Mexican immigrants.

He never suggested erecting a wall along the California border, nor did he ever warn Americans that algorithms would replace them in the workforce. Even people in the liberal West's heartland may be losing trust in the liberal narrative and the democratic process for this reason, but it is not the only one. Although the average person may not grasp artificial intelligence or biotechnology, they are aware that the future is slipping away from them. Even while conditions for the average individual in the USSR, Germany, or the USA may have been dire in 1938, he or she was continually taught that they were the most important thing in the world and that they held the key to the future as long as they weren't Jews or Africans, of course. When he glanced at the propaganda posters, which often featured heroic positions of coal miners, steelworkers, and housewives, he recognized himself in them. I am the future's greatest hero.

The average individual feels more and more unimportant in 2018. Many enigmatic terms, such as globalization, blockchain, genetic engineering, artificial intelligence, and machine learning, are enthusiastically thrown about at TED lectures, government think tanks, and high-tech conferences, but the average person may easily assume that none of these terms are about them. The liberal narrative focused on the lives of regular people. The people rebelled against exploitation in the 20th century and attempted to convert their crucial economic function into political power. The populace now fears becoming irrelevant and is scrambling to make use of what little political influence they still have. Thus, Brexit and the emergence of Trump could show a different trajectory from conventional socialist revolutions. Individuals who were economically important but lacked political authority started the revolutions in Russia, China, and Cuba. In 2016, many individuals who still had political power but worried they were losing their economic value backed Trump and Brexit. Perhaps populist uprisings will take place in the twenty-first century against an economic elite that no longer needs people, rather than one that abuses them. This war can end in failure. Fighting against irrelevance is considerably more difficult than fighting against exploitation.

The liberal narrative has had confidence crises before. Periodic problems have plagued this tale ever since it became widely known, in the latter part of the nineteenth century. The First World War's slaughter marked the end of the first period of globalization and liberalization, which was halted by imperial power politics. Following the assassination of Archduke Franz Ferdinand in Sarajevo, it became clear that the major powers placed a far higher value on imperialism than liberalism. Rather than bringing about global peace via open and peaceful trade, they were more interested in using force to annex a larger portion of the world. But despite this Franz Ferdinand-like event, liberalism overcame it and emerged from the tumult stronger than before, declaring that this was "the war to end all wars." As a result of the allegedly unparalleled butchery, humanity was allegedly now prepared to establish a new global order based on the values of freedom and peace [6]–[8].

Then came the Hitler moment, when fascism briefly looked unstoppable in the 1930s and early 1940s. Defeating one menace just brought forth the next. Between the 1950s and the 1970s, during the Che Guevara period, it seemed once again that liberalism was dying and that communism had the key to the future. In the end, communism was the one to fall. The Gulag was clearly no match for the shop. More crucially, the liberal narrative revealed itself to be far more flexible and dynamic than any of its rivals. It succeeded imperialism, fascism, and communism by incorporating some of their most beneficial principles and methods. The liberal narrative specifically learnt from communism to widen the scope of empathy and to cherish equality with liberty.

The liberal narrative looked to be oblivious to the misery of working-class individuals, women, minorities, and non-Westerners in the beginning and seemed to care more about the rights and advantages of middle-class European males. When the triumphant nations of Britain and France enthusiastically praised liberty in 1918, they were not considering the people who made up their vast empires. For instance, the Amritsar Massacre of 1919, in which the British army slaughtered hundreds of unarmed protesters, was a response to Indian calls for self-determination. Liberals in the West had a very difficult time imposing their purportedly universal ideas on non-Westerners, even after the Second World War. Thus, the Dutch very immediately raised an army and sent it halfway across the globe to retake their old colony of Indonesia after fleeing from five years of terrible Nazi captivity. While the Dutch handed up their own freedom in 1940 after just a few days of combat, they struggled to repress Indonesian independence for more than four long and arduous years. It is understandable why many national liberation groups throughout the globe put their faith in communist Beijing and Moscow rather than the self-styled defenders of liberty in the West.

However, the liberal narrative gradually broadened its scope and, at least in principle, began to appreciate the rights and freedoms of every person without distinction. The liberal narrative evolved to appreciate the significance of welfare programs inspired by communist socialism as the circle of liberty widened. Without any kind of social safety net, freedom is not very valuable. Social democratic welfare states united human rights, democracy, and government-funded healthcare and education. Even the ultra-capitalist USA has come to the conclusion that at least some government social programs are necessary for the safeguarding of liberty. Children who are starving have no rights. By the beginning of the 1990s, politicians and academics alike hailed "the End of History," asserting with assurance that all of the significant political and economic issues of the past had been resolved and that the updated liberal package of democracy, human rights, free markets, and public assistance programs remained the only game in town. This package seemed to be on a mission to conquer the whole planet, dismantle all barriers, obliterate all national boundaries, and unite all of humanity as a single, liberated species. But history has not yet come to a conclusion, and we are now experiencing the Trump moment after the moments of Franz Ferdinand, Hitler, and Che Guevara. This time, however, there is no unified ideological rival to the liberal myth, such as imperialism, fascism, or communism. The Trump era is much more pessimistic.

Donald Trump does not present a vision for the whole human race, in contrast to the main movements of the 20th century, which all had one, whether it was one of global dominance, revolution, or emancipation. The exact opposite. His key point is that it is not the responsibility of America to create and advance any kind of global vision. Similar to the British Brexiteers, who hardly have a plan for the future of the United Kingdom after Brexit, they have no idea what will happen to Europe or the rest of the globe. The majority of individuals who supported Trump and Brexit didn't completely reject the liberal package; instead, they lost trust only in its globalizing component. They still support social responsibility, human rights, democracy, and free markets, but they think these noble ideals may end at the border. In fact, they think it is desirable to erect a wall on the border and implement illiberal policies against outsiders in order to maintain liberty and prosperity in Yorkshire or Kentucky.

The burgeoning powerhouse of China is nearly a mirror image. Although it has a conservative attitude to internal politics, it has a far more liberal outlook on the rest of the globe. In reality, Xi Jinping seems to be Obama's true successor in terms of free trade and international collaboration. China seems to be content with the liberal world order after

putting Marxism-Leninism on the back burner. Though it has rebuilt its military power, a resurgent Russia views itself as a far more formidable competitor of the international liberal system despite being philosophically bankrupt. Vladimir Putin is undoubtedly well-liked in Russia and among other right-wing groups throughout the globe, but he lacks a universal point of view that would entice jobless Spaniards, displeased Brazilians, or wide-eyed Cambridge undergraduates. Although Russia does provide an alternative to liberal democracy, this alternative does not represent a unified political philosophy. The majority of a nation's wealth and power are instead monopolized by a small group of oligarchs, who then utilize their media sway to conceal their actions and solidify their domination.

Democracy is built on Abraham Lincoln's dictum that "you can fool some people all the time, and all the time you can fool some people, but you cannot fool all the time" A large enough number of citizens will ultimately realize that a corrupt government is failing to enhance the lives of its inhabitants and will overthrow it. Lincoln's argument, however, is undermined by government control of the media since it keeps the public from understanding the truth. Because it has a stranglehold on the media, the governing oligarchy can continually point the finger at others for its mistakes and focus attention on imagined or genuine external dangers.

When you live in such an oligarchy, there is always some catastrophe that takes precedence over uninteresting things like pollution and healthcare. Who has time to worry about congested hospitals and filthy rivers when the country is threatened by an external invasion or a devious subversion? A corrupt oligarchy may stay in power forever by creating an endless series of problems. This oligarchic paradigm, although being lasting in reality, is unpopular with everyone. Unlike other ideologies that freely proclaim their goals, governing oligarchies are not proud of their methods and often hide behind other ideas. As a result, Russia presents itself as a democracy and declares its commitment to Orthodox Christianity and Russian nationalism as opposed to oligarchy. Even their supporters would not want to live in a nation that mimics the Russian model, one with pervasive corruption, broken services, no rule of law, and staggering inequality. Right-wing extremists in France and Britain may rely on Russian assistance and express admiration for Putin. According to certain metrics, Russia is one of the most unequal nations in the world, with 87% of the country's wealth being held by the wealthiest 10% of its citizens.

People cast ballots with their feet. I've met a lot of individuals who want to immigrate to the USA, Germany, Canada, or Australia on my travels throughout the globe. A few people I know desire to relocate to China or Japan. However, I have yet to come across someone who had aspirations of moving to Russia. As for "global Islam," it mostly draws those who were born into it. It is difficult to see Greece or South Africa -- much alone Canada or South Korea adopting an international caliphate as a solution to their issues, despite the fact that it may appeal to certain individuals in Syria and Iraq and even to disaffected Muslim youth in Germany and Britain. The public makes its choice in this situation as well. A hundred Middle Eastern teenagers would have preferred to go the other way and begin a new life in liberal Germany for every Muslim kid from Germany who traveled to the Middle East to live under a Muslim theocracy.

This might mean that the current religious crisis is not as bad as previous ones. Any liberal who is depressed at the recent events should only go back to how much worse things were in 1918, 1938, or 1968. Humanity won't ultimately reject liberalism because there is no other option available to it. People may kick the system in the stomach in rage, but because they have nowhere else to turn, they will ultimately return. Alternately, individuals can entirely give up on having any form of universal narrative and instead seek solace in regional nationalist and religious myths. Nationalist groups had a significant role in politics

throughout the 20th century, but they did not have a cogent vision for how the world should be divided up into separate nation states. As a result, nationalists in Indonesia and Vietnam battled against Dutch rule, respectively, but there was no Indonesian or Vietnamese narrative that applied to all of mankind. Nationalists always looked to liberal or communist ideologies to explain how Indonesia, Vietnam, and all the other free countries should interact with one another as well as how people should approach global issues like the possibility of nuclear war.

But given that communism and liberalism have both fallen from grace, maybe people should give up on the concept of a unified global narrative altogether? All of these worldwide tales, including communism, weren't they the result of Western imperialism, right? Why should peasants in Vietnam trust the creation of a German from Trier and an entrepreneur from Manchester? Maybe each nation should follow an own route based on its own lengthy traditions? Maybe even Westerners should take a vacation from attempting to rule the globe and instead put their own needs first?

This is undoubtedly what is taking on all around the world as nostalgic dreams about some particular gilded past attempt to fill the void created by liberalism's collapse. As if the United States of the 1980s or 1950s were a flawless society that Americans could somehow rebuild in the twenty-first century, Donald Trump paired his appeals for American isolationism with a pledge to "Make America Great Again." As if they were still in the reign of Queen Victoria and as if "splendid isolation" were a workable strategy in the age of the Internet and global warming, Brexiteers dream of making Britain an independent power. As a complement to or possibly a replacement for the dubious Marxist ideology they inherited from the West, Chinese elites have rediscovered their original imperial and Confucian heritage.

Putin's stated goal in Russia is to revive the former tsarist empire rather than establish a corrupt oligarchy. Putin promises a return to the glories of the old tsarist era, with an authoritarian government bolstered by Russian nationalism and Orthodox faith expanding its influence from the Baltic to the Caucasus. This is a century after the Bolshevik Revolution. Similar nostalgic fantasies that blend religious traditions with nationalism allegiance support the governments of Turkey, Poland, India, and many other nations. These illusions are nowhere more severe than in the Middle East, where Islamists want to replicate the structure put in place by the Prophet Muhammad in Medina 1,400 years ago, while fundamentalist Jews in Israel surpass even the Islamists in their desire to return to Biblical times 2,500 years.

Members of Israel's current coalition government publicly express their desire to restore biblical law, enlarge contemporary Israel's boundaries to more nearly resemble those of ancient Israel, and even to erect the old Temple of Yahweh in Jerusalem in the place of the Al-Aqsa mosque. Liberal elites are horrified by these events and hold out hope that mankind will move back toward liberal ideals in time to prevent catastrophe. President Obama cautioned his audience against withdrawing "into a world sharply divided, and ultimately in conflict, along age-old lines of nation and tribe and race and religion" in his last address to the United Nations in September 2016. The values of free markets, transparent government, democracy, respect for human rights, and international law, he said, "remain the strongest foundation for human progress in this century."

Obama has correctly noted that the liberal package has a considerably better track record than any of its alternatives, despite its many flaws. The majority of people have never experienced more peace or prosperity than they did under the liberal order of the early 21st century. For the first time in human history, accidents now claim more lives than infectious illnesses, starvation claims more lives than obesity, and violence claims more lives than famine.

However, liberalism lacks clear solutions to the two major issues we are now facing: ecological collapse and technological disruption. Historically, liberalism has looked to economic expansion to miraculously resolve complex social and political tensions. By offering everyone a bigger piece of the pie, liberalism brought together the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, the religious and the atheistic, the indigenous and the immigrants, and the Europeans and the Asians. That was conceivable with a pie that was always expanding. Economic expansion, on the other hand, is not the solution to the ecological issue; rather, it is the source of it. Economic expansion, which depends on the development of ever-more disruptive technologies, will not be able to address the problem of technological disruption.

Big expectations are encouraged by the liberal narrative and the logic of free-market capitalism. In the second half of the 20th century, generations in Houston, Shanghai, Istanbul, or So Paulo all had access to greater healthcare, education, and earnings than their forebears. The younger generation, however, could be fortunate to just remain in situ in the following decades due to a collision of technological upheaval and ecological breakdown. As a result, we are left with the responsibility of telling the world a new tale. The next revolutions in biotechnology and information technology are likely to call for new perspectives, much as the upheavals of the Industrial Revolution gave rise to the creative ideologies of the twentieth century. Therefore, in-depth introspection and the creation of new social and political paradigms may define the next decades. Could liberalism reinvent itself once again, as it did in the aftermath of the crises of the 1930s and 1960s, becoming more appealing than ever? Could traditional religion and nationalism provide the liberals the answers they are unable to, and could they harness old knowledge to create a modern worldview? Or maybe the moment has come to fully break with the past and create a brand-new narrative that transcends not just the ancient gods and countries but also the fundamental principles of liberty and equality?

Humanity is still very far from agreeing on any of these issues. After people have lost trust in the old narrative but prior to their accepting a new one, we are still in the nihilist period of despair and rage. Then what? The first stage is to calm down the dire predictions and shift from panic to confusion. Hubris takes the shape of panic. It stems from my arrogant belief that I understand the direction the world is going down. Bewilderment is more modest and hence more perceptive. If you want to rush down the street screaming, "The end of the world is here!" try convincing yourself, "No, it's not that." The truth is that I just don't comprehend what is happening in the world.

But first, we need to have a greater understanding of the difficulty that technology offers before looking at possible solutions to humanity's problems. It is questionable to what degree the biotechnological and informational revolutions, which are still in their infancy, are really to blame for the present liberal dilemma. The majority of people in Birmingham, Istanbul, St. Petersburg, and Mumbai are only vaguely aware of the growth of artificial intelligence and how it could affect their life, if they are even aware of it at all. The technological revolutions will undoubtedly accelerate over the next decades and present humanity with some of the most difficult challenges the species has ever faced. Any narrative that aspires to win over mankind will be judged most heavily on its capacity to address the simultaneous InfoTech and biotech revolutions. If liberalism, nationalism, Islam, or any other unique creed wants to have an impact on the world in 2050, it will need to create a new meaningful narrative that makes sense of artificial intelligence, Big Data algorithms, and biotechnology.

It would be preferable to start with the labor market in order to comprehend the nature of this technological dilemma. Since 2015, I have been traveling the globe and discussing the plight of humanity with politicians, corporate leaders, social activists, and students. I typically only need to use one magic word to bring them back to focus when they start to become irritated

or tired with the constant discussion about bioengineering, big data analytics, and artificial intelligence: employment. A large new class of unemployed people might be created by the coming technology revolution, which could force billions of people out of the labor force and cause social and political upheavals that no current ideology is prepared to manage. Even if all the discussion about technology and ideology may seem distant and abstract, the very real possibility of widespread unemployment, whether it be personal unemployment, leaves no one apathetic [9]–[12].

CONCLUSION

The fast speed of technology development leads to the phenomena of technological disillusionment. While there is no denying that technology has enhanced many elements of our life, it has also had unforeseen effects including social inequality, privacy issues, and a decline in personal connection. This disappointment results from a mismatch between the advantages of technology as they are advertised and the complicated reality of their use. It is essential to take a more human-centric approach to technology development in order to overcome this problem. This strategy takes into account how technology affects people's psychological, social, and ethical well-being. To lessen the negative effects of technology advancement, proactive steps are required, such as strict regulation, thorough privacy protections, and enhanced openness in algorithmic decision-making.

In addition, promoting public awareness and education about the possible drawbacks and restrictions of technology may enable people to make wise decisions and have an active role in determining its future. Collaboration amongst all parties is essential to ensuring a fair and inclusive approach to technology, including users, politicians, and technology developers. Prioritizing human values, wellbeing, and the maintenance of our social fabric is necessary in order to achieve this. Only by pursuing such initiatives will we be able to fully use technology for societal advancement while reducing any risk for disappointment.

REFERENCES

- [1] M. Kriechbaum, A. Posch, and A. Hauswiesner, “Hype cycles during socio-technical transitions: The dynamics of collective expectations about renewable energy in Germany,” *Res. Policy*, 2021, doi: 10.1016/j.respol.2021.104262.
- [2] J. T. Chiang, “From ‘mission-oriented’ to ‘diffusion-oriented’ paradigm: the new trend of U.S. industrial technology policy,” *Technovation*, 1991, doi: 10.1016/0166-4972(91)90017-X.
- [3] R. Mittenthal, “Ten keys to successful strategic planning for nonprofit and foundation leaders,” 2016.
- [4] R. Mittenthal, “Ten Keys to Successful Strategic Planning,” *TCC Gr.*, 2002.
- [5] M. Jacobs, “84 The Adoption of AI in the Core Scientific Cycle of Feed Research,” *J. Anim. Sci.*, 2021, doi: 10.1093/jas/skab235.074.
- [6] C. Holtze, S. A. Weisse, and M. Vranceanu, “Commercial value and challenges of drop-based microfluidic screening platforms-An opinion,” *Micromachines*. 2017. doi: 10.3390/mi8060193.
- [7] C. E. Black, R. D. English, J. E. Helmreich, P. C. Helmreich and A. J. McAdams, *Rebirth: A political history of Europe since world war II*. 2018. doi: 10.4324/9780429497810.

- [8] M. H. Faghfoory, "Doctrines of Shi'i Islam," *Am. J. Islam Soc.*, 2003, doi: 10.35632/ajis.v20i2.1861.
- [9] M. Pirtea, C. Nicolescu, and C. Botoc, "The Role of Strategic Planning in the Role of Strategic Planning in Modern Organizations," *Ann. Univ. Apulensis Ser. Oeconomica*, 2009.
- [10] J. Costa, "Passing the plateau of productivity," *IEEE Microw. Mag.*, 2014, doi: 10.1109/MMM.2014.2356152.
- [11] K. Prabhakar, "Social Forecasting: Evolving a Model for Indian Business Process Outsourcing Industry," *SSRN Electron. J.*, 2018, doi: 10.2139/ssrn.2941486.
- [12] O. Perez, "Open Government, Technological Innovation and the Politics of Democratic Disillusionment: (E-)Democracy from Socrates to Obama," *SSRN Electron. J.*, 2012, doi: 10.2139/ssrn.2078741.

CHAPTER 2

A BRIEF INTRODUCTION ON WORK: PHYSICAL AND COGNITIVE

Dr. Anantha Subramanya Iyer, Associate Professor,
Department of Marketing, CMS Business School, Jain (Deemed to be University), Bangalore,
Karnataka, India,
Email Id:asi@cms.ac.in

ABSTRACT:

The interaction between physical and mental labor and how it affects productivity and wellbeing in people is described in this chapter. Labor that requires physical motions and effort is referred to as "physical work," but jobs that need brain processes like information processing, problem solving, and decision-making are considered "cognitive work." Understanding how these two sorts of labor interact and affect one another can help to illuminate tactics for enhancing individual performance and advancing general wellbeing. In order to increase productivity, efficiency, and employee happiness, the study takes into account data from many research studies, emphasizing the significance of taking both physical and cognitive factors into account in working settings.

KEYWORDS:

Algorithm, Human, Physical Work, Cognitive Work.

INTRODUCTION

The labor market will look like in 2050 is a mystery to us. It is commonly acknowledged that robots and machine learning will transform almost every industry, from yoghurt production to yoga instruction. Regarding the nature of the shift and its imminence, there are opposing viewpoints. Some predict that billions of people will lose their jobs over the next ten or two years. Others contend that automation will continue to create new employment and increase overall prosperity over the long term. So, are we about to experience a frightening revolution, or are these predictions just more unfounded Luddite hysteria? It's difficult to say. Since the eighteenth century, there have been concerns that automation may lead to a significant increase of unemployment; nevertheless, this has not happened. For every job lost to a machine since the start of the Industrial Revolution, at least one new employment has been created, and the average quality of living has significantly grown. However, there are compelling arguments to believe that machine learning will really alter the game this time around [1].

Both physical and cognitive talents are present in humans. Humans and robots used to compete primarily in terms of sheer physical ability in the past, but humans still had a significant cognitive advantage over machines. As a result, new service professions that needed the type of cognitive abilities only humans possessed learning, analyzing, communicating, and most all comprehending human emotions rose as manual tasks in agriculture and industry were mechanized. However, AI is already starting to perform better than people in an increasing number of these abilities, including the comprehension of human emotions. Beyond the physical and the cognitive, there is no third area of activity that we are aware of where humans will always have a competitive advantage [2].

Realizing that the AI revolution is about more than simply faster, smarter computers is essential. Innovations in the social sciences and the biological sciences are also what drive it. Computers will become better at analyzing human behavior, forecasting human decisions, and eventually taking the place of human drivers, bankers, and attorneys as we better grasp the physiological principles behind human emotions, wants, and choices. Scientists have been able to hack people in recent years and, in particular, have a far better knowledge of how people make choices because to studies in fields like neuroscience and behavioral economics. It was discovered that rather than being the product of some enigmatic free will, our decisions on everything from food to partners are rather the outcome of billions of neurons quickly evaluating probability. The much-praised "human intuition" is really only "pattern recognition."

Good drivers, bankers, and attorneys don't have supernatural intuitions about traffic, investments, or negotiations; instead, they notice and strive to avoid reckless pedestrians, incompetent borrowers, and dishonest criminals by recognizing recurrent patterns. The biochemical algorithms of the human brain also proved to be far from ideal. They depend on old-fashioned circuits, heuristics, and shortcuts that were developed for the African savannah rather than the urban jungle. It seems sense that even skilled bankers, attorneys, and drivers sometimes make foolish errors. Thus, even in jobs that are said to need "intuition," AI may outperform humans. If you believe that AI must compete with the human soul in terms of mystic intuitions, then that seems impossible [3]. However, it seems far less scary if AI just has to compete with neural networks at calculating probabilities and identifying patterns. In instance, AI may do tasks requiring interpersonal intuitions better than humans. The capacity to accurately judge the emotions and wants of others is necessary in many professions, including driving a car across a crowded street, lending money to strangers, and negotiating a commercial transaction. Is that child going to run out into the street? Is the guy in the suit going to steal my money and then vanish? Will that attorney follow through on his threats or is he just bluffing?

Computers will never be able to replace human drivers, bankers, and attorneys as long as it is believed that these emotions and wants are produced by an immaterial soul. Because how can a machine comprehend the spirit that God created in humans? However, if these feelings and wants are only molecular formulas, there is no reason why computers cannot understand these formulas, and do so far more effectively than any Homo sapiens. A banker evaluating a borrower's reliability, a lawyer judging the atmosphere at the negotiating table, and a motorist forecasting the intents of a pedestrian do not depend on witchcraft. Instead, they are unaware that their brains are recognizing biological patterns through analyzing hand gestures, speech tones, facial expressions, and even body odors. All of that could be accomplished by an AI with the appropriate sensors significantly more precisely and consistently than a person [4].

Thus, the possibility of job losses is not only a consequence of the development of information technology. It is the product of the fusion of biotech and information technology. Although there is a lengthy and difficult path from the fMRI scanner to the labor market, it can still be completed in a few decades. In 2050, it's likely that computers will perform better than human psychiatrists and bodyguards because to what scientists are discovering about the amygdala and the cerebellum today. AI not only has the potential to beat humans in previously exclusively human talents. It also benefits from peculiarly non-human qualities that distinguish AI workers from humans on a more fundamental level than just a difference

in degree. The connectedness and updateability of AI are two especially significant non-human capacities.

Since everyone are unique, it is challenging to link them to one another and keep them all up to date. Computers, on the other hand, aren't people, therefore it's simple to include them into a single adaptable network. Therefore, the issue we are confronting does not include replacing millions of individual human employees with millions of individual robots and computers. Instead, an integrated network is more likely to take the role of individual people. Therefore, it is incorrect to compare a single human doctor to a single AI doctor when discussing automation, or a single human driver to a single self-driving automobile. Instead, we need to contrast the skills of a group of human beings with those of an integrated network [5].

For instance, many drivers often break the constantly evolving traffic laws because they are not acquainted with them. Additionally, since each car is an independent entity, a collision may occur when two vehicles approaching a junction at the same moment fail to communicate their intentions. In contrast, all self-driving vehicles may be interconnected. When two of these cars approach a crossroads, they are really a single algorithm and not two distinct entities. They are consequently far less likely to miscommunicate and collision. And if the Ministry of Transportation chooses to alter a traffic rule, all autonomous cars can be readily updated at the same time, and, barring a software glitch, they will all adhere to the new rule perfectly [6].

DISCUSSION

Similar to this, it is almost difficult to inform all human physicians in the world about new medical discoveries made by the World Health Organization or by laboratories. Contrarily, even if there were 10 billion AI physicians in the globe, each one observing the health of a single person, you could still update them all in a split second and have them all share their opinions on the new illness or treatment. Even if some people still do certain tasks better than the machines individually, these prospective benefits of connectedness and updateability are so great that it could make sense to replace all humans with computers, at least in some fields of labor.

You may counter that if we go from individual persons to a computer network, the benefits of uniqueness would be lost. For instance, if a single human doctor makes a mistake, no patients are killed and no new drugs are prevented from being developed as a result. On the other hand, if all physicians are really simply one big system and that system makes a mistake, the consequences might be disastrous. In actuality, an integrated computer system may maximize the benefits of connectedness without sacrificing the advantages of uniqueness. A patient in a distant jungle community may get not just one authoritative doctor via her smartphone, but really 100 distinct AI physicians, whose relative performance is always being compared, thanks to the ability to run multiple alternative algorithms on the same network. You disagree with what the IBM doctor said? No issue. You can simply get in touch with the Baidu doctor for a second opinion, even if you are trapped someplace on Kilimanjaro's slopes. The advantages for human civilization are probably enormous. For billions of people, especially those who now get no healthcare at all, AI physicians might provide far better and less expensive treatment. A poor peasant in an impoverished nation may soon be able to get healthcare through her smartphone that is significantly superior than what the wealthiest person in the world receives today from the most cutting-edge metropolitan hospital, thanks to learning algorithms and biometric sensors [7].

Similar to how improved transportation services might be offered, self-driving cars could also lower traffic accident fatalities. Nearly 1.25 million people die in automobile accidents worldwide each year, which is more than twice as many as die in conflicts, crimes, and terrorist attacks combined. More than 90% of these collisions are the result of very human mistakes, such as drinking and driving, texting and driving, dozing off behind the wheel, or daydreaming instead of paying attention to the road. According to estimates from the US National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, drunk driving accounted for 31% of fatal collisions in the US in 2012, speeding for 30%, and driver distraction for 21%. None of these things will ever be accomplished by self-driving cars. The replacement of all human drivers with computers is anticipated to decrease traffic-related fatalities and injuries by around 90%, despite the fact that human drivers have their own setbacks and limits and that certain accidents are unavoidable [8].

In other words, a million lives might be saved annually by converting to driverless cars. Therefore, it would be insane to prevent automation in industries like transportation and healthcare only to preserve human employment. After all, it's people who need to be protected, not jobs, in the end. The redundant physicians and drivers will simply have to find another job. AI and robots are unlikely to entirely replace whole sectors in the near future, at least not yet. Jobs that call for specialization in a constrained set of routine tasks will be mechanized. However, it will be considerably more challenging to replace people with robots in less conventional professions that need the simultaneous application of a variety of abilities and that include handling unanticipated circumstances. Consider the healthcare industry. Many physicians devote practically all of their attention to information processing; they take in medical data, analyze it, and come up with a diagnosis.

In contrast, in order to administer a painful injection, change a bandage, or control a combative patient, nurses also need strong physical and emotional abilities. As a result, it will probably be decades before we have a trustworthy nurse robot and instead an AI family doctor on our smartphones. The industry that looks for the sick, the young, and the old will probably continue to be a human bastion for a very long time. In fact, caring for the elderly will likely be one of the human labor market's fastest-growing industries as people live longer and have fewer children. Along with care, creativity also presents some of the most challenging obstacles for automation. The iTunes store allows us to download music without the need for human intermediaries, yet the DJs, musicians, vocalists, and composers are still living, breathing people. In addition to creating entirely original music, we also depend on their ingenuity to choose from a dizzying array of accessible options [9].

However, no employment will be completely immune to automation in the long term. Even artists need to be reminded. In the contemporary world, art is often linked to emotional responses from people. We have a tendency to believe that artists are manipulating our subconscious minds and that the whole point of art is to arouse our emotions or instill new ones in us. As a result, when it comes time to analyze art, we often appraise it based on how it affects the audience emotionally. But if human emotions are what characterize art, what may happen if external algorithms become more adept at deciphering and influencing human emotions than Shakespeare, Frida Kahlo, or Beyonce?

After all, emotions are a product of a biological process, not some supernatural phenomena. Consequently, in the not too distant future, a machine-learning algorithm could analyze the biometric data streaming from sensors on and inside your body, establish your personality type and track your changing moods, and determine the emotional impact that a particular song, even a specific musical key, is likely to have on you. Music is arguably the most amenable to big data analysis of all the arts since both its inputs and its outputs can be

precisely mathematically represented. The electrochemical patterns of brain storms are the outputs, while the inputs are mathematical patterns of sound waves. An algorithm that analyzes millions of musical experiences might learn to forecast certain inputs' effects on specific outputs within a few decades [10].

Suppose you and your partner just had a heated argument. Your sound system's algorithm will be able to hear your inner emotional pain right away, and based on what it knows about you individually and on human psychology in general, it will play music designed to mirror your misery and resonate with your melancholy. These songs may not be appropriate for other listeners, but they are exactly right for you. The algorithm would then play the one music in the whole world that is certain to make you feel better, maybe because your subconscious associates it with a joyful childhood experience that even you are unaware of. A human DJ would never be able to compete with such an AI's abilities. You could counter that the AI would therefore eliminate serendipity and confine us to a little sonic bubble created by our prior preferences. How about discovering new musical preferences and styles? No issue. You might simply modify the algorithm such that 5% of its selections are entirely random, surprising you with a recording of an Indonesian Gamelan ensemble, a Rossini opera, or the most recent K-pop song. The AI may even learn over time, by seeing your emotions, the perfect degree of randomness that would maximize exploration while minimizing aggravation, possibly decreasing or boosting its serendipity level to 3% or 8%.

Another potential criticism is that it's unclear how the algorithm might determine its emotional objective. Should the algorithm try to make you happy or sad if you just had a fight with your boyfriend? Would it slavishly adhere to a fixed scale of "good" and "bad" emotions? Perhaps there are moments in life when it's healthy to feel depressed? Of course, human musicians and DJs might be asked the same thing. However, this problem has a lot of intriguing solutions when using an algorithm. Simply leaving it up to the buyer is one possibility. Any method you choose to use to assess your feelings will be followed by the algorithm. Whether you want to celebrate or wallow in self-pity, the algorithm will obediently obey your instructions. In fact, the algorithm could pick up on your preferences without your conscious knowledge [11].

The algorithm will then begin fiddling with the tunes and melodies themselves, altering them slightly to suit your preferences. Maybe there's a segment of a great song that you don't enjoy. The algorithm is aware of this because every time you hear that awful bit, your heart skips a beat and your oxytocin levels dwindle a little. The program could edit the problematic notes out or rewrite them. Long-term, computers may be taught to write complete songs, playing on human emotions like a piano keyboard. The algorithms might even create customized songs for you alone in the whole cosmos using your biometric data. People are believed to connect with art because they recognize themselves in it often. If and when, for example, Facebook starts producing individualized artwork based on all it knows about you, this might have unexpected and slightly frightening implications. If your lover breaks up with you, Facebook will surprise you with a personalized song about that specific jerk rather than the unidentified guy who shattered Adele or Alanis Morsette's heart. You can even be reminded by the music of private, world-secret events from your relationship.

Of course, personalized art may never become popular since people will continue to choose universally popular songs. How can you dance or sing along to a song that only you know? But rather of creating individualized rarities, computers may prove even more skilled at creating universal bestsellers. The program may know which biological buttons to push to generate a worldwide hit that would have everyone swinging crazily on the dance floors by leveraging vast biometric information amassed from millions of individuals. Few if any

human musicians will have a chance to compete with such an algorithm if art is really about evoking (or influencing) human emotions since they lack its level of knowledge of the main instrument they are performing on: the human biochemical system.

Will the end product be outstanding art? Depending on how you define art. Biometric algorithms have a possibility to create the greatest works of art in human history if beauty is in fact in the ears of the listener and if the customer is always right. Biometric algorithms may not make very good artists if art is meant to represent a reality that transcends human emotions and physiological vibrations. But most people also do not. Algorithms won't need to start by immediately exceeding Tchaikovsky in order to join the art business and replace many human composers and performers. If they do better than Britney Spears, that will be enough.

The emergence of new human occupations will somewhat counterbalance the loss of many conventional jobs in industries ranging from healthcare to the arts. GPs who concentrate on identifying well-known ailments and providing well-known treatments will likely be supplanted by AI physicians. However, exactly because of this, there will be far more money available to pay human physicians and lab workers to do ground-breaking research and create new drugs or surgical techniques. AI may also contribute to the creation of new human employment. Humans may instead concentrate on using and supporting AI rather than fighting with it. For instance, the use of drones in lieu of human pilots has displaced some employment while generating many new ones in maintenance, remote control, data analysis, and cyber security. Every unmanned Predator or Reaper drone used by the US military requires thirty personnel to operate, and at least another eighty are needed to analyze the data collected as a consequence. The US Air Force faced an amusing issue in 2015 when it came to staffing its unmanned aircraft since there weren't enough qualified people to fill all these posts.

If so, collaboration between humans and AI may define the employment market in 2050 rather than competition. Teams of people and AI might outperform both humans and computers in a variety of industries, from banking to law enforcement. Humans continued to play chess after IBM's Deep Blue defeated Garry Kasparov in 1997. Instead, with the help of AI trainers, human chess masters improved more than ever, and for a brief while, human-AI teams known as "centaurs" surpassed both players and computers. Similar to how it helped train the world's greatest bankers, warriors, and detectives. However, the issue with all of these new positions is that they are likely to need a high degree of knowledge and won't address the issues faced by unskilled workers who are currently out of work. It can be simpler to create new positions for people than to retrain people to do those tasks. People could often move from one regular low-skill job to another in earlier automation waves. A farm laborer who was laid off in 1920 as a result of the mechanization of agriculture may find employment at a factory that made tractors. An unemployed manufacturing worker in 1980 may begin working as a supermarket cashier. The transition from the farm to the factory and from the factory to the supermarket needed relatively little retraining, making such professional shifts possible.

However, a cashier or textile worker who is replaced by a robot in the year 2050 would rarely be able to start a new profession as a cancer researcher, a drone pilot, or a member of a human-AI banking team. They won't possess the requisite abilities. Sending millions of untrained conscripts to charge machine guns and perish by the hundreds during the First World War made sense. Their specific talents didn't really matter. In spite of the current scarcity of drone pilots and data analysts, the US Air Force is reluctant to hire Walmart dropouts to fill the shortages. You wouldn't want a new recruit to mistake a wedding in

Afghanistan for a high-level Taliban meeting. As a result, despite the emergence of several new human professions, we could yet see the emergence of a new class of people who are "useless." With rising unemployment and a lack of competent workers, we could truly experience the worst of both situations. Many individuals could experience the same fate as nineteenth-century horses, who were gradually driven out of the labor market completely rather than nineteenth-century wagon drivers, who transitioned to operating taxis.

Furthermore, as machine learning and robotics advance, no human employment will ever be secure from the danger of automation in the future. The flying of drones may have been automated by the time a forty-year-old jobless Walmart cashier manages to reinvent herself as a drone pilot; yet, ten years from now she may need to do it once again. Additionally, this unpredictability will make it more difficult to establish unions or protect workers' rights. Numerous new positions in developed countries now entail unprotected temporary employment, freelancing, and one-time assignments. Similar to these teams, human-computer centaur teams are more likely to be characterized by an ongoing struggle between the people and the computers than by a lasting alliance. Teams made up just of people, like Sherlock Holmes and Dr. Watson, often establish enduring rituals and hierarchies. But a human investigator working with IBM's Watson computer system which rose to fame after taking home the 2011 Jeopardy! Trophy will discover that every routine invites disruption and every hierarchy invites revolution. The assistant from yesterday may become the superintendent of tomorrow, and every year all procedures and manuals will need to be updated.

On December 7, 2017, a significant achievement was made when Google's Alpha Zero algorithm beat the Stock fish 8 program, not when a computer defeated a person in chess, which is already old news. 2016's top computer chess player was Stock fish 8. It had access to decades of computer expertise as well as millennia of combined human and machine chess knowledge. It could determine 70 million different chess positions per second. Alpha Zero, on the other hand, only completed 80,000 of these computations per second, and its human designers never even taught it how to play traditional openings. Instead, Alpha Zero played chess against itself while using the most recent machine learning techniques to teach itself the game. Nevertheless, the inexperienced Alpha Zero managed to draw 72 games and win 28, out of a total of 100 matches versus Stock fish. It never lost a game. Since Alpha Zero had no instruction from any humans, many of its successful maneuvers and tactics were novel to us. They may be regarded as imaginative, if not outright brilliant. Can you determine how long it took Alpha Zero to study the game of chess from scratch, get ready for the competition with Stock fish, and hone its brilliant intuition? Four hours. Not a typo, that. Chess was revered for many years as one of the pinnacles of human intellect. Without the aid of any human mentor, Alpha Zero progressed from complete ignorance to creative expertise in four hours.

CONCLUSION

The interconnectivity of physical and cognitive activity and its important effects on human performance and wellbeing are highlighted in this study. It is clear that attaining desired results in a variety of disciplines depends on finding the ideal balance and integrating these two forms of effort. Demands on the body and the mind may interact, with excessive physical activity having a detrimental influence on cognitive performance and vice versa. Therefore, while developing work settings and activities, a holistic approach is required, taking into account the physical and cognitive aspects and any possible interactions. Organizations may increase productivity, efficiency, and employee happiness by encouraging physical health and fitness, offering chances for cognitive stimulation and skill development, and creating supportive work environments. Given the changing nature of work and the dynamic demands on people in the contemporary period, future study should continue examining this complex

link. In the end, a holistic view of work that emphasizes the value of mental and physical health is essential for encouraging the best performance and general well-being.

REFERENCES

- [1] L. Witlox, S. B. Schagen, M. B. De Ruiter, M. I. Geerlings, P. H. M. Peeters, E. W. Koevoets, E. Van Der Wall, M. Stuver, G. Sonke, M. J. Velthuis, J. A. M. V. Der Palen, J. J. Jobsen, A. M. May, and E. M. Monninkhof, "Effect of physical exercise on cognitive function and brain measures after chemotherapy in patients with breast cancer (PAM study): Protocol of a randomised controlled trial," *BMJ Open*, 2019, doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2018-028117.
- [2] R. Afrina and A. Karimah, "Cognitive Behavioral Therapy for Chronic Pain," *Biomol. Heal. Sci. J.*, 2019, doi: 10.20473/bhsj.v2i2.14963.
- [3] S. J. Hartman, L. S. Weiner, L. Natarajan, D. D. Sears, B. W. Palmer, B. Parker, T. Ahles, M. L. Irwin, and K. Au, "A randomized trial of physical activity for cognitive functioning in breast cancer survivors: Rationale and study design of I Can! Improving Cognition After Cancer," *Contemp. Clin. Trials*, 2021, doi: 10.1016/j.cct.2021.106289.
- [4] S. Chanda and R. Mishra, "Impact of transition in work status and social participation on cognitive performance among elderly in India," *BMC Geriatr.*, 2019, doi: 10.1186/s12877-019-1261-5.
- [5] L. Sargent, M. Nalls, E. J. Amella, P. W. Slattum, M. Mueller, S. Bandinelli, Q. Tian, T. Swift-Scanlan, S. K. Lageman, and A. Singleton, "Shared mechanisms for cognitive impairment and physical frailty: A model for complex systems," *Alzheimer's Dement. Transl. Res. Clin. Interv.*, 2020, doi: 10.1002/trc2.12027.
- [6] S. Fox, A. Kotelba, and I. Niskanen, "Cognitive factories: Modeling situated entropy in physical work carried out by humans and robots," *Entropy*, 2018, doi: 10.3390/e20090659.
- [7] G. E. Giles, L. Hasselquist, C. M. Caruso, and M. D. Eddy, "Load carriage and physical exertion influence cognitive control in military scenarios," *Med. Sci. Sports Exerc.*, 2019, doi: 10.1249/MSS.0000000000002085.
- [8] J. W. Santrock, "A Topical Approach to Life-span Development," McGrawHill. 2018.
- [9] A. L. Gyllensten, L. N. Jacobsen, and G. Gard, "Clinician perspectives of Basic Body Awareness Therapy (BBAT) in mental health physical therapy: An international qualitative study," *J. Bodyw. Mov. Ther.*, 2019, doi: 10.1016/j.jbmt.2019.04.012.
- [10] D. Suma, J. Meng, B. J. Edelman, and B. He, "Spatial-temporal aspects of continuous EEG-based neurobotic control," *J. Neural Eng.*, 2020, doi: 10.1088/1741-2552/abc0b4.
- [11] M. Wu, X. Liang, S. Lu, and Z. Wang, "Infant motor and cognitive abilities and subsequent executive function," *Infant Behav. Dev.*, 2017, doi: 10.1016/j.infbeh.2017.09.005.

CHAPTER 3

A BRIEF DISCUSSION ON UNIVERSAL

Dr. Raja Sankaran, Associate Professor,
Department of Marketing, CMS Business School, Jain (Deemed to be University), Bangalore,
Karnataka, India,
Email Id:dr.raja_sankaran@cms.ac.in

ABSTRACT:

This paper examines the idea of universality and seeks to provide readers a thorough knowledge of what is meant by the term. Philosophy, science, and culture are only a few of the areas that the word "universal" covers. This chapter explores the fundamental ideas and traits that characterize universality by examining various viewpoints and instances. It also looks at the implications and restrictions of universality in various circumstances.

KEYWORDS:

Economic, Human, Labour Market, Universal.

INTRODUCTION

There is more creative software than Alpha Zero. Today, several computer programs consistently beat human chess players, not only in terms of pure computation but also in terms of "creativity." Judges in human-only chess competitions are continuously on the watch for players who attempt to cheat by covertly using computers to assist them. It's possible to spot cheaters by keeping an eye on how original the gamers are. When they play a particularly inventive move, the judges often assume that it was generated by a machine rather than a person. Creativity is already more the domain of machines than people, at least in the game of chess! We are thus properly informed that the canary is dying if chess is our coal mine canary. In the future, human-AI teams in police, medical, and finance may experience what is now occurring with chess teams composed of both humans and machines [1]–[3].

Consequently, it won't be a one-time endeavor to create new occupations and retrain people to fill them. The AI revolution won't be a single watershed event that leads directly to a new equilibrium in the labor market. Instead, a series of progressively larger disturbances will occur. Few workers nowadays anticipate remaining in the same position for the rest of their careers. Not merely the concept of "a job for life," but even the concept of "a profession for life," may look antiquated by the year 2050. We may ask if the typical person would have the emotional fortitude required for a life of such frequent upheavals, even if we could continually create new employment and retrain the workforce. Change is always difficult, and the fast-paced early twenty-first century has led to an epidemic of stress on a worldwide scale. Would individuals be able to handle the rising unpredictability of the labor market and of individual careers? To stop the Sapiens mind from exploding, we would definitely require significantly more potent stress-reduction methods, like as medicines, neuro-feedback, and meditation. By 2050, a class that is "useless" may arise due to lacking mental fortitude as well as a complete absence of employment opportunities and a lack of suitable education.

Of course, much of this is simply conjecture. Automation has impacted several sectors at the time of writing (early 2018), but it hasn't led to a significant increase in unemployment. In truth, unemployment is at a record low in several nations, including the USA. Nobody can predict with certainty what effects automation and machine learning will have on various professions in the future, and it is extremely difficult to predict when these developments will occur, especially given that they depend as heavily on societal norms and political decisions as they do on technological advancements alone. Politicians and customers may therefore continue to oppose the transition for years, if not decades, even after self-driving cars are shown to be safer and more affordable than human drivers.

We cannot, however, allow us to get smug. Simply assuming that there will be enough employment creation to offset any losses is risky. It is in no way certain that it will occur again in the twenty-first century under the very different circumstances from past waves of automation. Despite the minimal likelihood of systemic mass unemployment, we should take the possible social and political upheavals extremely seriously. The Industrial Revolution of the nineteenth century brought up new circumstances and issues that no current social, economic, or political models could address. Traditional faiths, feudalism, and monarchy were not designed to handle the management of industrial metropolises, millions of displaced workers, or the dynamic character of the contemporary economy. Humanity was forced to create whole new models as a result, including liberal democracies, communist dictatorships, and fascist regimes. It took more than a century of horrible wars and revolutions to test these models, sort the good ideas from the bad, and put the best ones into practice. The Great Ukrainian Famine of 1932–1933, the First World War, and child labor in Dickensian coal mines made up just a tiny portion of the tuition that humanity had to pay [4], [5].

The challenge that information and biotechnology offer to humanity in the twenty-first century is perhaps considerably greater than the task that steam engines, railways, and electricity faced in the preceding period. We simply cannot afford any more failed experiments, wars, or violent revolutions given the huge destructive force of our civilization. This time, the flawed models might lead to nuclear wars, genetically modified monsters, and the total destruction of the environment. As a result, we must improve upon how we handled the Industrial Revolution. There are three broad categories of potential solutions: what to do to stop jobs from being lost; what to do to generate enough new employment; and what to do if, in spite of our best efforts, job losses still outpace job creation. Because it would involve giving up the enormous positive potential of AI and robots, preventing job losses completely is an undesirable and perhaps impossible plan.

To mitigate the consequent shocks and provide time for readjustments, governments may yet choose to consciously restrict the speed of automation. Technology is never deterministic, and just because something is technically possible, it doesn't imply that it has to be done. Even if a new technology is economically and commercially feasible, government regulation may nonetheless effectively stop it. For instance, we have had the capacity to establish a market for human organs for many years, replete with human "body farms" in developing nations and an almost insatiable demand from wealthy customers in need. These "body farms" may be worth several hundred billions of dollars. Regulated trading in human body parts is nonetheless prohibited, and while there is a black market for organs, it is far smaller and more restricted than one would have anticipated.

We may have time to develop enough new employment to offset the majority of the job losses if we could slow the pace of change. But as was already said, a revolution in psychology and education will need to go hand in hand with economic enterprise. If the new occupations aren't merely government sinecures, they'll probably need a high degree of competence, and as AI advances, human workers will have to constantly pick up new skills and switch careers. Governments will need to intervene, both by funding a sector for lifelong learning and by offering a safety net for the unavoidable times of change. A forty-year-old former drone pilot may need significant government assistance to support herself and her family during that period if it takes her three years to reinvent herself as a creator of virtual worlds. In Scandinavia, where governments live by the adage "protect workers, not jobs," this sort of program is now being pioneered.

However, it is far from certain if billions of individuals could continuously reinvent themselves without losing their mental equilibrium, even if sufficient government assistance is provided. Therefore, if a significant portion of humanity is excluded from the labor force despite all of our efforts, we would need to look at new scenarios for post-work communities, post-work economies, and post-work politics. Realizing that the social, economic, and political structures we have inherited from the past are unable to meet this challenge is the first step. Think about communism, for instance. One can speculate that communism might return as automation threatens to topple the capitalist system. However, communism was not designed to capitalize on that type of disaster. The working class was seen as essential to the economy by communist intellectuals in the 20th century, and they attempted to educate the proletariat how to convert its enormous economic strength into political weight. A working-class revolution was required under the communist political program. How applicable will these lessons be if the people no longer have economic worth and must fight irrelevance rather than exploitation? Without a working class, how can a working-class revolution be started?

Some could counter that even if humans can't compete with AI at work, they will always be required as consumers, therefore they can never become economically obsolete. Even as customers, it is far from assured that we will be required by the future economy. Computers and machines might also do it. Theoretically, an economy might exist in which a mining company produced and sold iron to a robotics company, the latter produced and sold robots to the mining company, which then mined more iron and used it to make more robots, and so on. These businesses don't even require people to purchase their goods; all they need are robots and computers to flourish and spread to the outer reaches of the cosmos. In fact, computers and algorithms are already starting to serve as customers in addition to being creators. For instance, algorithms are becoming the most significant purchasers of bonds, shares, and commodities on the stock market.

Similar to this, an algorithm the Google search algorithm is the most important client in the advertising industry. Instead of designing websites with the preferences of actual people in mind, many web designers adhere to the preferences of the Google search algorithm. Since algorithms are plainly not sentient, they are unable to appreciate the products they purchase and their choices are not influenced by feelings and experiences like human customers are. Google's search engine is unable to taste ice cream.

Algorithms choose items based on internal calculations and predetermined preferences, and these preferences are shaping our reality more and more. When it comes to rating the Web sites of ice cream sellers, the Google search algorithm has a highly refined taste, and the most successful ice cream merchants worldwide are those that the Google algorithm ranks first - not those who make the finest ice cream. This is something I can personally attest to. The publishers want me to create a brief summary for them to utilize as internet publicity once I publish a book. However, they have a unique specialist that customizes my writing to the preferences of the Google algorithm. The expert reviews my content and suggests that I use another term for this one. The Google algorithm will then pay us greater attention [6]–[8].

DISCUSSION

What will ensure humans' physical survival and psychological wellbeing if they are no longer required as consumers or producers? We must explore for solutions now rather than waiting for the situation to reach its peak. It will be too late by then. We must create new social and economic models as soon as possible if we are to survive the extraordinary technological and economic shocks of the twenty-first century. Instead of safeguarding employment, these models should be based on the idea of protecting people. Many occupations are boring slogs that aren't worth preserving. Cashiers are not anyone's ideal career. We should prioritize meeting people's fundamental needs and defending their social standing and self-worth. One innovative option that is attracting more and more attention is universal basic income. UBI advocates taxing the businesses and billionaires in charge of the algorithms and robots and using the proceeds to provide each individual a large allowance that will take care of their fundamental necessities. By doing this, the affluent will be shielded from populist wrath while the poor would be protected from job loss and economic disruption.

A similar approach suggests extending the spectrum of human activities that are regarded as "jobs." Currently, billions of people take care of their children, their neighbors watch out for one another, and their fellow citizens run their towns, yet none of these important tasks are recognized as employment. Perhaps we need to make a mental shift and acknowledge that raising children is possibly the most essential and difficult job in the world. If this is the case, there won't be a labor shortage even if robots and computers take the position of every driver, banker, and lawyer. Who would assess and compensate for these newly recognized employment is the obvious issue. It seems likely that the government will have to handle this as newborns under six months old won't be able to support their mothers on a paycheck.

The eventual outcome will be similar to universal basic income, assuming that we would want these incomes to meet all of a family's essential requirements. Governments may instead subsidize universal basic services in place of revenue. Instead of providing individuals money so they may spend it whatever they like, the government might subsidize free services like transportation, healthcare, and education. In actuality, this is communism's idealistic goal. Even if the communist strategy of inciting a working-class revolution may be out of date, shouldn't we nevertheless try to achieve the communist objective in other ways?

It is controversial whether providing everyone with universal basic services (the communist paradise) or universal basic income (the capitalist paradise) is preferable. There are benefits and cons to each choice. The true challenge, though, is in defining what "universal" and "basic," regardless of whose paradise you select. People often refer to national basic support when they talk about universal basic assistance, whether it takes the form of cash or services. Up until now, all UBI ideas have only been national or local. Finland launched a two-year experiment in January 2017 that would provide 2,000 jobless Finns 560 euros each month,

whether or whether they find employment. The Canadian state of Ontario, the Italian city of Livorno, and many Dutch cities are all doing similar initiatives [9]–[11].

Voters in Switzerland rejected the proposal of implementing a national basic income program in a referendum the country conducted in 2016. However, the biggest victims of automation may not reside in Finland, Ontario, Livorno, or Amsterdam, which is the issue with such national and local programs. People in one nation are now completely reliant on markets in other countries due to globalization, but automation threatens to dismantle significant portions of this global commerce network, which would be terrible for the weakest connections. Developing nations without access to natural resources gained economic growth in the 20th century mostly by exporting the unskilled labor of their workforce.

Today, millions of Bangladeshis make a livelihood by manufacturing shirts and selling them to clients in the United States, while Bangalore residents make a living by working in contact centers that handle customer service issues from Americans. But the need of cheap, unskilled labor would diminish significantly with the development of AI, robotics, and 3-D printers. You could purchase the shirt's code online from Amazon and have it printed in New York, as opposed to producing the garment in Dhaka and transporting it all the way to the US. Brooklyn 3-D printing facilities might take the place of the Zara and Prada storefronts on Fifth Avenue, and some individuals could even have a printer at home. Simultaneously, you may speak with an AI agent in the Google cloud whose accent and tone of voice are customized to your tastes rather than phoning customer support in Bangalore to complain about your printer. How can the recently laid-off employees and contact center agents in Bangalore and Dhaka survive without the education needed to convert to creating stylish clothes or writing computer code?

If artificial intelligence (AI) and 3-D printers do actually replace Bangladeshis and Bengalis, the money that formerly went to South Asia will suddenly fill the coffers of a few IT companies in California. We could see enormous new riches being produced in innovation areas like Silicon Valley, while many underdeveloped nations collapse, rather than economic progress improving circumstances throughout the globe. Of fact, some developing nations, like Bangladesh and India, may develop quickly enough to join the victorious squad. Given enough time, the descendants of contact center agents and textile workers may one day become the engineers and business owners who create and own computers and 3-D printers. But there isn't much longer to do this transformation. Cheap, unskilled labor has historically provided a safe bridge over the global economic gap, and even if a nation made sluggish progress, it might anticipate reaching safety someday. Making the appropriate moves was more crucial than moving quickly. However, the bridge is now trembling and might soon fall. Those who have already made the transition from low-skilled work to high-skilled work will probably be okay. However, those who fall behind can end themselves stranded on the incorrect side of the gap with no way to cross. What do you do when no one wants your cheap, unskilled laborers and you lack the funds to establish a top-notch educational system and impart fresh knowledge to them?

What will happen to the stragglers after that? It is conceivable that American voters would agree that the taxes paid by Google and Amazon for their US operations might be utilized to provide stipends or free services to unemployed taxi workers in New York and unemployed miners in Pennsylvania. Would American voters, however, also agree that these taxes should be used to help jobless people in nations President Trump has referred to as "shithole countries"? If you hold that view, you may as well think that the issue will be resolved by Santa Claus and the Easter Bunny. Basic human needs are supposed to be met through universal basic assistance, yet there is no agreed-upon definition of what that entails. A

Sapiens only need 1,500–2,500 calories per day to exist from a biological standpoint. Any extra is a luxury. But every society throughout history has classified extra necessities as "basic" if they go above and beyond this biological poverty level. Because church services attended to one's immortal soul rather than their transient body, they were valued in medieval Europe even more than availability to food. In modern Europe, adequate healthcare and education are seen as fundamental human rights, and others contend that even Internet connection is now necessary for every man, woman, and kid. How would they define "basic" if the United World Government decides to tax Google, Amazon, Baidu, and Tencent in 2050 to give basic support for every person on earth, in Dhaka as well as in Detroit?

What does fundamental education, for instance, consist of just reading and writing, or also developing computer code and playing the violin? Six years of primary school or all the way to a PhD? How about medical care? Will all 10 billion people on the earth have access to the new medicines if by 2050 medical advancements allow for the major extension of human lifespans and the slowing of aging processes, or will only a select few billionaires have access to them? If biotechnology makes it possible for parents to upgrade their offspring, would this be seen as a fundamental human need, or would we witness the biological classes of humanity separating, with wealthy superhumans possessing capacities much superior to those of lowly Homo sapiens?

Regardless of how you define "basic human needs," once they are made available to everyone without charge, they will be taken for granted. At that point, fierce social competitions and political conflicts will center on extravagances such as access to virtual reality parks, fancy self-driving cars, or improved bioengineered bodies. However, it is difficult to see how the jobless masses could possibly aspire to acquire such pleasures if they do not command any economic possessions. As a result, the wealth disparity between the wealthy (Tencent management and Google stockholders) and the poor (those reliant on UBI) may not only widen but also become unbridgeable. Therefore, even if a universal assistance program in 2050 gives the poor considerably greater access to healthcare and education than they have now, they could still be quite irate about the world's inequality and the absence of social mobility. People will believe that the government only works for the super-rich, that the system is biased against them, and that their children's and their own futures will only become worse.

Humans are just not designed for contentment. Happiness in humans is more influenced by our own expectations than by external circumstances. However, expectations often change in response to circumstances, especially other people's circumstances. Expectations soar as things go better, thus even significant changes in circumstances could leave us feeling unsatisfied as before. Aiming to improve the objective circumstances of the ordinary person in 2050, universal basic assistance has a decent likelihood of being successful. However, it is likely to fall short if its goal is to reduce subjective dissatisfaction and increase subjective happiness.

Universal basic assistance will need to be complemented with some worthwhile activities, such as sports or religion, in order to really accomplish its aims. Israel has hosted what may be the most effective experiment to date on how to have a happy life after leaving the workforce. Nearly half of the ultraOrthodox Jewish males there never work. They devote their whole life to studying the sacred texts and carrying out religious rites. They and their families don't go hungry in part because the women often work and in part because the government generously subsidizes them and offers them free services, ensuring that they have access to the needs of life. That is unconditional fundamental support in its purest form.

These ultra-Orthodox Jewish males claim the highest levels of life happiness of any group in Israeli society, despite being destitute and jobless. This is a result of their strong sense of community, as well as the profound significance they get from reading the Bible and engaging in rituals. A tiny room filled with Jewish men debating the Talmud may provide more happiness, interest, and understanding than a big textile sweatshop full of toiling industrial workers. Israel often ranks among the top countries in the world for life happiness, in part because of the contribution of these impoverished, unemployed individuals.

Israelis who identify as secular often and vehemently criticize the ultra-Orthodox for not doing enough for society and for living off the labor of others. Israelis who identify as secular often claim that the ultra-Orthodox lifestyle is unsustainable, particularly given that these families typically have seven children. The state won't be able to sustain this many jobless people forever, and eventually the ultra-Orthodox will need to find employment. However, it may be the exact opposite. The ultra-Orthodox Jews may end up being recognized as the model of the future rather than a dinosaur from the past as robots and AI drive people out of the labor market.

Not everyone will convert to Judaism and enroll in yeshivas to learn the Talmud. However, in everyone's life, the search for community and purpose may take precedence over the search for employment. Losing our employment to algorithms could potentially prove to be a benefit if we can manage to combine a global economic safety net with vibrant communities and worthwhile endeavors. The situation where we lose control of our life, however, is considerably frightening. Despite the threat of widespread unemployment, we should be more concerned about the transition of power from people to algorithms, which might shatter any residual confidence in the liberal narrative and pave the path for the emergence of digital dictatorships [12], [13].

CONCLUSION

The idea of universality has several facets, spans disciplines, and includes general concepts and traits. In philosophy, universal truths or principles are those that apply independently of one's own viewpoint or cultural background. In science, universality often refers to underlying principles or hypotheses that hold true regardless of the kind of physical phenomenon. Similar patterns, attitudes, or behaviors that are shared by several civilizations are referred to as cultural universals. Recognizing the constraints of universality is crucial because it offers a framework for comprehending and generalizing information. The understanding and application of universal principles may be influenced by contextual elements and human differences. It is important to remember that universality is a dynamic idea that develops as a result of new knowledge, viewpoints, and cultural shifts rather than being absolute or unchangeable. It promotes multidisciplinary research and a wider perspective on the world. To guarantee a nuanced and culturally informed interpretation, it is crucial to approach universality with critical thought and understanding of its limits.

REFERENCES

- [1] Equality and Human Rights Commission, "What is the Universal Declaration of Human Rights?," *Equal. Hum. Rights Comm.*, 2018.
- [2] K. Chládková and N. Paillereau, "The What and When of Universal Perception: A Review of Early Speech Sound Acquisition," *Language Learning*. 2020. doi: 10.1111/lang.12422.

- [3] T. O’Connell, K. Rasanathan, and M. Chopra, “What does universal health coverage mean?,” *The Lancet*. 2014. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(13)60955-1.
- [4] M. Francese and D. Prady, “What is universal basic income?,” *Finance and Development*. 2018.
- [5] E. Dąbrowska, “What exactly is Universal Grammar, and has anyone seen it?,” *Frontiers in Psychology*. 2015. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2015.00852.
- [6] W. H. Organisation, “WHO: What Is Universal Coverage?,” *World Health Organization*. 2016.
- [7] R. Hasdell, “What We Know About Universal Basic Income: A Cross-Synthesis of Reviews,” *Stanford Basic Income Lab*, 2020.
- [8] P. Cairney, S. Russell, and E. S. Denny, “The ‘Scottish approach’ to policy and policymaking: what issues are territorial and what are universal?,” *Policy Polit.*, 2016, doi: 10.1332/030557315X14353331264538.
- [9] G. S. Forrester and M. S. C. Thomas, “What is universal and what differs in language development?,” *Language, Cognition and Neuroscience*. 2015. doi: 10.1080/23273798.2015.1055281.
- [10] R. Null, “What Is Universal Design?,” in *Universal Design*, 2013. doi: 10.1201/b15580-3.
- [11] S. A. Mehr *et al.*, “Universality and diversity in human song,” *Science (80-.)*, 2019, doi: 10.1126/science.aax0868.
- [12] National Disability Authority, “What is Universal Design | Centre for Excellence in Universal Design,” *The Centre for Excellence in Universal Design*, 2019.
- [13] Hasdell Rebecca, “What We Know About Universal Basic Income,” *Stanford Basic Income Lab*, 2020.

CHAPTER 4

ROLE OF LIBERTY IN 21ST CENTURY

Prof. Suparna Ghosal, Adjunct Faculty,
Department of Marketing, CMS Business School, Jain (Deemed to be University), Bangalore,
Karnataka, India,
Email Id: suparna.ghosal@cms.ac.in

ABSTRACT:

In democratic countries, liberty is often seen as a basic value that includes people's ability to exercise their rights, make decisions, and pursue their own interests. Throughout history, this idea has been the focus of intellectual, political, and legal debate. The abstract idea of liberty, its multiple facets, and its importance in modern society are all explored. We may better comprehend the significance of liberty for both individuals and society at large by exploring the fundamental ideas and arguments around it.

KEYWORDS:

Artificial Intelligence, Algorithm, Human, Individual Freedom, Liberty.

INTRODUCTION

The liberal narrative values human liberty above anything else. It makes the case that all power ultimately derives from people's own free will, which is manifested in their thoughts, emotions, and decisions. Liberals think that voters are the ones who understand politics the best. Consequently, it supports democratic elections. Liberalism holds that the consumer is always correct in terms of economics. Consequently, it applauds free-market ideals. As long as they do not infringe on the freedoms of others, liberalism encourages individuals to listen to themselves, be loyal to themselves, and follow their emotions in personal affairs. Human rights maintain this individual freedom.

Today, the word "liberal" is frequently employed in Western political discourse to refer to those who favor certain issues like homosexual marriage, gun control, and abortion. However, the majority of so-called conservatives also subscribe to a liberal worldview. Republicans and Democrats should periodically take a break from their heated arguments to remind themselves that they all agree on principles like free elections, an independent judiciary, and human rights. This is especially true in the United States. It is also important to keep in mind that right-wing icons like Margaret Thatcher and Ronald Reagan were staunch supporters of both individual and economic liberty. There is no such thing as society, Thatcher famously said in an interview in 1987. There is a "living tapestry of men and women," and "how much each of us is willing to take responsibility for we will determine the quality of our lives."

Conservative Party members who are Thatcher's successors completely agree with the Labor Party that each voter's thoughts, decisions, and free will are what give politics its legitimacy. Prime Minister David Cameron did not consult Queen Elizabeth II, the Archbishop of Canterbury, or the dons of Oxford and Cambridge when it came time for Britain to determine whether or not to quit the EU. He didn't even consult the lawmakers. Instead, he staged a referendum, asking every Briton, "What do you think about it?"

You can protest that respondents were questioned on their thoughts rather on their feelings, but this is a typical misunderstanding. Elections and referendums are never about human reason; they are always about human sentiments. Giving everyone the same voting rights, or even any voting rights, would be completely pointless if democracy were a question of logical decision-making. There is much evidence to suggest that some individuals are significantly more informed and logical than others, especially when it comes to certain economic and political issues. Following the Brexit decision, renowned scientist Richard Dawkins expressed disapproval, arguing that the great majority of the British population, including himself, should not have been let to participate in the referendum because they lacked the required knowledge of politics and economics. You may as well ask the public to vote on which runway the pilot should land on or hold a national referendum to determine if Einstein correctly applied algebra.

However, elections and referendums do not reflect our opinions, for better or worse. They deal with our emotions. And neither Einstein nor Dawkins are superior to anybody else when it comes to sentiments. Democracy is based on the premise that, despite some individuals being cleverer than others, all people are equally free and that human sentiments are a reflection of a deep and enigmatic "free will." An uneducated maid has free will just like Einstein and Richard Dawkins, thus on election day, her sentiments, as expressed by her vote, matter just as much as anybody else's. Not only do people follow their emotions, but so do leaders. Boris Johnson and Michael Gove led the Leave campaign in the 2016 Brexit vote. Gove originally backed Johnson for the role of premier when David Cameron resigned, but at the very last second, Gove proclaimed Johnson unsuitable for the office and stated his own intention to compete for the position. It was said that Gove's conduct, which eliminated Johnson's hopes, was a Machiavellian political murder[1], [2].

However, Gove justified his actions by touching on his emotions, saying, "At every turn in my political career, I have asked myself one question: "What is the proper thing to do? What is your heart trying to tell you? According to Gove, he has worked so hard to support Brexit and felt obliged to turn on his former colleague Boris Johnson and run for the top spot himself because his heart urged him to. This dependence on the emotions may end up being liberal democracy's downfall. Democratic politics will change into an emotional puppet show as soon as someone (in Beijing or San Francisco) has the technical capacity to hack and control the human heart [3], [4].

Take the Algorithm's Advice

The liberal view of people's emotions and autonomy is neither organic nor particularly old. For thousands of years, people held the view that power stemmed from divine rules rather than from the heart and that, as a result, we should honor God's word rather than individual freedom. It wasn't until recent times when people rather than heavenly deities became the source of power. Soon, power might once again transfer from people to algorithms. Similar to how human power was justified by the liberal tale and divine authority by religious mythology, the impending technological revolution may establish the authority of Big Data algorithms while weakening the whole concept of individual freedom.

As we said in the last chapter, scientific discoveries about the functioning of our brains and bodies imply that neither our sentiments nor any aspect of "free will" that is peculiar to humans are spiritual qualities. Instead, sentiments are physiological processes that all

mammals and birds employ to swiftly determine their chances of surviving and procreating. Feelings are based on calculation, not intuition, inspiration, or freedom.

Millions of neurons in the brain quickly analyze the pertinent information and determine that there is a high likelihood of death when a monkey, mouse, or human encounters a snake. When other biochemical algorithms determine that a nearby person provides a high likelihood of successful mating, social bonding, or some other desired objective, feelings of sexual attraction start to develop. Neural processes that have developed to support social collaboration are the source of moral emotions like wrath, shame, and forgiveness. Through millions of years of evolution, all of these molecular algorithms have been refined. If an old ancestor's sentiments were incorrect, the genes that shaped those feelings did not transfer to the next generation. Since emotions represent evolutionary rationality, they are not the antithesis of reason.

Most of the time, we are unaware that sensations are really computations since they happen so quickly and below our awareness threshold. We mistakenly think that our aversion to snakes, our choice of sexual partners, or our views on the European Union are the result of some enigmatic "free will" because we can't feel the millions of neurons in the brain that calculate the likelihood of survival and reproduction. Even if liberalism is mistaken in believing that our emotions are a reflection of our free will, up until recently, focusing on emotions made a lot of sense from a practical standpoint. Our sentiments were the finest way in the world for choosing what to study, who to marry, and which political party to support despite the fact that they were neither magical nor free. And no external system could ever expect to comprehend my emotions as well as I do. Even if the Spanish Inquisition or the Soviet KGB spied on me round-the-clock, they lacked the biological expertise and computational capacity required to interfere with the physiological processes influencing my desires and decisions. Practically speaking, it was plausible to assert that I had free will since my will was mostly influenced by the interaction of inner forces that no one outside of me could observe. While others could never really comprehend what was going on inside of me or how I made choices, I could take pleasure in the illusion that I was in charge of my own inner arena.

Thus, liberalism was right to advise people to listen to their hearts rather than those of a cleric or party official. However, soon computer algorithms may be able to advise you better than human emotions. 'Free will' will probably be shown as a fallacy, and liberalism could lose its usefulness when the Spanish Inquisition and the KGB give way to Google and Baidu. We are now at the intersection of two enormous revolutions. On the one hand, scientists are solving the puzzles surrounding the human body, particularly the brain and emotions. At the same time, computer scientists are providing us data processing capacity that has never been seen before. The power will likely move from people to machines when the biotech and InfoTech revolutions combine, creating Big Data algorithms that can monitor and comprehend my sentiments far better than I can. As I often interact with organizations, businesses, and governmental bodies that comprehend and control what was previously my inaccessible inner sphere, my illusion of free choice is likely to crumble.

In the world of medicine, this has already begun to occur. The most significant medical choices we ever make are based not on our perceptions of health or disease, nor even on our doctor's expert forecasts, but rather on computer computations that have a far deeper

understanding of our biology than we do. Within a few decades, Big Data algorithms might continuously monitor our health thanks to a steady influx of biometric data. Long before we feel ill, they may spot the very early stages of Alzheimer's illness, cancer, or influenza. They might then suggest suitable therapies, diets, and daily routines that were created specifically for each of us individual bodies, DNA, and personalities.

DISCUSSION

People will have access to the finest healthcare in human history, yet precisely because of this, they will likely be unwell all the time. In the body, there is always some kind of issue. It's never too late to make improvements. As long as you didn't experience discomfort or had a visible impairment like a limp, you used to feel totally well. But by 2050, illnesses may be identified and treated before they cause discomfort or incapacity, due to biometric sensors and Big Data algorithms. As a consequence, you will constantly be acting as if you have some kind of "medical condition" and should heed this or that algorithmic advice. Why should they bear the cost of your stubbornness if your medical insurance could lapse or your employer might fire you as a result of your refusal?

It is one thing to continue smoking despite widespread research linking the habit to lung cancer. To keep smoking in spite of a clear warning from a biometric sensor that has recently found 17 malignant cells in your upper left lung is quite another. If you choose to ignore the sensor, what will you do when it notifies your insurance company, your boss, and your mother? Who will have the time and resources to handle all of these illnesses? Most likely, we could just tell our health algorithm to handle the majority of these issues as it sees appropriate. The best it will do is periodically update our iPhones with the information that "seventeen cancerous cells were detected and destroyed." The majority of us will ignore these updates, just as we ignore those obtrusive anti-virus alerts on our PCs, while hypochondriacs may obediently read them.

The drama of choosing decisions

What is starting to happen in medicine will probably continue to happen in additional professions. The most important development is the biometric sensor, which may be worn on or within the body and transforms biological processes into electrical data that computers can store and analyze. External data-processing systems are capable of hacking all of your wants, judgments, and views if they have access to sufficient biometric data and computational capacity. They may be fully aware of your identity.

Most individuals have a poor understanding of who they are. I lived in denial for many years before realizing I was homosexual when I was twenty-one. That's not very unusual. Many homosexual guys struggle with their sexuality throughout their whole adolescent years. Consider the scenario in 2050, when an algorithm will be able to pinpoint a teen's precise place on the gay/straight spectrum. Perhaps the program presents you with images or videos of beautiful men and women, monitors your blood pressure, brain activity, and eye movements, and within five minutes ejects a Kinsey scale score. It may have spared me many years of misery. Perhaps you personally wouldn't want to take such a test, but let's say you find yourself at Michelle's uninteresting birthday party with a group of friends, and someone suggests you all take turns testing yourself using this neat new algorithm with everyone watching the results and leaving comments on them.

Even if you manage to conceal from yourself and your classmates, Amazon, Alibaba, or the secret police won't be able to find you. The algorithms will covertly track you while you browse the Internet, watch YouTube, or read your social media feed. They will then analyze

you and suggest to Coca-Cola that if it wants to sell you a fizzy drink, it should use the shirtless male in the advertising rather than the shirtless lady. No one will even know. However, they will be aware, and this knowledge will be very valuable. Then then, maybe everything will be transparent, and individuals will be happy to contribute their data in order to get better suggestions and, ultimately, have the algorithm make choices for them. Simple decisions like selecting a movie to watch are where it all begins. To begin a relaxing evening in front of the TV with your pals, you must first decide what to watch. In contrast to fifty years ago, when there was little to no option, thousands of titles are now accessible because to the growth of view-on-demand services. It might be difficult to come to a consensus when Jack enjoys romantic comedies, Jill favors intellectual French movies, and you yourself adore science fiction thrillers. You could choose a subpar B-movie in the end, disappointing everyone.

An algorithm might be useful. The computer may then determine the ideal match for the group based on its enormous statistical database after you tell it which prior movies each of you truly enjoyed. Unfortunately, a simple algorithm like this one is susceptible to error, especially because self-reporting is a notoriously inaccurate indicator of people's genuine preferences. It often occurs that we hear many people laud a movie as a masterpiece, feel driven to see it, and even if we pass out halfway through, we tell everyone it was a fantastic experience because we don't want to appear like philistines. Instead of depending on our own questionable self-reports, these issues can be resolved if we simply let the computer gather real-time data on us while we really watch movies. The program can first track which movies we finished viewing and which ones we stopped watching in the middle. The algorithm will be able to discern that we didn't make it through the first half-hour and didn't really see Atlanta burning, even if we declare *Gone With the Wind* to be the greatest film ever produced.

However, the algorithm is capable of much more. Software that can identify human emotions based on the movements of our eyes and facial muscles is presently being developed by engineers. Such software will be able to identify the situations on television that made us laugh, cry, or were otherwise entertaining if it has a decent camera. The program will then be able to determine how each frame has affected our pulse rate, blood pressure, and brain activity if you link it to physiological sensors. When we watch Tarantino's *Pulp Fiction*, for example, the algorithm may notice that the rape scene almost imperceptibly arouses us sexually, that we laughed guiltily when Vincent accidentally shoots Marvin in the face, and that we didn't get the joke about the Big Kahuna Burger but still laughed to avoid looking foolish. You engage different brain circuits and muscles when you make yourself laugh than when you laugh because something is really humorous. Most of the time, humans cannot tell the difference. However, a biometric sensor may.

Greek tele, which means "far," and Latin visio, which means sight, are the origins of the term television. It was initially intended to be a tool for long-distance vision. But soon, it may enable us to be seen from a distance. In Nineteen Eighty-Four, George Orwell predicted that the television would observe us as we watched it. We may not remember the majority of Tarantino's filmography once we've seen them all. However, Netflix, Amazon, or whomever controls the TV algorithm will be aware of our personality type and know just how to trigger our emotions. With the use of such information, Netflix and Amazon could be able to choose movies for us with almost supernatural accuracy, but they might also be able to decide for us what to study, where to work, and who to marry. Of course, Amazon won't always be right. That is not feasible.

Due to incomplete data, poor programming, unclear goal definitions, and the unpredictable nature of life, algorithms will often make errors. However, Amazon won't have to be flawless. All it will need to do is be on average superior than us. Because most individuals don't know themselves well and often make awful selections while making the most crucial choices in their life, this is not a particularly tough task. Humans struggle with inadequate data, flawed programming (genetic and cultural), hazy definitions, and life's unpredictability more than algorithms do. You might enumerate all the issues that plague algorithms and come to the conclusion that no one will ever trust them. But doing so is similar to listing all the problems with democracy and coming to the conclusion that no rational person would ever embrace it. According to Winston Churchill, democracy is the worst political system in the world, bar none. People may draw the same conclusions regarding Big Data algorithms, whether they are correct or incorrectly: they have many flaws, but there is no better option.

The temptation to depend on computers is expected to grow as scientists learn more about how people make judgments. Hacking human judgment will simultaneously make human sentiments less dependable while also increasing the reliability of Big Data algorithms. As governments and businesses are successful in hacking the human operating system, we will be subjected to a bombardment of well targeted propaganda, advertising, and manipulation. We may be compelled to depend on algorithms in the same manner that a pilot experiencing vertigo must disregard what his own senses are telling him and put all of his confidence in the technology because it will be so simple to control our thoughts and feelings.

People may not have a say in some nations or circumstances, and they may be compelled to follow Big Data algorithms' judgments. However, even in ostensibly free societies, algorithms may become increasingly powerful because we will progressively lose the capacity to make our own judgments as we come to learn to rely on them more and more. Consider how, in only the last two decades, a mere billion people have come to entrust the Google search algorithm with one of the most crucial responsibilities of all: finding reliable and relevant information. We don't look for information anymore. Rather, we use Google. And as we depend more and more on Google for solutions, our capacity to do independent research declines. The first page of a Google search already provides a definition of "truth."

This has also been the case with physical skills like space navigation. People use Google to get directions. Their intuition may urge them to turn left at a junction, whereas Google Maps may advise to turn right. They first follow their instinct, turn left, get into a traffic congestion, and miss a crucial meeting. The next time, they will follow Google's advice, turn right, and arrive on time. They gain confidence in Google via experience. Within a year or two, people become fully reliant on what Google Maps tells them, and if the smartphone breaks, they have no idea what to do. Three Japanese visitors to Australia in March 2012 made the decision to visit a tiny offshore island for the day and drove their vehicle directly into the Pacific. Yuzu Nuda, the driver, who is 21 years old, subsequently said that she just followed the GPS's directions since "it told us we could drive down there." It kept promising to guide us to a path. We were stranded.

People who seemed to be following GPS directions drove into lakes or fell off of destroyed bridges in a number of similar occurrences. Like a muscle, the ability to navigate must be exercised to maintain it. The option to choose a spouse or a career is equivalent. Millions of young people must pick each year what to study in college. This is a highly significant and challenging choice. Your parents, friends, and teachers all of whom have different interests and viewpoints—all put pressure on you. You must also cope with your own dreams and concerns. Hollywood blockbusters, trashy books, and smart advertising efforts obscure and influence your judgment. Making a sensible choice is especially challenging since you lack a

true understanding of what it takes to thrive in various occupations and a genuine perception of your own skills and shortcomings. What qualifications do lawyers need to succeed? How do I function under duress? Can I work well in a group?

One student could enter law school with an unreliable perception of her own abilities and an even more skewed idea of what practicing law entails (you don't get to cry "Objection, Your Honour!" all day long). While this is going on, her buddy chooses to pursue a lifelong ambition and enroll in a professional dance school, despite lacking the requisite discipline or bone structure. Both of them regret their decisions greatly years later. In the future, Google could be our go-to source for making these choices. Google might inform me that attending law school or ballet school would be a waste of time, but that I'd be a great and content psychologist or plumber instead.

Our conception of humanity and of existence will need to shift once AI is capable of making judgments better than we can about employment and possibly even romantic relationships. Humans are used to seeing life as a drama with choices. Individuals are seen under liberal democracy and free-market capitalism as independent agents who are always making decisions about the world. Shakespearean dramas, Jane Austen novels, and cheesy Hollywood comedies all have heroes who must make a choice that is very important. Being or not being? Should I assassinate King Duncan on the advice of my wife, or should I follow my conscience and spare him? To wed Mr. Darcy or Mr. Collins? Similar to Islamic theology, Christian theology emphasizes the drama of choice, saying that eternal salvation or damnation rests on making the proper option.

What will happen to this way of thinking if AI is used more and more to make choices for us? Currently, we rely on Google Maps and Netflix to pick movies and determine whether to turn right or left. Human life will stop being a drama of choices, however, if we start to rely on AI to make decisions about what to study, where to work, and who to marry. Free markets and democratic elections won't make much sense. And most art forms and faiths would concur. Imagine Anna Karenina pulling out her phone and asking the Facebook algorithm whether she ought to wed Karenin or go on a romantic getaway with the handsome Count Vronsky. Or picture the pivotal choices made by the Google algorithm in your favorite Shakespearean play. Although the lives of Hamlet and Macbeth will be far more pleasant, what kind of life will it be specifically? Do we have any examples to help us understand such a life?

We may no longer regard the world as the playground of independent people trying to make the correct decisions as power passes from humans to computers. Instead, we can think of the cosmos as a stream of data, see living things as nothing more than biochemical algorithms, and think that humanity's cosmic purpose is to build a system for processing all of the data in the universe before merging into it. We are already being transformed into insignificant chips within a vast data-processing machine that no one truly comprehends. I read innumerable emails, tweets, and articles every day, ingest the data, analyze it, and then send fresh pieces via other emails, tweets, and articles. I'm not really sure how I fit into the big picture or how my data connects to the data created by the billions of other people and machines. I am too busy responding to all of these emails to have the time to find out.

Digital Dictatorships

People are often afraid about AI since they don't believe it will always be obedient. We've seen far too many science fiction films about robots who overthrow their human masters, run wild in the streets, and massacre everyone. However, the precise opposite is the true issue with robots. Because they are likely to constantly submit to their masters and never resist, we should be afraid of them. Obviously, as long as the robots are under the control of kind

masters, mindless loyalty is acceptable. Killer robots might be used in conflict to guarantee that, for the first time in history, the rules of war are really followed on the battlefield. Human troops sometimes act in ways that violate the rules of war by killing, pillaging, and raping. We often equate emotions with kindness, love, and empathy, but during times of conflict, fear, anger, and brutality all too frequently take over. Since robots are emotionless, one could rely on them to always follow the military code's strict text and to never be influenced by one's own fears and prejudices. A company of American troops went on the rampage on March 16, 1968, in the South Vietnamese town of My Lai, killing 400 or more residents. The local initiative of individuals who had been engaged in jungle guerrilla fighting for many months led to the commission of this war crime. It was illegal and went against both US military doctrine and the law, and it had no strategic purpose. The cause was due to human emotions. The tragedy at My Lai would not have taken place if the USA had sent killer robots to Vietnam.

However, we must keep in mind that the features of their code are always reflected and amplified by the robots before we hastily create and use killer robots. The robots will probably be a tremendous improvement over the typical human soldier if the coding is constrained and benign. However, the outcomes will be disastrous if the code is callous and nasty. The main issue with robots is not their artificial intelligence, but rather their human overseers' inherent ignorance and ruthlessness. Around the town of Srebrenica in July 1995, Bosnian Serb soldiers slaughtered around 8,000 Muslim Bosniaks. The Srebrenica massacres, in contrast to the spontaneous My Lai massacre, were a lengthy and well-planned operation that represented Bosnian Serb intention to "ethnically cleanse" Bosnia of Muslims.

In 1995, if the Bosnian Serbs had access to killer robots, the horror very certainly would have gotten worse rather than better. No robot would have wavered for a second in carrying out the instructions it was given, and none of them would have saved the lives of any Muslim children out of altruism, contempt, or laziness. No matter how callous and insane his commands, a brutal tyrant with such killing robots would never have to worry that his army will rebel. In 1789, a robot army would have likely put an end to the French Revolution in its infancy. In 2011, Hosni Mubarak could have used killer robots to terrorize the public without worrying about rebels defecting. Similar to this, an imperialist government using a robot army might carry out unpopular wars without having to worry about the robots' motivation waning or their families organizing demonstrations. The My Lai massacre might have been avoided if the USA had killer robots in the Vietnam War, but the conflict may have dragged on for years longer because the American government would have been less concerned about disgruntled soldiers, large anti-war protests, or a movement of "veteran robots against the war" some American citizens may still have objected to the conflict, but without the worry of being drafted themselves, the memory of personally contributing to the conflict, etc..

Due to the reality that no automaker would intentionally design their cars to target and murder people, these kind of issues are far less relevant to autonomous civilian automobiles. Yet because to the fact that too many governments have a history of being morally reprehensible, if not outright wicked, autonomous weapon systems are a disaster waiting to happen. The threat is not just posed by murderous robots. Equally dangerous may be surveillance equipment. Strong surveillance algorithms may be the finest thing that has ever occurred to humanity in the hands of a good government. But the same Big Data algorithms may also provide power to a future Big Brother, leading to an Orwellian surveillance state where everyone is always being watched.

In fact, we could end up with something that even Orwell could hardly envision: a comprehensive surveillance system that keeps an eye on all of our actions and words, as well

as having the ability to see inside of us to monitor our inner experiences. Think about what the Kim government in North Korea may do with the new technology, for instance. In the future, North Korean citizens may be obliged to wear biometric bracelets that track their heart rate, blood pressure, and brain activity in addition to everything they say and do. The North Korean government may be able to determine what each and every person is thinking at any given moment for the first time in history by using our expanding knowledge of the human brain and the vast capacity of machine learning. You'll wake up in the Gulag tomorrow morning if the biometric sensors detect the telltale indicators of fury when you gaze at a photo of Kim Jong-un higher blood pressure, more amygdala activity.

Granted, the North Korean government may struggle to build the necessary technologies on its own given its isolation. However, the North Koreans and other repressive dictatorships may copy or purchase the technology from more advanced countries once it has been invented in such countries. Both China and Russia, as well as a number of democratic nations, including the USA and Israel, my country, are continually enhancing their surveillance capabilities. Israel, known as "the start-up nation," boasts a thriving high-tech sector and a cutting-edge cybersecurity business. At least some of its leaders, generals, and people may be willing to establish a complete monitoring system in the West Bank as soon as they acquire the required equipment since Israel is also embroiled in a violent confrontation with the Palestinians.

Israeli microphones, cameras, drones, or surveillance software are likely to be present anytime Palestinians make phone calls, post on Facebook, or move from one place to another. The collected data is subsequently examined using Big Data methods. This enables the Israeli security forces to identify and eliminate possible threats without committing a lot of ground personnel. Although certain cities and villages in the West Bank may be run by Palestinians, Israel maintains sovereignty over the skies, the radio waves, and the internet. As a result, just a small number of Israeli troops are required to successfully govern the roughly 2.5 million Palestinians living in the West Bank.

When whole groups, like women or black people, are the targets of prejudice, these groups might organize and demonstrate against the injustice they are experiencing as a whole. However, you may suddenly be the target of personal discrimination by an algorithm, and you have no clue why. Perhaps there is anything about your DNA, personal history, or Facebook account that the algorithm does not like. The algorithm treats you unfairly because of who you are, not because you are a woman or an African American. You possess a certain quality that the algorithm dislikes. You don't know what it is, and even if you did, you couldn't organize a protest with others since nobody else is subject to the same bias. There is just you. In the twenty-first century, individual discrimination may become a bigger issue than only collective prejudice [5], [6].

We will likely keep human figureheads at the highest levels of power, giving us the impression that algorithms are simply counselors and that humans still have ultimate authority. We won't choose an AI to lead Google or serve as Germany's chancellor. The CEO and chancellor's judgments, however, will be influenced by AI. The chancellor will still have a variety of alternatives to pick from, but these choices will all be the result of Big Data research and will be more reflective of how AI sees the world than how humans do. To use an analogous example, legislators now have a variety of economic policies to select from, but nearly often, these options represent a capitalist understanding of the economy. The choices that actually matter have already been made much earlier by the economists, bankers, and businesspeople who created the many items on the menu, giving politicians the appearance

that they have a choice. Politicians could find themselves making decisions from a menu created by AI in a few decades.

Artificial intelligence and Natural Stupidity

The fact that we won't have to cope with the full-blown science-fiction horror of AI becoming sentient and trying to enslave or wipe out humans in the next decades is one encouraging development. Although we will depend on algorithms more and more, it is doubtful that they will start to purposefully deceive us. They won't be aware at all. Science fiction often conflates intelligence with consciousness, assuming that for computers to equal or exceed human intellect, awareness must be developed. The miraculous moment when a computer or a robot acquires awareness is the central theme of practically all AI-related films and books. After then, either the robot attempts to murder all the humans or the human hero falls in love with the robot, or both things happen at once. But because intelligence and consciousness are two completely distinct concepts, there is no reason to believe that artificial intelligence would eventually develop awareness. Problem-solving skill is a sign of intelligence. Being conscious allows one to experience emotions like pain, pleasure, love, and rage. Because intellect and awareness go hand in hand in humans and other animals, we often mix the two.

Animals often rely on their senses to find solutions. However, computers approach problem-solving extremely differently. High intellect may be attained by a variety of different ways, only some of which entail being aware. Computers may eventually become far better problem solvers than mammals without ever acquiring emotions, just as aircraft fly faster than birds without ever growing feathers. True, AI will need to effectively analyze human emotions in order to heal human ailments, spot human terrorists, suggest human partners, and cross a street crowded with human people. But because it lacked any internal emotions, it could. An algorithm can recognize the various metabolic patterns of happy, angry, or terrified apes without experiencing pleasure, anger, or terror. Of course, there's a chance that AI may eventually have emotions of its own. To be certain, we still don't fully understand consciousness. There are generally three options to take into account:

1. It is impossible to induce consciousness in non-organic systems because awareness is inextricably related to organic biology.
2. Although consciousness is not related to biological biology, it is connected to intelligence in such a manner that computers might acquire consciousness. If they are to beyond a certain level of intelligence, computers will need to acquire awareness.
3. Neither advanced intellect nor biological biology have any fundamental connections with consciousness. Thus, computers may become aware, albeit this is not a given. They may develop super intelligence while yet being completely unconscious.

We cannot rule any of these possibilities out at the current stage of our understanding. However, it is doubtful that we will be able to build sentient computers very soon precisely because we know so little about consciousness. Therefore, despite the great capacity of artificial intelligence, its use will continue to be somewhat dependent on human awareness for the foreseeable future. The risk is that if we focus too much on creating AI and too little on creating human awareness, the highly developed artificial intelligence of computers may do little more than enhance humans' inherent stupidity. Although a robot uprising is unlikely in the near future, we may have to cope with armies of robots that have an uncanny capacity to appeal to our emotions more effectively than our mothers can in order to try to sell us

anything, whether it be a product, a politician, or a whole philosophy. The bots might discover our innermost phobias, hatreds, and appetites and use them against us. In previous elections and referendums throughout the globe, hackers learnt how to influence individual voters by analyzing data on them and preying on their preconceptions. This gave us a taste of what was to come. While spectacular apocalypses of fire and smoke are the focus of science-fiction novels, we could really be facing a commonplace apocalypse simply clicking [7], [8].

For every dollar and minute we spend on enhancing artificial intelligence, we should spend an equal amount on enhancing human awareness in order to prevent such results. Unfortunately, we are not doing much right now to study and advance human awareness. Rather of taking into account our own long-term requirements as aware beings, we are primarily investigating and developing human capacities in accordance with the urgent demands of the political and economic system. My employer doesn't care whether I can taste and enjoy the meal I'm eating; he just wants me to respond to emails as fast as possible. I thus lose the capacity to pay attention to my own feelings and check my emails even during meals. The economic system forces me to grow and diversify my portfolio of investments but offers me no incentives to do the same with my compassion. I thus make far less of an effort to comprehend the fundamental causes of misery while trying to fathom the secrets of the stock market.

Humans resemble other domesticated animals in this way. Although we have produced docile cows that give copious quantities of milk, they are very different from their wild relatives in other ways. They are less nimble, inquisitive, and resourceful. Currently, we are taming individuals to create vast quantities of data and serve as very effective chips in massive data processing systems, yet these data cows scarcely maximize human potential. Because we understand the human mind so little, we really have no notion what the true potential of humans is. But instead of putting considerable effort into studying the human mind, we choose to work on boosting the speed of our Internet connections and the effectiveness of our Big Data algorithms. If we are not cautious, degraded people will use modern technology to wreak havoc on both themselves and the rest of the globe.

Digital autocracies are hardly the only threat we face today. The liberal order has placed a high importance on equality in addition to liberty. Political equality has long been prized by liberalism, and gradually it came to understand that economic equality is nearly as important. Liberty is useless without a social safety net and some degree of economic equality. Big Data algorithms, however, have the potential to both destroy liberty and produce the most unequal society ever. The small minority may have all the riches and power, but the majority of people will suffer not from exploitation but from something much worse: irrelevance [9].

CONCLUSION

The idea of liberty is crucial for forming democratic society and defending individual rights. It stands for the inherent right of every person to exercise autonomy, make decisions, and pursue their own interests within the confines of the law and morality. While the idea of liberty has changed throughout time, its fundamental tenet of safeguarding individual rights has not changed. Thoughtful examination of liberty's boundaries and possible conflicts between individual liberties and the good of the whole is necessary for its effective deployment. It's difficult to strike a balance between individual freedom and society interests, therefore legislation and policymaking must take this into consideration. It is essential to promote a society that preserves liberty while advancing justice, equality, and the common good as we manage the complexity of the contemporary world. The only way liberty can

genuinely blossom, empowering people and allowing them to contribute to the development and well-being of their communities, is via such a harmonic combination.

REFERENCES

- [1] G. Alandjani and S. Pervez, "Role of Internet of Things (Iot) in Higher Education," *Proc. ADVED 2018- 4th Int. Conf. Adv. Educ. Soc. Sci.*, 2018.
- [2] B. Forst, *Terrorism, crime, and public policy*. 2008. doi: 10.1017/CBO9780511816314.
- [3] R. Kitchin, "Civil liberties or public health, or civil liberties and public health? Using surveillance technologies to tackle the spread of COVID-19," *Sp. Polity*, 2020, doi: 10.1080/13562576.2020.1770587.
- [4] H. S. Sætra, "When nudge comes to shove: Liberty and nudging in the era of big data," *Technol. Soc.*, 2019, doi: 10.1016/j.techsoc.2019.04.006.
- [5] S. Adams and A. Robins, "Gendering Landscape Art," *The Barber Institute's Critical Perspectives in Art History*. 2000.
- [6] G. Nadi, "2017 Dissertation List," *PS Polit. Sci. Polit.*, 2018, doi: 10.1017/s1049096518000823.
- [7] I. Mergel, "OpenCollaboration in Public Sector: The case of social codign on Github," *Gov. Inf. Q.*, 2012.
- [8] O. O'Donnell *et al.*, "Qualitative study on maternal referrals in rural Tanzania: decision making and acceptance of referral advice," *BMC Pregnancy Childbirth*, 2018.
- [9] A. J. Kolber, "The End of Liberty," *Crim. Law Philos.*, 2021, doi: 10.1007/s11572-021-09568-7.

CHAPTER 5

EQUALITY: DATA OWNERS CONTROL THE FUTURE

Dr Xavier V.K, Professor,
Department of General Management, CMS Business School, Jain (Deemed to be University),
Bangalore, Karnataka, India,
Email Id:xavier_vk@cms.ac.in

ABSTRACT:

The relevance of equality in diverse social, political, and economic circumstances is examined in this chapter. The objective is to provide a thorough grasp of equality and its effects on people and communities. The study explores several aspects of equality, such as social, economic, and gender equality, and it addresses the difficulties and solutions for attaining equality in various contexts. The chapter emphasizes the significance of equality in establishing justice, inclusion, and general society advancement by reviewing current research and case studies.

KEYWORDS:

Equality, Equal Opportunity, Economic Equality, Gender Equality, Society.

INTRODUCTION

People have been informed that humanity is moving toward equality during the previous several decades and that new technology and globalization would hasten that process. In actuality, the 21st century may produce the most unequal society in recorded history. Although globalization and the Internet help to close the gap between nations, they also pose a danger to widen the difference between classes. When a result, just when humanity seems to be on the verge of achieving worldwide unity, the species itself may split into several biological castes [1]. Egalitarianism has existed since the Stone Age. A naked hole in the earth was the only option for some members of hunter-gatherer communities who were buried thirty thousand years ago, while others were lavishly interred in graves filled with hundreds of ivory beads, bracelets, diamonds, and artifacts.

Despite having minimal property, prehistoric hunter-gatherer tribes were yet more egalitarian than any later human civilization. Long-lasting inequality requires property. Property increased after the Agricultural Revolution, and inequality followed. Rigid hierarchical civilizations with few elites monopolizing most wealth and power for generations as people came to possess land, animals, plants, and tools. This arrangement was eventually accepted by people as being normal and even divinely intended. Not only was hierarchy the norm, but it was also the goal. Without a distinct hierarchy between aristocrats and commoners, men and women, or parents and children, how can there be order? Priests, philosophers, and poets from all over the globe carefully emphasized that, just as not all parts of the human body are equal the feet must follow the head so too would equality in human society only lead to chaos.

But when the modern age drew to a close, equality spread to practically all human communities. The emergence of the new ideologies of liberalism and communism had a role in it. However, the Industrial Revolution, which gave the people more importance than ever before, was partly to blame. Masses of common laborers supported industrial economies, and

massed common warriors supported industrial armies. Both democracies and dictatorships made significant investments in the health, education, and welfare of the populace because they required millions of able-bodied workers to run the factories and millions of devoted troops to fight on the front lines. As a result, a significant portion of twentieth-century history was focused on reducing disparities across classes, races, and genders. Even though there were still some hierarchies in the world of 2000, it was still far more egalitarian than it was in 1900. People anticipated that the egalitarian trend would continue and even speed up in the early years of the twenty-first century. They anticipated, in particular, that globalization would spread economic prosperity over the globe, allowing individuals in India and Egypt to eventually enjoy the same possibilities and advantages as those in Finland and Canada. On this promise, a whole generation was raised[2], [3].

It seems right now that this promise may not be kept. Large swaths of mankind have undoubtedly profited from globalization, yet there are indications of rising inequality within and across states. While billions are left behind, certain people increasingly monopolize the benefits of globalization. The wealthiest 1% now own 50% of the world's wealth. Even more concerning, the top 100 wealthiest individuals together possess more than the bottom 4 billion. It may become a lot worse. As was discussed in previous chapters, the development of AI may reduce the economic and political influence of the majority of people. Meanwhile, advances in biotechnology could enable the conversion of economic disparity into biological inequity. Finally, the ultra-wealthy will be able to use their incredible money for something really good. They could only buy status symbols up until now, but soon they could be able to purchase actual life. Humanity may divide into biological classes if new methods of prolonging life and improving physical and cognitive capacities turn out to be pricey.

The wealthy and aristocratic have always believed that they are more intelligent than everyone else and that this is why they are in power throughout history. This was untrue, as far as we can determine. The typical duke was not more gifted than the ordinary peasant; rather, his supremacy was the result of unfair economic and legal discrimination. But by 2100, the wealthy could actually be more gifted, imaginative, and clever than slum dwellers. It will be almost hard to bridge a genuine aptitude gap between the wealthy and the poor once it starts to exist. The disparity will only expand over time if the wealthy utilize their superior intelligence to promote their own wealth and if more money can be spent on giving them better bodies and minds. The wealthiest 1% may control the majority of the world's money, as well as its beauty, creativity, and health, by the year 2100.

Therefore, the two processes bioengineering and the development of artificial intelligence could separate humanity into a sizeable underclass of unproductive *Homo sapiens* and a tiny class of superhuman. Adding to the already dire scenario is the possibility that the state will be less motivated to invest in the welfare, education, and health of the populace as they lose economic and political clout. Being redundant is a very scary situation. Then, the goodwill of a little elite will determine the fate of the people. Maybe for a few centuries, there will be goodwill. However, during a crisis, like as a climate disaster, it would be extremely alluring and simple to throw the unnecessary people overboard.

Perhaps the elite will continue to look out for the common people in nations like France and New Zealand where liberal ideas and welfare-state policies have a long history. However, in the more capitalist USA, the elite could exploit the first chance to destroy what remains of the

American welfare state. Large emerging nations like India, China, South Africa, and Brazil have an even greater issue. There, inequality might soar if normal people lose their economic worth.

Therefore, rather of bringing about global unification, globalization may instead lead to "speciation" the division of humanity into several biological classes or even distinct species. By removing national boundaries, globalization will unify the globe horizontally while also dividing mankind vertically. It is possible for the ruling oligarchies of nations as different as the United States and Russia to unite and wage war on the majority of common Sapiens. According to this viewpoint, the present populist animosity against "the elites" is well-founded. If we are not cautious, the descendants of Silicon Valley millionaires and Russian oligarchs may surpass those of Appalachian hillbillies and Siberian villages as a superior species.

As the superior caste gathers within a self-declared "civilization" and constructs walls and moats to divide it from the hordes of "barbarians" outside, such a scenario may ultimately de-globalize the planet. Industrial civilization in the 20th century relied on 'barbarians' for their cheap labor, raw resources, and markets. As a result, it overcame and consumed them. A post-industrial society that relies on AI, biotechnology, and nanotechnology, however, may be far more self-sufficient and independent in the twenty-first century. Whole nations and continents, not just whole classes, might become irrelevant.

The self-declared civilized zone, where cyborgs attack one another with logic bombs, may be separated from the barbaric territories, where wild humans fight one another with machetes and Kalashnikovs, by fortifications protected by drones and robots. I often refer to the future of humanity in the first person plural throughout this work. I discuss what "we" should do to address "our" concerns. But maybe there isn't a "we." The fact that various human groups have radically diverse destinies may be one of "our" major challenges. Perhaps in certain regions of the globe you should educate your children to program computers, while in others you should teach them to sketch quickly and aim correctly [4], [5].

DISCUSSION

The key is to control data ownership if we want to avoid the consolidation of all money and power in the hands of a tiny few. Land used to be the most valuable asset in the world, politics was a battle for control of it, and if too much land ended up in too few hands, society would become divided between aristocrats and commoners. In the modern age, factories and machinery surpassed land in importance, and political conflicts centered on securing control of these crucial production facilities. If too many machines were concentrated in too few hands, capitalism and proletarianism would separate society. Data, however, will surpass both land and machines as the most valuable asset in the twenty-first century, and politics will be a contest to control the flow of data. If information is concentrated in too few hands, various species of humans will emerge.

Data-giants like Google, Facebook, Baidu, and Tencent are leading the race to get the data. So far, several of these heavyweights seem to have embraced the "attention merchants" business model. They draw us in by offering us free information, services, and entertainment before selling our attention to marketers. The data giants, though, likely set their sights far higher than any prior attention merchant. Selling adverts is not at all their actual business. Instead, by getting our attention, they are able to gather a vast quantity of information about us that is more valuable than any advertising money. We are their product, not their clients.

The advertising sector itself will be the first casualty of the radical new business model that this data trove paves the way for in the medium future. The new approach is predicated on handing over control of decisions and purchases from people to computers. The old advertising industry will go out of business if algorithms start making our purchases for us. Consider Google. Google aspires to the point when we can ask it anything and get the best response possible. When we can ask Google, "Hey Google, based on everything you know about cars, and based on everything you know about me (including my needs, my habits, my views on global warming, and even my opinions about Middle Eastern politics), what is the best car for me?" what will happen? What possible use may automobile commercials serve if Google can provide us with a satisfactory response, and if we come to trust Google's knowledge rather than our own easily swayed emotions as a result of experience?

Long-term, the data-giants could control us and make decisions for us, but they might also reengineer organic life and create inorganic life forms if they gathered enough data and processing power to crack the innermost mysteries of life. The giants may need short-term financial support from selling adverts, but they often rank applications, goods, and businesses based on the data they collect rather than the revenue they bring in. A well-liked app may not have a sound business plan and could even experience short-term losses, but as long as it wastes data, it might be worth billions. Even if you are unsure of how to utilize the data right now, it is still valuable to have since it may contain the secret to influencing and directing life in the future. Although I can't say for sure that the data-giants actually conceive of it in such terms, their behavior suggests that they place greater importance on data acquisition than just money [5], [6].

It will be exceedingly difficult for regular people to withstand this procedure. Right now, individuals are willing to part with their most priceless asset - their personal data - in return for cost-free email and amusing kitten videos. Similar to how Native American and African tribes unknowingly sold whole nations to European imperialists in return for brightly colored beads and inexpensive trinkets. When regular people start to depend on the network for all of their choices, including their healthcare and physical survival, they may find it more impossible to attempt to restrict the flow of data in the future.

If people are cut off from the network, they could become so fully merged with machines that they will not be able to exist at all. They will be intertwined from the moment you are born, and if you later decide to cut them off, insurance companies, employers, and healthcare providers may refuse to cover your costs. Health is most likely to triumph by a landslide in the major conflict between privacy and health. Businesses and governmental organizations will find it simple to get to know you, control you, and make choices on your behalf as more and more data from your body and brain is sent to the intelligent computers through the biometric sensors. More crucially, they would be able to design life by understanding the intricate workings of every body and brain. The crucial issue is who controls the data if we want to stop a tiny few from monopolizing such godlike abilities and if we want to stop humans from dividing into biological classes. Do the details of my DNA, brain, and existence belong to me, the government, a business, or the whole human race?

The dominance of large businesses will likely be reduced if governments are required to nationalize the data, but this might also lead to eerie digital dictatorships. Politicians use the human emotional and physiological system as their instrument, similar to how musicians use an instrument. They make a speech, and a wave of panic sweeps the nation. They tweet, and anger erupts in full force. We shouldn't provide these players with a more advanced instrument, in my opinion. Politics will devolve into an emotional circus if politicians have direct access to our emotional buttons, able to elicit fear, rage, delight, and boredom at

command. Even if we should be wary of the influence of large companies, history reveals that we may not always be better off under the control of overbearing governments. since of March 2018, I would rather give my information to Mark Zuckerberg than to Vladimir Putin (although the Cambridge Analytica incident showed that maybe there isn't much of a choice here, since any information given to Zuckerberg may likely make its way to Putin).

Although it may seem more appealing than any of these alternatives, private ownership of one's own data is not quite obvious what it entails. The laws governing property ownership have been in place for countless years. We understand how to enclose a field in fencing, station a guard at the entrance, and manage access. We have developed quite complex systems to control who owns what in the last 200 years; as a result, I can now own shares in companies like General Motors and Toyota and own a little portion of each. However, we lack significant expertise in controlling the ownership of data, which is a considerably more challenging undertaking by nature since, unlike land and equipment, data can travel at the speed of light and may be duplicated as many times as you wish.

Therefore, we should ask our legal professionals, elected officials, philosophers, and even poets to focus on this problem: how do you control the ownership of data? This might very well be the most significant political issue of our time. Our sociopolitical system could disintegrate if we do not quickly find a solution to this topic. The impending catastrophe is already being felt by many. Perhaps for this reason, liberal narratives that looked unstoppable a decade ago are losing favor with people all across the globe. So how do we go from here and how do we handle the enormous difficulties of the biotech and information technology revolutions? The same entrepreneurs and scientists who first disrupted the world could be able to provide a technology remedy. Could networked algorithms, for instance, serve as the framework for a worldwide human society that would control all data and guide the evolution of life? Perhaps Mark Zuckerberg might ask his 2 billion pals to band together and take action in the face of rising social tensions and global inequity [1], [4].

Complicated Implementation

Efforts to achieve one objective can have unintended repercussions or lead to other issues, and initiatives to promote specific sorts of equality of opportunity may be challenging. Although there are challenges there as well, it is generally agreed that the formal method is simpler to execute than the others. For legislators, an equal treatment requirement in a government policy might be problematic. It may be excessively costly for the government to be required to provide equitable health care services to all people. New issues might arise if the government attempts to provide people with equal access to healthcare by rationing services according to a maximizing approach. According to one research, attempting to ration health care by increasing "quality-adjusted years of life" might divert funds away from the handicapped, despite the fact that they may be more worthy. Another time, BBC News questioned the wisdom of subjecting female army recruits to the same rigorous testing as their male counterparts given that many women were suffering injuries as a consequence.

Age bias may be a frustrating obstacle for politicians attempting to promote equal opportunity. According to various research, efforts to be equally fair to the young and the elderly are difficult since the older person is likely to have fewer years to live and it may make more sense for a society to spend more resources in the health of a younger person. From a different angle, treating both people equally while adhering to the text of the equality of opportunity looks unjust. An unjust situation in one dimension might be made worse by efforts to create equality in another. For instance, public restrooms Men may use urinals, which need less physical space, therefore the overall outcome may be unfair if the physical

size of men's and women's restrooms is equal. In other words, it could be more equitable to provide more actual room for women's bathrooms. According to sociologist Harvey Molotch, "society guarantees that individual women will be worse off than individual men by creating men's and women's rooms of the same size." Another challenge is that it is difficult for a society to provide real equality of opportunity for every sort of job or sector. People with various abilities may be shut out if a country concentrates attention on certain businesses or jobs. A warrior culture, for instance, may provide everyone an equal chance to succeed in the military via fair competition, but those with non-military abilities like farming would be shut out. When attempting to establish equality of opportunity, lawmakers have encountered difficulties. The hope that organizations would try to focus more on "fairness" than "equality" was replaced in 2010 in Britain with a legal requirement "forcing public bodies to try to reduce inequalities caused by class disadvantage" after much debate. Fairness is generally seen as a much more ambiguous concept than equality, but is easier for politicians to manage if they are seeking to avoid fractious debate. Mayor Ed Koch of New York City sought to find methods to uphold the "principle of equal treatment" while opposing more substantial and sudden transfer payments known as minority set-asides.

Difficulties with Measurement

The general assumption is that it is difficult to assess equality of opportunity, whether doing so by looking at a single employment choice or groups over time. Single instance. Questions like "Was it fair?" may be used to analyze the guidelines guiding a particular employment decision, determine if they were followed, and reassess the choice. Fair processes were they followed? Was the best candidate chosen?" This is a choice that requires judgment, and decision-makers may have prejudices. If equality of opportunity is in place, it is considered fair if each applicant has a 50% chance of landing the job, meaning they both have an equal chance of succeeding (presuming, of course, that the person making the probability assessment is unaware of all variables, including valid ones like talent or skill as well as arbitrary ones like race or gender). However, it is difficult to determine whether each candidate had a 50% chance based just on the results.

Groups. By examining trends and irregularities and often comparing smaller subgroups with larger groups on a percentage basis, statistical analysis is sometimes used to evaluate the equal opportunity for a certain kind of employment, firm, sector, or country. It is feasible to determine if equality of opportunity is breached using statistical analysis, but there are several challenges involved. For example, discrimination that affects a subset or population over time may constitute such a violation. To guarantee compliance with equal opportunity laws, organizations including municipal governments and colleges have engaged full-time experts with a statistical background. For instance, the head of Colorado State University's Office of Equal Opportunity is required to keep detailed information on the university's personnel by job type, as well as minority and gender. In order to abide by the equal opportunity laws in the United Kingdom, Aberystwyth University gathers data on the "representation of women, men, members of racial or ethnic minorities, and people with disabilities amongst applicants for posts, candidates interviewed, new appointments, current staff, promotions, and holders of discretionary awards [7], [8]."

Although statistical analysis may show signs of concerns, it is vulnerable to disagreements over interpretation and methodological flaws, making it difficult to establish uneven treatment. For instance, a 2007 research from the University of Washington looked at how women were treated there. Researchers gathered data on female engagement in a variety of facets of university life, such as the percentages of women holding full professorships (23%) and enrolment in fields like nursing (90%) and engineering (18%). These numbers may be

interpreted in a broad variety of ways. For instance, using census statistics, one may compare the 23 percent number for women holding full professorships to the proportion of women overall (probably 50 percent) or to the proportion of women holding full professorships at rival institutions. It may be utilized in a comparison of the number of women who applied for and were hired for the post of full professor. The 23 percent statistic might also be used as a standard or starting point in a continuing longitudinal study to be compared with subsequent polls in order to measure advancement over time. In addition, statistical factors like sample size and bias might affect how strong the results are. Most types of statistical interpretation are quite challenging for the aforementioned reasons [9].

CONCLUSION

An equitable and just society is built on the basic idea of equality. It covers a range of topics, including gender, social, and economic equality all of which are essential for creating a more just society. Social equality is the practice of providing all people with equal opportunity and treatment, regardless of their background or personal traits. In order to reduce inequalities and provide a level playing field, economic equality places an emphasis on the equitable allocation of wealth and resources. Equal rights, opportunity, and representation for persons of all genders are the goals of gender equality. Numerous obstacles, such as systematic prejudice, socioeconomic inequalities, and cultural prejudices, stand in the way of achieving equality. However, society may seek to reduce inequality by identifying these barriers and taking preventative action. To level the playing field and lessen gaps, policies and programs that support social welfare, healthcare, job prospects, and education are recommended. In addition, tackling ingrained biases and encouraging inclusion may help create a society that is more egalitarian.

REFERENCES

- [1] C. Maharati, "Adoption and Adaptation of the Past and Present Leadership Style of Prophet Muhammad SAW in Islamic Economics Through the World Economic System," *JEBDEER J. Entrep. Bus. Dev. Econ. Educ. Res.*, 2020, doi: 10.32616/jbr.v2i2.238.
- [2] J. Kantola and E. Lombardo, "Strategies of right populists in opposing gender equality in a polarized European Parliament," *Int. Polit. Sci. Rev.*, 2021, doi: 10.1177/0192512120963953.
- [3] M. Foley and R. Cooper, "Workplace gender equality in the post-pandemic era: Where to next?," *J. Ind. Relations*, 2021, doi: 10.1177/00221856211035173.
- [4] S. Whiting and D. Carter, "Access, Place and Australian Live Music," *M/C J.*, 2016, doi: 10.5204/mcj.1085.
- [5] J. A. Laub, "Assessing the servant organization; Development of the Organizational Leadership Assessment (OLA) model. Dissertation Abstracts International," *Procedia - Soc. Behav. Sci.*, 1999.
- [6] A. Bris *et al.*, "Knights, Raiders, And Targets - The Impact Of The Hostile Takeover - Coffee,Jc, Lowenstein,L, Roseackerman," *J. Bank. Financ.*, 2021.

- [7] A. A Agarwal, "Post-Stroke Fatigue: Difficulties in Measurement and Treatment," *J. Cardiol. Res. Rev. Reports*, 2021, doi: 10.47363/jcrrr/2021(2)141.
- [8] A. S. Yang, "Investors' trust and financial participation: Latent difficulty measurement," *Asia Pacific Manag. Rev.*, 2020, doi: 10.1016/j.apmr.2019.10.001.
- [9] R. Watson, "E-Press and Oppress," *M/C J.*, 2005, doi: 10.5204/mcj.2345.

CHAPTER 6

A BRIEF DISCUSSION ON POLITICAL CHALLENGE: COMMUNITY

Dr Hemanth Kumar.S, Assistant Professor,
Department of General Management, CMS Business School, Jain (Deemed to be University),
Bangalore, Karnataka, India,
Email Id:dr.hemanth_kumar@cms.ac.in

ABSTRACT:

The idea of community is important in the political sphere and presents different difficulties for politicians and policymakers. The consequences of the political problem of community for governance and decision-making processes are studied in this chapter. It explores the intricate relationships between people and groups, stressing the tensions and conflicts that develop when group goals collide with the freedoms and rights of the individual. It also examines how community identification and solidarity influence political discourse and inspire group action.

KEYWORDS:

Community, Facebook, Online, Political Challenge.

INTRODUCTION

Even though California is used to earthquakes, Silicon Valley was rudely surprised by the political upheaval caused by the 2016 US elections. The computer wizards replied by doing what engineers do best: searching for a technological solution after realizing they could be contributing to the issue. Nowhere was the response stronger than at Facebook's Menlo Park headquarters. This is comprehensible. Facebook is particularly sensitive to social upheavals since its business is social networking. Following three months of introspection, Mark Zuckerberg presented an ambitious manifesto on the need for and Facebook's role in creating a global community on February 16, 2017.

In a follow-up address at the first Communities Summit on June 22, 2017, Zuckerberg said that the breakdown of human communities is largely to blame for the sociopolitical upheavals of our day, which range from widespread drug abuse to deadly totalitarian governments. He bemoaned the fact that "membership in all kinds of groups has decreased by as much as one-quarter for decades." That's a lot of folks who now need to go elsewhere for support and a sense of direction. In order to reconstruct these communities, he pledged that Facebook would take the initiative, and his engineers will take up the work left undone by parish priests. To "make it easier to build communities," he added, "we're going to start rolling out some tools."

"We started a project to see if we could get better at suggesting groups that will be meaningful to you," he said. To do this, we began to develop artificial intelligence. It also works. We assisted 50% more individuals in the first six months to join relevant communities. "To help 1 billion people join meaningful communities," is his ultimate ambition. If we can do this, it will begin to strengthen our social fabric and bring the whole globe closer together in addition to reversing the decades-long fall in community participation. This objective is so crucial that Mark Zuckerberg has committed to "change Facebook's entire mission to take it on."

When Zuckerberg bemoans the dissolution of human groups, he is undoubtedly true. However, the Cambridge Analytical incident, which broke just as this book was about to go to print, showed that data given to Facebook by users was taken by outside parties and used to rig elections all over the globe many months after Zuckerberg made his commitment. This undermined Zuckerberg's high claims and destroyed public confidence in Facebook. One can only hope that Facebook will first commit to preserving the security and privacy of current communities before attempting to create new human groups [1]–[3].

Nevertheless, it is important to carefully study Facebook's communal vision and determine if online social networks can contribute to the creation of a worldwide human community once security is strengthened. Humans may become gods in the twenty-first century, but as of 2018, we are still Stone Age animals. We still need to root ourselves in close-knit groups if we want to thrive. Humans have evolved to live in tiny groups of no more than a dozen individuals over millions of years. No matter how many Facebook friends we claim to have, the majority of us still find it hard to really know more than 150 people. Humans experience loneliness and alienation when these groups are absent.

Unfortunately, intimate communities have been crumbling over the last 200 years. It would be impossible to completely replace tiny communities of individuals who know one another with projected communities of countries and political parties. A single genuine sibling or friend cannot give you the warm familiarity that your millions of brothers in the national family and your millions of comrades in the Communist Party can. People thus lead more alone lives in an increasingly interconnected world. This melancholy is much to blame for the social and political upheavals of our day.

Therefore, Zuckerberg's goal of reuniting people is one that is relevant. However, talk is cheap, and in order to put this vision into practice, Facebook may need to alter its whole business strategy. When your primary source of income is grabbing people's attention and selling it to advertising, it's difficult to create a worldwide community. Despite this, Zuckerberg should be commended for having the courage to express such a vision. The majority of businesses think that people should trust the market to make the really critical choices on our behalf, while governments should do as little as possible. Therefore, people who are afraid of Facebook's power shouldn't use screams of "Big Brother" to try to force it back into the corporate cocoon if it really wants to make an ideological commitment to creating human communities. We should encourage other businesses, organizations, and governments to compete with Facebook by committing to other ideologies.

Naturally, there is no shortage of organizations that regret the dissolution of human communities and work to put them back up. We will investigate some of these initiatives in coming chapters. Everyone is involved in community-building, from feminist campaigners to Islamic extremists. Facebook's gambit is distinctive because to its worldwide reach, corporate support, and unwavering confidence in technology. According to Zuckerberg, the new Facebook AI may "strengthen our social fabric" and "bring the world closer together" in addition to identifying "meaningful communities." That is a lot more ambitious than using AI to detect disease or drive a vehicle. Facebook's community vision may be the first overt effort to employ AI for globally coordinated social engineering. Therefore, it serves as an important test case. If it is successful, there will probably be a lot more efforts like this, and algorithms will be seen as the new rulers of human social networks. If it fails, it will highlight the limits

of the new technologies: although algorithms may be useful for driving and treating illnesses, we still need politicians and clerics to address social issues [4]–[6].

DISCUSSION

A trend in British politics called community politics seeks to reawaken people's interest in taking part in local politics. The British Greens, other parties, and Independents have all embraced it to some level, but the Liberal Democrats have developed it the most. The triumph of Michael Meadowcroft in Leeds West, a normally secure Labour seat, in the 1983 general election is highlighted as an early example. Small-scale activity on regional political concerns is the foundation of community politics. As an illustration of how it functions: The trash that is deposited alongside a playing field irritates the locals. A "non-community" political approach would be to make a public demand for greater funding to be set aside to deal with trash that has been deposited. A 'community politics' answer would be for local councillors to organize a team of individuals to remove the trash themselves, then educate the neighborhood via a newsletter.

The outcome is a stronger local community that believes its elected officials are making a difference, and there is a higher likelihood that even the most underfunded local government will take the time to address the issue going forward. The low-cost methods are simple to use. There is no need for mass direct mail, television advertising, or relationships with major publications. Any locality and any party may use community politics as a guide. Local action on people's problems and good face-to-face and newsletter communication with locals are the keys. Parties that support community politics often have electoral success, especially in regions where one political party has previously had sway (such as the Liberal Democrats' ability to escape the third-party trap). Residents of Letchworth Garden City petitioned for their own town council and elected all 24 members as independents after becoming disgusted with local politics and the local establishment [7], [8].

National and local initiatives

A number of projects have been launched in an effort to make it simpler for individuals to participate in local decision-making in response to concerns about the UK's disengagement from local politics, which is represented, among other things, by poor participation in local elections. Their effectiveness is questionable. Two noteworthy national efforts include the mechanism established in the Local Government Act 2000, which allows the people to request a referendum on whether there should be a locally elected mayor, and modifications to electoral systems to enable universal postal voting on a trial basis. Community leadership is a requirement for national regeneration funding streams like New Deal for Communities' governance structures. At the local level, several local authorities have created "area", "ward" or "neighbourhood" committees and similar groups that focus on larger regional concerns that affect the whole community, often with delegated funding. Greater community engagement is another goal of the requirement that each local authority in England and Wales establish a Local Strategic Partnership. The systems for involving patients and the general public in health matters are likewise undergoing constant revision. Processes for "Community Calls for Action" are outlined in the 2006 Police and Justice Act and the 2006 local government white paper. These documents establish statutory mechanisms by which local residents can formally bring issues of concern to the attention of their local authority and other public sector organizations.

Online Versus Offline

Facebook has had astounding progress in recent years and has more than 2 billion active members at this time. However, it will need to cross the gap between online and offline in order to put its new vision into practice. A community may start as an online gathering, but for it to thrive, it must also establish roots in the offline community. Will the communities vanish if one day a tyrant bans Facebook from his nation or shuts down the Internet entirely, or will they band together and rebel? Without internet communication, will they be able to plan a protest? In his manifesto from February 2017, Zuckerberg said that online communities support offline ones. Sometimes, this is accurate. However, there is often a trade-off between online and offline, and there are basic differences between the two.

Virtual communities cannot equal the richness of physical communities in the foreseeable future, at least not yet. My online buddies from California can chat to me if I'm ill at home in Israel, but they can't bring me soup or a cup of tea. All people have bodies. Technology has been separating us from our bodies throughout the last century. Our capacity to pay attention to our senses of taste and smell has been declining. Instead, we are engrossed in our laptops and iPhones. Rather of paying attention to local events, we are more interested in what is going online. Talking to my cousin in Switzerland is now more accessible than ever, but having a breakfast conversation with my husband is challenging since he is always ogling his smartphone rather than me.

Humans could not afford such negligence in the past. Foragers in antiquity were always on guard and focused. They walked through the forest looking for mushrooms, keeping an eye out for any telltale bulges on the ground. In order to determine if a snake may be hiding there, they carefully monitored even the smallest movement in the grass. When they discovered an edible fungus, they carefully consumed it to separate it from its toxic relatives. People living in today's wealthy society don't need such acute awareness. We may browse the grocery isles while texting, and we can purchase any of a thousand different meals that are all under the watchful eye of the health authorities. Whatever we decide, though, we risk eating it quickly while checking our emails or watching television in front of a screen and hardly noticing the food's flavor.

In order to provide you the ability to share your experience with others, Facebook is dedicated, according to Zuckerberg, to "continue improving our tools." People may really need the means to relate to their own experiences, however. People are urged to comprehend what occurs to them in terms of how others view it in the name of "sharing experiences." Facebook users automatically go for their iPhones when something interesting occurs, snap a photo, share it online, and wait for the "likes" to roll in. They seldom even pay attention to how they are feeling while doing this. In fact, the responses online are increasingly dictating how people feel.

People who are cut off from their bodies, senses, and the physical world are more prone to feel bewildered and alienated. The weakening of religious and national ties is often cited as the cause of such alienation by pundits, but losing connection with your body is likely to be more significant. Humans have survived for millions of years without states and faiths; they can likely do the same in the twenty-first century. Yet if they are cut off from their bodies, they cannot live happily. You will never feel at home in the world if you don't feel at home in your body. Facebook's own business strategy up until this point pushed users to spend ever-increasing amounts of time online, even if it meant having less time and energy to invest in offline activities. Can it embrace a new paradigm that promotes people to use the internet only when absolutely required and to pay greater attention to their surroundings, bodies, and

senses in general? What may the investors think of this model? Tristan Harris, a former Google employee and tech philosopher who developed a new measurement of "time well spent," recently offered a blueprint for such an alternate paradigm.

Online dating's drawbacks cast doubt on Zuckerberg's proposal to end social polarization. He correctly notes that just introducing people to other viewpoints and linking them to them would not eliminate social chasms since "showing people an article from the opposite perspective, actually deepens polarization by framing other perspectives as foreign." The greatest ways to improve conversation, according to Zuckerberg, "may come from getting to know each other as whole people instead of just opinions - something Facebook may be uniquely suited to do," he says. It is simpler to have a conversation on things we disagree on if we connect with others through things we have in common, such as sports teams, TV series, or hobbies.

But getting to know each other as "whole" beings is really challenging. It takes a long time and necessitates face-to-face contact. The ordinary Homo sapiens is probably unable to know more than 150 people well, as was already said. Building communities should ideally not be a zero-sum endeavor. People are capable of harboring dual allegiances. Unfortunately, it is likely that personal relationships are a zero-sum game. After a certain point, your ability to get to know your neighbors will suffer as a result of the time and effort you put into getting to know your online buddies from Iran or Nigeria.

When an engineer creates a new technology that encourages people to spend more time engaging in meaningful IRL activities with friends rather than online shopping, that will be Facebook's important test. Will Facebook use this tool or ban it? Will Facebook really take a risk and put social concerns ahead of business interests? If it succeeds in doing so and avoids bankruptcy, it will be a significant change. Facebook's taxes practices are impacted by its preference for the offline world over its quarterly reports. Facebook has been charged with tax cheating several times, joining the likes of Amazon, Google, Apple, and several other internet titans.

These multinational firms find it simpler to use all kinds of inventive accounting techniques because of the challenges associated with taxing internet activity. If you believe that people primarily spend their lives online and that you provide them access to all the resources they need for their online life, you might still see yourself as providing a valuable social service while evading paying taxes to offline governments. It becomes much more difficult to defend tax evasion once you realize that people still need things like roads, hospitals, and sewage systems because they have bodies. How can you praise the benefits of community while refusing to contribute money to the most crucial services provided by the community?

We can only hope that Facebook can alter its business strategy, implement a tax system that is more offline-friendly, contribute to global unification, and yet turn a profit. However, we shouldn't have high hopes for Facebook's capacity to realize its goal of creating a worldwide community. Corporations historically weren't the best platform for directing social and political revolutions. Real revolutions eventually need sacrifices that businesses, their workers, and their shareholders are unwilling to undertake. For these reasons, revolutionaries created churches, political organizations, and armies. The so-called Facebook and Twitter revolutions in the Arab East began in upbeat online groups, but when they spilled over into the chaotic physical world, zealots of various religions and military juntas took control of them. Facebook will need to do a far better job of bridging the divide between online and offline if it now wants to start a worldwide movement. It and the other internet behemoths have a tendency to perceive people as audiovisual creatures with 10 fingers, a screen, and a

credit card attached to two pairs of eyes and two pairs of ears. Recognizing that people have bodies is an important first step in bringing humanity together.

Of course, there are drawbacks to this appreciation as well. When internet corporations become aware of the limits of online algorithms, they can decide to expand their reach even further. The lines between online and offline are intended to be blurred by devices like Google Glass and apps like Pokémon Go, which combine both into a unified augmented reality. Further eroding the line between electronic devices and biological bodies and physically penetrating our skin are biometric sensors and direct brain-computer interactions. The digital titans may eventually be able to control every part of our bodies in the same manner that they now control our eyes, fingers, and credit cards once they have a better understanding of the human body. We could start to long for the good old days when online and offline were kept separate.

Community Development

In order to advance the social welfare of local, regional, and, occasionally, national communities, community development frequently involves stakeholders, foundations, governments, or contracted entities such as universities, non-governmental organizations (NGOs), or government agencies. More grassroots initiatives, such as community development and community organizing, aim to empower people and organizations by giving them the tools they need to bring about change in their own neighborhoods. These abilities often help in the development of powerful social organizations with a similar goal. Practitioners of community development must be able to influence communities' positions within the framework of broader social institutions in addition to working with people. On the other hand, public managers must comprehend community development in the context of rural and urban development, housing and economic development, as well as community, organizational, and corporate development.

Building a knowledge basis to inform the curriculum for public administration, sociology, and community studies is often done via formal recognized programs run by universities as part of degree-granting institutions. Examples of national community development in the United States include the General Social Survey from the National Opinion Research Center at the University of Chicago and the Saguro Seminar from the Harvard Kennedy School. Core courses in community and economic development are offered at Syracuse University's Maxwell School of Citizenship and Public Affairs in New York State. These courses include topics including non-profit development and US budgeting (federal, municipal, and community money). The Community Development Journal, published by the University of Oxford in the UK and utilized by sociologists and community development practitioners all over the globe, has been a pioneer in offering substantial research in the topic.

Numerous initiatives and groups with community development resources sit at the nexus of community building and community development. The Asset Based Community Development Institute program at Northwestern University serves as one illustration of this. The institute offers downloadable tools that may be used to evaluate local assets and establish ties between nonprofit organizations and other entities that can support community development. The Institute focuses on "mobilizing neighborhood assets" to support community development by starting from the inside out rather than the outside in. With origins in John McKnight's methods, community building was widely used in the disability area in the 1980s and 1990s [9]–[12].

CONCLUSION

Politicians and policymakers must give significant thought to the complex problem of the political challenge provided by community dynamics. Through their collective demands and activities, communities operate as a source of identity and unity, reshaping the political landscape. But negotiating the conflicts between collective interests and individual rights is very difficult. A fair and inclusive society must strike a balance between the needs and aspirations of communities and the safeguarding of individual liberties.

CONCLUSION

Effective governance and decision-making procedures must protect the rights of disadvantaged or minority groups while also taking into consideration the variety of interests and viewpoints present within a society. Political discourse is essential in determining how a society functions because it has the power to either promote harmony and collaboration or stoke strife. Promoting open communication and cultivating a feeling of shared accountability may aid in resolving the political issues brought on by diverse community viewpoints. They need to work to foster a climate that promotes civic engagement and involvement in political processes. Politicians may promote democratic governance by encouraging a feeling of ownership and empowerment among communities by including them in decision-making and policy formation.

REFERENCES

- [1] C. C. Wang, C. Cater, And T. Low, "Political Challenges In Community-Based Ecotourism," *J. Sustain. Tour.*, 2016, Doi: 10.1080/09669582.2015.1125908.
- [2] B. A. Putra, Darwis, And Burhanuddin, "Asean Political-Security Community: Challenges Of Establishing Regional Security In The Southeast Asia," *J. Int. Stud.*, 2019, Doi: 10.14254/2071-8330.2019/12-1/2.
- [3] M. Burton, C. Kagan, And P. Duckett, "Making The Psychological Political – Challenges For Community Psychology," *Psychol.*, 2007.
- [4] M. Fayazi, I. A. Bisson, And E. Nicholas, "Barriers To Climate Change Adaptation In Indigenous Communities: A Case Study On The Mohawk Community Of Kanasatake, Canada," *Int. J. Disaster Risk Reduct.*, 2020, Doi: 10.1016/J.Ijdr.2020.101750.
- [5] E. Keymolen And A. Voorwinden, "Can We Negotiate? Trust And The Rule Of Law In The Smart City Paradigm," *Int. Rev. Law, Comput. Technol.*, 2020, Doi: 10.1080/13600869.2019.1588844.
- [6] A. Acharya, "Asean 2030: Challenges Of Building A Mature Political And Security Community," *Ssrn Electron. J.*, 2013, Doi: 10.2139/Ssrn.2350586.
- [7] Y. Theocharis And A. Jungherr, "Computational Social Science And The Study Of Political Communication," *Polit. Commun.*, 2021, Doi: 10.1080/10584609.2020.1833121.
- [8] C. C. Wang, C. Cater, And T. Low, "Journal Of Sustainable Tourism: Political Challenges In Community-Based Ecotourism," *J. Sustain. Tour.*, 2016.
- [9] D. Francescato, "Globalization, Artificial Intelligence, Social Networks And Political Polarization: New Challenges For Community Psychologists," *Community Psychol. Glob. Perspect. Cpgp*, 2018.

- [10] J. B. Nachega *Et Al.*, “Contact Tracing And The Covid-19 Response In Africa: Best Practices, Key Challenges, And Lessons Learned From Nigeria, Rwanda, South Africa, And Uganda,” *American Journal Of Tropical Medicine And Hygiene*. 2021. Doi: 10.4269/Ajtmh.21-0033.
- [11] A. Baviera, “Preventing War, Building A Rules-Based Order : Challenges Facing The Asean Political-Security Community,” *Build. Asean Community Polit. Socio-Cultural Reflections*, 2017.
- [12] G. T. Molnár and G. Ilonszki, “Identity formation of the profession in a latecomer political science community,” *Eur. Polit. Sci.*, 2021, doi: 10.1057/s41304-021-00318-w.

CHAPTER 7

A BRIEF DISCUSSION ON CIVILISATION

Dr Sarangapani Nivarthi, Assistant Professor,
Department of General Management, CMS Business School, Jain (Deemed to be University),
Bangalore, Karnataka, India,
Email Id:dr.sarangapani.nivarthi@cms.ac.in

ABSTRACT:

The complex social, cultural, and technical evolution of human communities is referred to as civilization. It covers a wide range of topics, such as government, the arts, architecture, languages, education, and scientific developments. The notion of civilization, its historical development, and its effects on humans are all discussed in this chapter. It studies the fundamental traits, struggles, and triumphs of civilizations while underlining the interaction between social advancement and possible dangers.

KEYWORDS:

European, Human Rights, Political, Scientific Advancements, United States.

INTRODUCTION

While Mark Zuckerberg envisions bringing humanity together online, recent developments in the real world appear to give the 'clash of civilizations' theory new vitality. Many commentators, politicians, and regular people hold the view that conflicts between "Western Civilization" and "Islamic Civilization" are to blame for the Syrian Civil War, the establishment of the Islamic State, the chaos surrounding Brexit, and the instability of the European Union. Islamic countries violently reacted to Western efforts to impose democracy and human rights on them, and a flood of Muslim immigration combined with Islamic terrorist assaults drove European voters to give up on multicultural aspirations in favor of xenophobic local identities [1], [2].

This theory contends that the many civilizations that make up humans have had incompatible worldviews from the beginning. Conflicts between civilizations are inevitable as a result of these opposing worldviews. Civilizations have often battled throughout history, and only the fittest have lived to tell the tale, just as many species struggle for existence according to the merciless principles of natural selection. Liberal politicians or optimistic engineers who ignore this sobering truth do so at their own risk. The 'clash of civilizations' hypothesis has broad political ramifications. Its proponents assert that any effort to make peace between "the West" and "the Muslim world" is bound to failure. Muslim nations will never acculturate to Western norms, and Western nations will never be able to properly integrate Muslim populations.

As a result, neither the United States nor the European Union should accept immigration from Syria or Iraq, and the latter should abandon its multiculturalism in favor of an unashamedly Western identity. Only one civilization has a chance of surviving the harsh tests of natural selection in the long term, therefore Britain, Denmark, or France had best choose their own path if the Brussels bureaucrats are unwilling to preserve the West from the Islamic threat.

This theory is false while being widely accepted. Islamic fundamentalism may provide a severe threat, but far from being a purely Western phenomenon, the "civilization" it confronts is a global one. Iran and the United States have joined forces against the Islamic State, and not for nothing. Even Islamic extremists, despite their dreams of the middle Ages, have a far stronger connection to modern global culture than they do to Arabia in the 7th century. Instead of serving the needs of medieval peasants and merchants, they are tending to the concerns and dreams of alienated contemporary youth. Radical Islamists have been inspired by Marx and Foucault as much as by Muhammad, and they carry on the tradition of nineteenth-century European anarchists as much as that of the Umayyad and Abbasid caliphs, as clearly established by Pankaj Mishra and Christopher de Bellaigue. Therefore, it is more appropriate to see even the Islamic State as a misguided offshoot of the shared global culture rather than as a branch of an unidentified alien tree [3], [4].

More crucially, the "clash of civilizations" theory is based on a faulty comparison between history and biology. Fundamental differences exist between human groups and animal species, and historical conflicts and natural selection processes are quite distinct from one another. Animal species have distinct identities that stand the test of time across countless generations. Genes, not ideas, determine whether you are a chimpanzee or a gorilla, and many genes influence various social behaviors. Males and females live together in mixed-gender chimpanzee groups. By forming alliances of followers from both sexes, they strive for power. In contrast, a single dominant male maintains a harem of females among gorillas and often drives out any adult males who could threaten his dominance. As far as we know, chimps and gorillas have had the exact same social systems for hundreds of thousands of years. Chimps cannot acquire gorilla-like social structures, and gorillas cannot begin to organize themselves like chimpanzees.

Nothing like that exists among people. Yes, different social systems may exist among human tribes, but they are not genetically based, and they seldom last for more than a few centuries. Germans from the twentieth century come to mind. German society divided into six very distinct systems in less than a century: The Hohenzollern Empire, the Weimar Republic, the Third Reich, the German Democratic Republic also known as communist East Germany, the Federal Republic of Germany also known as West Germany, and finally the democratically reunited Germany. The Germans naturally preserved their culture, including their love of beer and bratwurst. But is there a certain German quality that sets them apart from other countries and hasn't altered from Wilhelm II to Angela Merkel? If you do think of anything, was it also present 5,000 or 1,000 years ago? Beginning with the statement that it draws inspiration from "the cultural, religious, and humanist inheritance of Europe, from which have developed the universal values of the inviolable and inalienable rights of the human person, democracy, equality, freedom, and the rule of law," the (unratified) Preamble of the European Constitution states that it is a "constitution for the European Union."

This might easily convey the idea that the principles of human rights, democracy, equality, and freedom are what constitute European culture. Numerous speeches and writings commemorate the 2,500-year history of freedom and democracy in Europe by tracing its roots directly from the ancient Athenian democracy to the modern EU. This is comparable to the story of the blind guy who grabs hold of an elephant's tail and thinks the animal is a kind of brush. Although democratic principles have been a part of European culture for many years, they have never been the core. Despite its fame and influence, Athenian democracy

was an incomplete experiment that only lasted for 200 years in a remote region of the Balkans. What are we to make of Sparta and Julius Caesar, the Crusaders and the conquistadors, the Inquisition and the slave trade, Louis XIV and Napoleon, Hitler and Stalin, if democracy and human rights have been the defining characteristics of European civilization for the last twenty-five centuries? Were they all strangers from another culture?

The fact is that European civilization may be whatever Europeans want it to be, just as Christianity can be whatever Christians want it to be, Islam can be whatever Muslims want it to be, and Judaism can be whatever Jews want it to be. And throughout the decades, humans have created a striking variety of things out of it. Human communities are characterized more by the changes they go through than by any continuity, yet because of their mastery of storytelling, they are nonetheless able to forge for themselves old identities. They are frequently able to combine the ancient and the modern into a single yarn regardless of the revolutions they go through.

Even one person may weave revolutionary changes in their own lives into a compelling and cohesive narrative: "I am that person who was once a socialist, but then became a capitalist; I was born in France, and now live in the USA; I was married, and then got divorced; I had cancer, and then got well again." Similar to how the Germans defined themselves by the same changes they went through: "Once we were Nazis, but we have learned our lesson, and now we are peaceful democrats." There is no need to search for any particular German spirit that first appeared in Wilhelm II, then in Hitler, and then in Merkel. The very nature of German identity is defined by these profound developments. In 2018, being German involves addressing the challenging Nazi history while defending liberal and democratic principles. In 2050, who knows what it will imply.

People often hesitate to accept these changes, particularly when they affect their fundamental political and religious beliefs. We believe that our principles are a priceless inheritance from our distant forefathers. However, the fact that our forefathers are long dead and unable to speak for themselves is the only thing that enables us to say this. Consider Jewish perceptions on women, for instance. Modern ultra-Orthodox Jews forbid the public display of photos of women. Only males and boys are often shown in billboards and commercials directed towards ultra-Orthodox Jews; never women or girls.

When the ultra-Orthodox Brooklyn newspaper *Di Tzeitung* published a picture of American officials watching the raid on Osama bin-Laden's compound in 2011, all of the ladies in the picture including Secretary of State Hillary Clinton were digitally removed. The tabloid claimed that Jewish "laws of modesty" required it to do so. Similar controversy occurred when Angela Merkel was removed from a photograph of a protest against the Charlie Hebdo atrocity by the *HaMevaser* newspaper so as not to incite any lusty ideas in the minds of pious readers. The editor of *Hamodia*, a third ultra-Orthodox publication, justified this practice by saying, "We are supported by thousands of years of Jewish tradition." The synagogue is the only place where seeing women is strictly prohibited. To prevent any males from unintentionally seeing the form of a woman when they are saying their prayers or reading scripture, women are strictly separated from the men in Orthodox synagogues and are required to remain in a designated area where they are concealed behind a curtain. But how to explain the fact that when archaeologists in Israel excavated ancient synagogues from the time of the Mishnah and Talmud, they found no sign of gender segregation and instead

discovered lovely floor mosaics and wall paintings depicting women, some of whom were rather scantily dressed? If all this is supported by thousands of years of Jewish tradition and immutable divine laws. These synagogues were frequented by the rabbis who composed the Mishnah and Talmud, but modern Orthodox Jews would see them as blasphemous desecrations of old customs [5].

All faiths share the same distortions of historic traditions. The Islamic State has bragged that it has returned to the ancient and purest form of Islam, but in reality, its interpretation is completely new. They do, however, use a great deal of judgment in deciding which texts to cite and which to disregard, as well as in how to interpret them. In fact, their independent approach to exegesis of the sacred texts is itself extremely contemporary. In the past, the knowledgeable ulama scholars who studied Muslim law and theology in respected schools like Cairo's Al-Azhar had exclusive authority over interpretation.

Most renowned ulama have condemned Abu Bakr al-Baghdadi and his ilk as illiterate criminals, and few of the Islamic State's leaders have such credentials. That does not imply, as some claim, that the Islamic State has been "un-Islamic" or "anti-Islamic." It is especially amusing when Christian leaders like Barack Obama have the audacity to explain what it means to be a Muslim to Muslims who self-identify as such, like Abu Bakr al-Baghdadi. Simply put, there is no purpose to the contentious debate over Islam's actual nature. Islam lacks a fixed DNA. Islam is what Muslims make it to be.

DISCUSSION

The distinction between human groupings and animal species is significantly more profound. Species often diverge, but they never combine. Gorillas and chimpanzees shared ancestors about 7 million years ago. The two populations that resulted from the division of this single original species subsequently followed different evolutionary paths. After then, there was no turning back. No two species can ever mate and produce fruitful offspring, hence there can never be a fusion of the two. Giraffes cannot merge with elephants, dogs cannot merge with cats, and gorillas cannot merge with chimpanzees.

Human tribes, on the other hand, often grow through time into bigger and bigger groupings. The Saxons, Prussians, Swabians, and Bavarians who had not so long before expended little affection on one another came together to become the modern Germans. After reading Darwin's *On the Origin of Species*, Otto von Bismarck reputedly stated that the Bavarian is the missing link between the Austrian and the human. The Franks, Normans, Bretons, Gascons, and Provençals combined to become the French. Across the Channel, the fusion of the English, Scots, Welsh, and Irish into the British people took place through time, whether voluntarily or not. Germans, French, and Britons may soon become part of the European continent [6].

People in London, Edinburgh, and Brussels are now acutely aware that mergers don't always endure. Brexit may start the simultaneous disintegration of the EU and the UK. But in the long run, history's course is unmistakable. The human race was fragmented into innumerable scattered tribes ten thousand years ago. These merged into bigger and bigger groupings with each passing millennium, resulting in fewer and fewer separate civilisations. The few surviving civilisations have just merged to form a single global civilizations. Although there are still political, racial, ethnic, and economic divides, they do not compromise the overall cohesiveness. In fact, there are certain divisions that are only feasible because of a broad shared structure. For instance, in the economy, the division of labor is ineffective without

everyone having access to the same market. One nation cannot specialize in making automobiles or oil unless it can import food from nations that cultivate rice and wheat.

Human unity has occurred in two ways: by forging ties between various tribes and by standardizing behaviors among them. Even across groups that continue to act in quite different ways, connections may arise. Links may develop between sworn adversaries, in fact. Some of the greatest ties between people may be formed during a war. Many historians contend that after a first high in 1913 and a protracted drop during the Cold War and the World Wars, globalization only began to recover after 1989. Though it overlooks the distinct but no less significant trend of military globalization, this may be accurate in terms of economic globalization. Ideas, technology, and people spread far more swiftly via war than through trade. The United States and Europe had stronger ties in 1918 than they had in 1913. After drifting apart throughout the interwar period, the Second World War and the Cold War forced the two to become irrevocably intertwined. Additionally, war greatly increases interpersonal interest. During the Cold War, when every cough in a Moscow hallway had people scurrying up and down Washington stairs, the US and Russia were closer than they had ever been. People care about their opponents a lot more than they do about their business partners. There are probably fifty American films on Vietnam for every one about Taiwan.

The Ancient Games

The world of the early twenty-first century goes much beyond just establishing connections between various groups. Not only are people connected to one another on a global scale, but they also increasingly have the same values and behaviors. Planet Earth offered ideal ground for hundreds of various political paradigms a thousand years ago. Feudal principalities, autonomous city states, and tiny theocracies coexisted throughout Europe. The Muslim world experimented with kingdoms, sultanates, and emirates in addition to its caliphate, which claimed global dominance. The tribal confederacies in the north and west engaged in ferocious warfare while the Chinese empires saw themselves as the only legitimate political force. While polities in America, Africa, and Australasia varied from small hunter-gatherer tribes to vast empires, India and South East Asia held a kaleidoscope of governments. It is understandable why even nearby human populations struggled to reach consensus on standard diplomatic practices, much alone international rules. Every community had its own political paradigm, making it challenging to comprehend and appreciate foreign political ideas.

In contrast, a single political paradigm is now universally acknowledged. About 200 sovereign nations make up the world's population, and most of these states adhere to the same diplomatic customs and legal norms. Despite having many differences, Sweden, Nigeria, Thailand, and Brazil are all recognized as sovereign nations with comparable rights and benefits and are all indicated on our atlases as the same kind of colorful forms. All four countries are also members of the UN. In fact, they agree on a wide range of political principles and practices, including at least a nominal support for political parties, representative organizations, universal suffrage, and human rights. Along with London and Paris, other cities with parliaments include Cape Town, New Delhi, Tehran, and Moscow. They all utilize the same language of human rights, state sovereignty, and international law while competing for the favor of the general people, whether it is Israelis and Palestinians, Russians and Ukrainians, Kurds and Turks.

There are many different kinds of "failed states" in the world, but there is only one paradigm that defines a successful state. Thus, international politics adheres to the Anna Karenina principle, according to which all successful states are similar but every unsuccessful state

fails uniquely by excluding one or more components of the dominant political system. The Islamic State has lately distinguished itself by completely rejecting this package and by attempting to construct a worldwide caliphate, a completely new form of political organization. But it has fallen short for this same reason. Many terrorist groups and guerrilla armies have succeeded in establishing new nations or occupying ones that already exist. But they have always achieved this by adopting the tenets of the world political system. Even the Taliban fought for acceptance as Afghanistan's legitimate government on a global scale. No organization that rejects the fundamentals of international politics has so far established long-lasting dominance over any sizable region.

Perhaps the easiest way to understand the power of the global political paradigm is to look at something like the 2016 Rio Olympics rather than more serious political issues like war and diplomacy. Think back for a minute on how the Games were run. Instead of religion, class, or language, the 11,000 athletes were divided into delegations according to their country. The English-speaking proletariat, the Buddhists, and the delegations were all absent. The majority of the time, identifying the athletes' nationality was a simple process, with the exception of Taiwan and Palestine. The athletes marched in groups during the opening ceremony on August 5, 2016, each group carrying a country flag. The "Star-Spangled Banner" was played after Michael Phelps won another gold medal, prompting the raising of the Stars and Stripes. The French tricolor was flown high and the Marseillaise was performed when Emilie Andéol took home the gold medal in judo. Conveniently, every nation in the globe has an anthem that follows the same basic structure. Instead of a twenty-minute chant that may only be sung by a restricted caste of hereditary priests, almost all anthems are short orchestral works. Even nations like Saudi Arabia, Pakistan, and the Republic of the Congo have adapted Western musical styles for their national anthems.

The same gloomy uniformity is seen in national flags. With one exception, all flags are rectangular pieces of fabric with a very limited palette of hues, stripes, and geometrical patterns. The only nation having a flag made up of two triangles is Nepal. However, it has never taken home an Olympic gold. A red stripe is placed atop a white stripe in the Indonesian flag. A white stripe is placed above a red stripe in the Polish flag. The flags of Indonesia and Monaco are identical. The flags of Belgium, Chad, Ivory Coast, France, Guinea, Ireland, Italy, Mali, and Romania all feature three vertical stripes in different colors, making it difficult for someone who is colorblind to distinguish between them.

Even though several of these nations had been at war with one another for a long time, just three of the Games have been postponed because of hostilities (in 1916, 1940, and 1944). The Olympics have been at the center of political controversy on numerous occasions, most notably in 1936 when Nazi Berlin hosted the Games and in 1972 when Palestinian terrorists massacred the Israeli delegation to the Munich Olympics. The 1980 Olympics in Moscow were boycotted by the United States and some of its allies, while the 1984 Olympics in Los Angeles were boycotted by the Soviet Union. Political squabbles, however, have generally prevented the Olympic idea from failing.

Let's travel back a thousand years now. Imagine if in 1016 you wanted to host the Olympic Games of the Middle Ages in Rio. Forget for a minute that Rio was a little Tupi Indian settlement at the time, and that Asians, Africans, and Europeans had no idea that America even existed. Forget about the transportation issues involved with getting all the best athletes to Rio without the use of aircraft. Don't forget that there aren't many global sports, and even if everyone could run, there wouldn't be universal agreement on the rules of a running tournament. Just consider how to divide the contending delegations. The Taiwan and Palestine issues are debated for hours on end by the International Olympic Committee today.

To calculate how many hours you would need to devote to the politics of the Medieval Olympics, multiply this by 10,000.

To begin with, in 1016, the Chinese Song Empire did not acknowledge any other political body as being on par with it. Giving its Olympic delegation the same prestige as that awarded to the delegates of the Korean kingdom of Koryo or the Vietnamese kingdom of Dai Co Viet — not to mention the representatives of crude barbarians from beyond the oceans — would consequently be an inconceivable insult.

The majority of Sunni Muslims acknowledged the caliph in Baghdad as their top leader and declared that he had worldwide sovereignty. But in reality, the caliph had little control over Baghdad. Therefore, would all Sunni athletes be split up into hundreds of delegations from the many emirates and sultanates of the Sunni world, or would they all be a member of a single caliphate delegation? What's the point in stopping with the emirates and sultanates? There were several free Bedouin tribes populating the Arabian Desert who acknowledged no master other than Allah. Would each be allowed to send a separate delegation to engage in camel racing or archery? You'd have a lot of comparable problems in Europe. Would a sportsman from Ivry, a Norman town, compete for the weak King of France, the local Count of Ivry, or possibly the Duke of Normandy?

Within a few years, several of these political organizations arose and vanished. Nobody could predict which delegations would attend the 1016 Olympics in advance since no one knew which governmental bodies would still be in existence in that time frame. If the kingdom of England had sent a delegation to the 1016 Olympics, by the time the athletes returned home with their medals, they would have learned that the Danes had just taken control of London and that England, along with Denmark, Norway, and some of Sweden, was being absorbed into King Cnut the Great's North Sea Empire. That dominion collapsed in another twenty years, but the Duke of Normandy reconquered England thirty years later.

Naturally, the great majority of these transient political organizations lacked a song to sing or a flag to raise. Political symbols were obviously extremely important, but the symbolic language of European politics was quite distinct from that of Chinese, Tupi, or Indonesian politics. It would have been very hard to come to an agreement on a standard procedure to celebrate victory. So keep in mind that this seeming rivalry between states signifies an astounding global accord when you watch the Tokyo Games in 2020. Despite the sense of national pride individuals have when their delegation receives a gold medal and their flag is hoisted, there is a far larger cause to be proud of how well humans can plan an event.

People have experimented with a dizzying array of economic models throughout premodern eras, in addition to a wide range of political systems. The views of Russian boyars, Hindu maharajas, Chinese mandarins, and Amerindian tribal leaders on commerce, taxes, and employment were all extremely different. Currently, however, practically everyone adheres to a single global manufacturing line and believes in somewhat varied versions of the same capitalist theme. No matter where you live in the Congo, Mongolia, New Zealand, or Bolivia your everyday activities and financial outcomes are influenced by the same economic theories, businesses and financial institutions, and capital currents. If the finance ministers of Israel and Iran had lunch together, they could easily comprehend and relate to each other's problems since they speak the same economic language.

Tens of thousands of people were killed, ancient sites were destroyed, sculptures were toppled, and other reminders of former governments and Western cultural influence were deliberately destroyed when the Islamic State seized major portions of Syria and Iraq. However, when its warriors raided the neighborhood banks and discovered caches of

American currency with images of American presidents and English-language slogans endorsing American political and religious principles, they chose not to burn these representations of American imperialism. For all political and religious differences together, the dollar note is revered. Even Islamic extremists, Mexican drug lords, and North Korean dictators believe in the dollar and the Federal Reserve's wisdom despite the fact that it has no inherent worth and cannot be used to buy food or drink.

But when it comes to how we see the natural world and the human body, modern humanity's uniformity is most obvious. It was very important where you lived if you were ill in the past. In Europe, the local priest would likely inform you that you had offended God and that, in order to restore your health, you needed contribute to the church, visit a holy place, and passionately beg for God's forgiveness. As an alternative, the local witch would claim that you were possessed by a demon and that you might be freed from its control by singing, dancing, and drinking a black cockerel's blood.

Doctors trained in ancient traditions could have said that your four body humours were out of balance in the Middle East and that you should balance them with a healthy diet and foul-smelling remedies. Ayurvedic doctors in India would provide herbal remedies, massages, and yoga poses as a cure for the balance between the three physical components known as doshas. Every empire, kingdom, and tribe had its own traditions and experts, each espousing different views about the human body and the nature of illness and each offering their own variety of rituals, concoctions, and treatments. Examples include Chinese physicians, Siberian shamans, African witch doctors, and Amerindian medicine men. While some of them were just short of a death sentence, others functioned remarkably effectively. The sole similarity between Chinese, African, European, and American medical methods was that they all had average life expectancies much below fifty and at least one-third of children died before they became adult.

Today, it matters considerably less where you reside if you happen to be ill. You will be escorted to similar-looking hospitals in Toronto, Tokyo, Tehran, or Tel Aviv where you will encounter white-coated physicians who attended the same medical schools and studied the same scientific ideas. They will employ the same procedures and testing to arrive at quite similar diagnoses. Then, they will distribute the same medications made by the same multinational pharmaceutical corporations. Israeli, Canadian, Japanese, and Iranian doctors share many of the same beliefs about the human body and human illnesses, yet there are still a few small cultural distinctions. The Islamic State did not destroy the neighborhood hospitals after capturing Raqqa and Mosul. Instead, it issued a call for all Muslim medical professionals to donate their time and talents there.

It is likely that even Islamist medical professionals agree that germs are killed by antibiotics, that the human body is made up of cells, and that pathogens are to blame for illnesses. What are the components of these bacteria and cells? In fact, what constitutes the whole world? Every tribe has its own mythology about the cosmos and the basic components of the cosmic soup a thousand years ago. Today, educated individuals throughout the globe have the exact same beliefs about matter, energy, time, and space. Consider the nuclear programs in Iran and North Korea. The root of the whole issue is that Israelis and Americans have precisely the same conception of physics as Iranians and North Koreans do. Israel and the United States wouldn't give a damn about Iran's and North Korea's nuclear programs if they thought $E = mc^4$.

Religions and national identities still exist today. However, when it comes to the practical knowledge, such as how to create a state, an economy, a hospital, or a bomb, almost everyone

in the world is a product of the same civilisation. There are controversies, without a question, but every civilization has them as well. They are, in fact, characterized by these conflicts. People often compile a shopping list of shared characteristics while attempting to define their identity. That is incorrect. If they developed a list of typical disputes and conundrums, they would perform considerably better. Europe, for instance, had no unified religious identity in 1618; instead, religious struggle served to define the continent. In 1618, being a European meant obsessing over minute theological distinctions between Lutherans and Calvinists or Catholics and Protestants and being prepared to fight and be murdered for them. In 1618, the only people who would not have cared about these disputes were Turks or Hindus certainly not Europeans. Similar to today, Germany and Britain in 1940 had radically different political beliefs but were yet integral parts of "European Civilization." Hitler and Churchill both have European heritage. Instead, their conflict helped to define what it meant to be European at that time in history. A!Kung hunter-gatherer in 1940, on the other hand, wasn't European since he wouldn't have understood the internal European conflict for race and empire [7], [8].

We argue most often with members of our own families. More than agreements, identity is established through disputes and moral quandaries. What does being European imply in 2018? It does not imply that you must be white, believe in Jesus, or support freedom. Instead, it refers to vigorously debating immigration, the EU, and the bounds of capitalism. It also means to ponder your identity on a constant basis. and to be concerned about the aging population, unchecked consumerism, and global warming. Twenty-first-century Europeans vary from their forebears in 1618 and 1940 in terms of their conflicts and challenges, but they resemble their Chinese and Indian trading partners more and more. Whatever changes lie ahead for mankind, they are more likely to entail a battle among brothers within one civilization than a conflict between civilisations from other planets. The major difficulties of the twenty-first century will be universal in scope. What will happen when ecological disasters are brought on by climate change?

What will happen when computers execute tasks better than humans do and replace people in more and more jobs? What will occur once biotechnology makes it possible to improve people and lengthen lifespans? We will undoubtedly engage in lengthy debates and acrimonious disputes about these issues. However, our disagreements and confrontations are not likely to drive us apart from one another. the exact opposite. They will increase our dependence on one another. Despite the fact that humanity is so far from being a peaceful species, we are all part of one raucous global civilization. So how can we account for the nationalistic trend that is permeating so much of the world? Perhaps we have dismissed the great ancient countries too quickly in our eagerness for globalization? Could the answer to our dire global challenges lie in a return to traditional nationalism? If globalization has so many drawbacks, why not simply stop using it?

CONCLUSION

The pinnacle of human growth and success is civilization. It has influenced the course of history and aided in the development of several cultures throughout the world. Governance, the arts, architecture, language, education, and scientific knowledge breakthroughs that have raised living standards and broadened intellectual horizons are characteristics of civilization. Civilizations do have certain difficulties, however. Conflicts, environmental damage, inequality, and the improper use of technology are just a few of the factors that seriously jeopardize the sustainability and stability of civilizations. Therefore, it is essential to adopt a balanced strategy that highlights civilization's advantages while addressing its inherent weaknesses. Societies may strive toward peaceful coexistence and the preservation of civilization for future generations by fostering values like empathy, collaboration, and

sustainable development. Understanding our civilization's history helps us to manage the complexity of the present and create a more affluent and resilient future.

REFERENCES

- [1] G. Therborn, "States, Nations, and Civilizations," *Fudan J. Humanit. Soc. Sci.*, 2021, doi: 10.1007/s40647-020-00307-1.
- [2] K. B. Taylor, "The passing of western civilization," *Futures*, 2020, doi: 10.1016/j.futures.2020.102582.
- [3] A. S. Green, "Killing the Priest-King: Addressing Egalitarianism in the Indus Civilization," *J. Archaeol. Res.*, 2021, doi: 10.1007/s10814-020-09147-9.
- [4] M. Pabich and M. Materska, "Biological effect of soy isoflavones in the prevention of civilization diseases," *Nutrients*, 2019, doi: 10.3390/nu11071660.
- [5] F. Clemente *et al.*, "The genomic history of the Aegean palatial civilizations," *Cell*, 2021, doi: 10.1016/j.cell.2021.03.039.
- [6] F. Zafari, "Religion as a pillar for establishing a civilization: Al-Māwardī's perspective," *J. Islam. Thought Civiliz.*, 2021, doi: 10.32350/JITC.111.13.
- [7] S. D. Baum *et al.*, "Long-term trajectories of human civilization," *Foresight*, 2019, doi: 10.1108/FS-04-2018-0037.
- [8] P. Huang and L. Westman, "China's imaginary of ecological civilization: A resonance between the state-led discourse and sociocultural dynamics," *Energy Research and Social Science*. 2021. doi: 10.1016/j.erss.2021.102253.

CHAPTER 8

NATIONALISM: GLOBAL ISSUES NEED GLOBAL SOLUTIONS

Dr L. Sudershan Reddy, Professor,
Department of Decision Sciences, CMS Business School, Jain (Deemed to be University), Bangalore,
Karnataka, India,
Email Id:sudershan.reddy@cms.ac.in

ABSTRACT:

In light of global concerns and the need for global solutions, nationalism, a potent force that has impacted history, has received fresh attention. The complicated link between nationalism and global concerns is examined, along with the possible advantages and disadvantages of nationalism in resolving these problems. It contends that while nationalism may provide a feeling of identity and togetherness among countries, it can also obstruct global collaboration and the creation of all-encompassing solutions. In the end, it asks for a proportionate strategy that values national interests while encouraging teamwork to address common global issues.

KEYWORDS:

Climate Change, Global Issues, Global Solutions, Nationalism, Nuclear.

INTRODUCTION

Americans, Russians, and many other groups gravitate to nationalistic isolation when everyone in the world now lives in a single civilization and has the same problems and opportunities. Does a resurgence of nationalism provide genuine answers to the unheard-of issues facing our global community, or is it only an escape that might bring death to people and the ecosystem as a whole? We need to debunk a common misconception before we can respond to this question. Contrary to popular belief, nationalism has nothing to do with human biology and is not a fundamental aspect of the human mind. True, humans are innately sociable creatures with a strong tendency toward group allegiance. But for hundreds of thousands of years, Homo sapiens and its progenitors the hominids lived in tiny, close-knit groups of no more than a few dozen individuals. Humans readily form bonds of allegiance with tiny, close-knit organizations like tribes, army companies, and family businesses, but it is scarcely normal for them to do so with millions of complete strangers. Such widespread allegiances have only developed recently in evolutionary words, this morning and need great social building efforts [1], [2].

Because they faced problems that no one tribe could handle, they went to the bother of creating national collectives. Consider the historic tribes who formerly resided along the Nile River thousands of years ago. Their source of life was the water. It transported their trade and irrigated their lands. However, it was an erratic ally. When it rained too little, people starved to death; when it rained too much, the river overflowed its banks and wiped out whole communities. Because each tribe only controlled a little portion of the river and could only mobilize a limited number of laborers, no tribe could resolve this issue on its own. The only way to contain and control the powerful river would be to work together to construct enormous dams and dig hundreds of kilometers of canals. This was one of the factors that led to the tribes coming together over time to form a unified nation with the ability to forge

canals and dams, control river flow, store food for famine years, and set up a national transportation and communication network.

Despite these benefits, it was never simple to unite tribes and clans into a single country, whether in ancient times or now. You just need to ask yourself, "Do I know these people?" to realize how hard it is to connect with such a country. I could list my two sisters and eleven cousins and speak about their characteristics, peculiarities, and connections for a whole day. The 8 million individuals who share my Israeli citizenship are not known to me, I have never met most of them, and it is quite improbable that I will ever do so. It is not a heritage from my hunter-gatherer ancestors that I can still feel a sense of loyalty to this amorphous mass; rather, it is a marvel of modern history. The ability of these apes to form social relationships with billions of strangers would never occur to a Martian scientist who was only acquainted with the anatomy and evolutionary history of *Homo sapiens*.

The Zionist movement and the Israeli state had to construct a massive infrastructure of education, propaganda, and flag-waving, as well as national systems of security, health, and welfare, in order to persuade me to be loyal to "Israel" and its 8 million citizens. That does not imply that there is a problem with national bonding. Massive systems cannot work without widespread allegiances, and widening the sphere of human empathy undoubtedly has benefits. One of humanity's most helpful inventions has been the milder types of patriotism. I care about people and make sacrifices for them because I believe that my country is exceptional, that it merits my devotion, and that I have particular duties to its citizens. To think that we would all be living in a liberal utopia if nationalism didn't exist is a risky assumption. We would most likely be living in tribal anarchy. Sweden, Germany, and Switzerland are all peaceful, developed, and liberal nations that have strong senses of nationality. Afghanistan, Somalia, Congo, and the majority of other failed governments are on the list of nations without strong national connections [3]–[5].

When benevolent patriotism turns into chauvinistic ultra-nationalism, a problem arises. I can start feeling that my country is paramount, that I owe it my complete allegiance, and that I have no meaningful commitments to anybody else instead of thinking that my nation is special, which is true of all countries. Conflicts may easily become violent in this environment. For many years, the most fundamental critique of nationalism was that it caused wars. However, the connection between nationalism and violence did nothing to restrain nationalist excesses, especially as each country used the necessity to defend itself from its neighbors' intrigues to justify its own military buildup. The majority of the country's residents were prepared to pay the price in blood as long as the country offered them previously unheard-of levels of security and wealth. The nationalist bargain nevertheless seemed to be highly appealing in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Modern nation governments created significant systems of healthcare, education, and welfare even while nationalism was causing terrible wars on an unprecedented scale. Passchendaele and Verdun were made to look worthy by national health services.

In 1945, everything was altered. The balance of the nationalist agreement was dramatically tipped when nuclear weapons were developed. After Hiroshima, people started to dread nuclear war rather than just a conventional conflict as a result of nationalism. Total devastation has a way of sharpening people's perceptions, and in large part because of the atom bomb, the seemingly unthinkable occurred and the nationalist genie was at least

partially re-enchanted. In the nuclear age, a global community gradually emerged over and above the various nations because only such a community could restrain the nuclear demon, just as the ancient inhabitants of the Nile Basin redirected some of their loyalty from local clans to a much bigger kingdom that was able to restrain the dangerous river.

One of the most effective works of propaganda in the history of television was the iconic Daisy commercial, which Lyndon B. Johnson ran during the 1964 US presidential campaign. The commercial begins with a little girl picking up and counting the petals of a flower; however, as she reaches number 10, a metallic male voice takes over and counts backwards from ten to zero as in a countdown for a missile. When the countdown reaches zero, a nuclear explosion's brilliant light fills the screen, and Johnson addresses the American people, saying: "These are the stakes. Either create a world where all of God's children may exist, or enter oblivion. Either we must love one another or we must perish. The phrase "make love, not war" is often associated with the counterculture of the late 1960s, but in reality, it was widely recognized in 1964, even by hard-nosed leaders like Lyndon Johnson. As a result, throughout the Cold War, nationalism was subordinated to a more global understanding of international politics, and after the Cold War, globalization seemed to be the unstoppable force driving the future.

Nationalistic politics were thought to be a thing of the past, a holdover from more prehistoric times that may, at worst, appeal to the uneducated populace of a few impoverished nations. But recent events have shown that nationalism still has a strong grip on people in Europe and the United States, not to mention those in Russia, India, and China. People all across the globe look for comfort and purpose in the nation's heart because they are alienated by the impersonal forces of global capitalism and worried about the future of their countries' health, education, and welfare systems. However, the issue posed by Johnson in the Daisy commercial is arguably more relevant now than it was back then. Will we create a world where all people may coexist, or will we all perish in the dark? Do Donald Trump, Theresa May, Vladimir Putin, Narendra Modi, and their allies rescue the world by stoking our nationalism, or is the present nationalist uprising a sort of denial of the insurmountable difficulties we confront on the international stage?

DISCUSSION

The Nuclear Challenge

Let's begin with the well-known foe of humanity: nuclear war. Nuclear destruction was a real concern when the Daisy commercial first aired in 1964, two years after the Cuban Missile Crisis. Both experts and the general public were concerned that humanity lacked the intelligence to prevent devastation and that it was just a matter of time until the Cold War heated up. In fact, humanity rose to the nuclear threat with triumph. The Cold War ended with minimal violence thanks to American, Soviet, European, and Chinese changes to the way geopolitics has been practiced for millennia, and a new internationalist global order ushered in a period of unimaginable calm. Not only was a nuclear conflict avoided, but all wars also decreased. Surprisingly few boundaries have been altered by outright aggression since 1945, and the majority of nations have stopped using war as a common political tactic. In 2016, fewer individuals died from human violence than from obesity, auto accidents, or suicide, despite hostilities in Syria, Ukraine, and other trouble regions [6]–[8].

The greatest political and moral accomplishment of our time may have been this. Unfortunately, we now take this accomplishment for granted since we are so used to it. People allow themselves to play with fire in part because of this. Recent nuclear arms races

between Russia and the United States have resulted in the development of unique doomsday weapons that might reverse decades of hard-won progress and push the world back to the verge of nuclear war. As mentioned in Dr. Strangelove, the public has either learned to stop caring and love the bomb or has just forgotten about it.

As a result, the crucial role the EU plays in maintaining peace in Europe and the world has largely been overlooked throughout the Brexit discussion in Britain, a significant nuclear power. A system that maintains continental peace has been developed by the French, Germans, Italians, and Britons after centuries of awful carnage, only for the British populace to derail the wonder device. Building the internationalist system that avoided nuclear war and preserved world peace was very challenging. Without a question, we must modify this system to reflect the evolving global environment, for instance by depending less on the USA and providing non-Western nations like China and India a larger role.

But to completely throw up the towel on this administration and return to nationalist power politics would be a reckless risk. It is true that nationalist politics were practiced in nineteenth-century nations without causing the collapse of civilization. But it was back in the days before Hiroshima. Since then, the advent of nuclear weapons has increased the stakes and altered the basic character of both politics and conflict. Humanity's existence relies on prioritizing the avoidance of nuclear war above the interests of any specific country as long as they can enrich uranium and plutonium. Extreme nationalists who exclaim, "Our country first!" should reflect on whether their nation can save the whole globe from nuclear annihilation on its own, much alone defend itself.

The Ecological Challenge

Ecological collapse, a new existential danger to humanity that hardly registered on political radars in 1964, would be faced in the following decades in addition to nuclear war. The global ecosystem is being disrupted by humans on many different levels. We are depleting the environment's resources at the same time as we are putting massive amounts of garbage and poison back into it, altering the makeup of the soil, water, and atmosphere. The many ways humans upset the delicate ecological balance that has evolved over millions of years are hardly even conscious to us. Take phosphorous as an example, which is used as a fertilizer. It is a necessary nutrient for the development of plants in modest amounts. But when used in excess, it becomes poisonous. Modern industrial farming relies on artificially fertilizing the fields with a lot of phosphorus, but this practice pollutes rivers, lakes, and seas with a high concentration of phosphorus, which has a terrible effect on marine life. Thus, a corn farmer in Iowa may unintentionally kill fish in the Gulf of Mexico. Such activities lead to habitat degradation, the extinction of animals and plants, and the potential destruction of whole ecosystems like the Amazon rainforest and the Australian Great Barrier Reef. *Homo sapiens* has been acting in an ecologically murderous manner for thousands of years, but it is now changing into an ecological mass murderer. If we stay on our current path, not only will a significant portion of all living forms perish, but it might also undermine the very underpinnings of human civilization.

The possibility of climate change poses the greatest hazard of all. The existence of humans dates back hundreds of thousands of years, and they have weathered multiple ice ages and warm periods. However, sophisticated communities, towns, and agriculture have only been around for perhaps 10,000 years. The Holocene is a time when the climate of Earth has been generally steady. Human cultures will face immense obstacles they have never faced before if Holocene norms are deviated from. It will be similar to using countless numbers of humans as test subjects in an open-ended experiment. Even if human civilization does ultimately

adjust to the new circumstances, it is impossible to predict how many people will die throughout the adaptation process. This dreadful experiment is already under progress. Climate change is a current fact, in contrast to nuclear war, which is a hypothetical future event. There is scientific agreement that human activities, especially the release of greenhouse gases like carbon dioxide, are accelerating the pace of climate change on Earth.

Nobody is quite sure how much carbon dioxide we can keep adding to the atmosphere before we cause an irreversible catastrophe. But according to our most accurate scientific projections, unless we significantly reduce greenhouse gas emissions over the next 20 years, average global temperatures will rise by more than 2°C. Growing deserts, melting ice caps, increasing sea levels, and an increase in the frequency of severe weather events like hurricanes and typhoons. Due to these changes, cities will be flooded, much of the planet will become uninhabitable, and hundreds of millions of people will be forced to flee in search of new homes.

Furthermore, a number of tipping points are quickly approaching beyond which even a sharp reduction in greenhouse gas emissions won't be sufficient to buck the trend and prevent a global catastrophe. For instance, less sunlight is reflected back from planet Earth to space when global warming melts the polar ice sheets. This results in increased heat absorption by the planet, greater temperature increases, and quicker ice melt. All of the ice in the polar regions will melt if this feedback loop passes a crucial threshold and gains an unstoppable speed, even if people cease burning coal, oil, and gas. So, just realizing the threat we face is insufficient. It is imperative that we take action right now. Unfortunately, as of 2018, there has been no change in the pace of global greenhouse gas emissions; it is still rising. There is not much time left for humanity to transition away from fossil fuels. Today is the day to start treatment. Today, not tomorrow month or next year. "Hello, my name is Homo sapiens, and I'm addicted to fossil fuels."

What role does nationalism play in this concerning situation? Exists a nationalist response to the ecological threat? Can any country, no matter how strong, halt global warming on its own? Individual nations may implement a variety of green policies, many of which are sensible from both an economic and environmental standpoint. Governments may impose a tax on carbon emissions, increase the price of oil and gas by include the cost of externalities, adopt stricter environmental laws, stop funding polluting companies, and promote the use of renewable energy sources. Additionally, they may spend more money on the investigation and creation of ground-breaking eco-friendly technology, a la the ecological Manhattan Project. Many of the accomplishments of the last 150 years may be attributed to the internal combustion engine, but if we are to maintain a stable physical and economic environment, it must now be retired and replaced by new technologies that do not consume fossil fuels.

Innovations in technology may be useful not only in the energy sector. Think about how 'clean beef' may one day be developed, for instance. In addition to causing enormous suffering to billions of sentient people, the meat industry is now one of the primary contributors to global warming, one of the largest users of antibiotics and poison, and one of the worst pollutants of air, land, and water. A kilogram of beef requires around 15,000 litres of fresh water, but a kilogram of potatoes only need 287 litres, according to a 2013 research by the Institution of Mechanical Engineers.

As hundreds of millions more people convert regularly from eating potatoes to beef due to increased income in nations like China and Brazil, the impact on the environment is expected to worsen. It would be challenging to persuade the Chinese, the Brazilians, the Americans, or the Germans to give up their steak, burgers, and sausages. What if scientists discovered a

technique to produce meat from cells? Instead of growing and butchering a whole cow (and shipping the carcass hundreds of kilometers), simply grow a hamburger. Although it may seem like science fiction, in 2013 the first clean hamburger in the world was produced from cells and consumed. \$330,000 was spent. After four years of development, the cost was reduced to \$11 a unit, and within another ten years, it's anticipated that clean meat produced in factories would be less expensive than meat from animals that were killed. This scientific advancement has the potential to feed billions of hungry people, rescue billions of animals from a life of extreme pain, and avoid ecological disaster all at once.

Therefore, there are several things that governments, businesses, and people themselves can do to stop climate change. However, they must be carried out globally in order to be successful. Countries just aren't sovereign in the climate realm. They are dependent on the decisions made by individuals on the other side of the world. If other nations don't act similarly, the Pacific island country of Kiribati, which could decrease its greenhouse gas emissions to zero, would still be flooded by increasing sea levels. Even if solar panels were installed on every roof, Chad would still turn into a desolate wasteland as a result of the careless environmental policies of far-off outsiders. Even strong countries like China and Japan lack ecological sovereignty. The Chinese and Japanese will need to persuade the Russian and American governments to change their 'business as usual' stance in order to shield Shanghai, Hong Kong, and Tokyo from damaging floods and typhoons.

In the context of climate change, nationalist isolationism poses an even greater threat than nuclear war. All countries have an equal interest in averting an all-out nuclear conflict since it poses a danger to their destruction. On the other hand, various countries will likely experience the effects of global warming differently. Some nations most notably Russia might even profit from it. Russia is far less concerned about rising sea levels than China or Kiribati because it has comparatively few shoreline assets. And although increased temperatures are expected to convert Chad into a desert, they may also transform Siberia into the world's breadbasket. Furthermore, when the ice in the far north melts, Kamchatka may take the position of Singapore as the world's crossroads, and the Russian-dominated Arctic sea lanes may become the main artery of international trade. Similar to this, certain nations may be more interested in switching from fossil fuels to renewable energy sources than others. South Korea, Japan, and China all rely heavily on oil and gas imports. They will be ecstatic to be relieved of that responsibility. Saudi Arabia, Iran, and Russia all rely on oil and gas exports. If solar and wind suddenly replace oil and gas, their economies will collapse.

As a result, although certain countries, like China, Japan, and Kiribati, are likely to press for a rapid reduction in global carbon emissions, other countries, like Russia and Iran, could be far less enthusiastic. Nationalists may be too naive and self-centered to see the risk, even in nations like the USA that stand to lose a lot due to global warming. In January 2018, a modest but instructive example was presented when the United States put a 30% tax on solar equipment and panels manufactured abroad, choosing to assist American solar manufacturers even at the expense of delaying the transition to renewable energy. Nobody can overlook the danger posed by an atom bomb because it is so evident and immediate. Contrarily, global warming is a more nebulous and enduring threat.

Therefore, nationalists may be inclined to put immediate national interests first and comfort themselves that they can worry about the environment later or simply leave it to others abroad if long-term environmental issues require some unpleasant short-term sacrifice. Alternately, they can just flatly reject the issue. The fact that the nationalist right tends to be skeptical about climate change is not a coincidence. Rarely do socialists on the left tweet that

"climate change is a Chinese hoax." Some nationalist leaders would rather pretend that there is no issue with global warming since there is no national solution to it.

The Nationalist Answer To These Menace

Nationalist solutions don't exist. The nation state is just the wrong structure to face the problem, just as it is with climate change and technological upheaval. Even a superpower like the United States cannot impose restrictions on research and development on its own since they are not the exclusive property of any one nation. Even though the US government outlaws genetically altering human embryos, Chinese scientists are still able to do so. And if the circumstances that follow provide China a significant military or economic edge, the USA will be inclined to violate its own embargo. If even one nation decides to follow a high-risk, high-gain technological route, other nations will be compelled to follow suit since none can afford to fall behind, especially in a xenophobic dog-eat-dog world. Humanity would likely need some kind of global identity and allegiance to prevent such a race to the bottom.

Furthermore, whereas nuclear war and climate change merely pose a danger to humankind's physical existence, disruptive technologies have the potential to alter the entire character of humanity. As a result, they are intertwined with people's most fundamental ethical and religious values. Everyone believes that nuclear war and ecological collapse should be avoided, yet ideas regarding whether to use biotechnology and artificial intelligence to improve humans and create new life forms vary greatly. Dr. Frankenstein will have free reign if humanity fails to create and implement universally recognized ethical standards.

Nationalism is particularly hampered by an absence of creativity when it comes to developing such moral standards. Nationalists see long-lasting territorial wars, but cosmic concepts are more appropriate for understanding the technological revolutions of the twenty-first century. Science is ushering in the age of inorganic life molded by intelligent design after 4 billion years of biological life growing via natural selection. It is conceivable that Homo sapiens will vanish in the process. We still belong to the hominid family of apes. The majority of our physical characteristics, physical skills, and cerebral capacities still resemble those of chimpanzees and Neanderthals. Our passion, love, fury, and social ties are all clearly hominid traits, in addition to our hands, eyes, and brains. The fusion of biotechnology and AI may produce physical, mental, and biological characteristics that entirely break away from the hominid mold within a century or two. Some speculate that awareness may even be freed from all biological and physical limitations and might roam cyberspace without being attached to any bodily form. On the other side, the growth of AI may lead to a future where super-intelligent but wholly non-conscious beings rule, fully detaching intelligence from awareness [9]–[11].

Spaceship Earth

Nuclear conflict, ecological collapse, and technological disruption alone are enough to endanger the continuation of Western civilization. However, when they are combined, they create an unheard-of existential dilemma, particularly because they are probably going to reinforce and compound one another. For instance, even while the ecological crisis puts human civilization as we know it in danger, it is unlikely to halt the advancement of AI and biotechnology. Assume again if you assume that our focus will be diverted from algorithms and DNA by rising seas, diminishing food sources, and huge migrations. The creation of high-risk, high-gain technology will likely only speed up as the ecological situation worsens.

In fact, it's possible that climate change will serve the same purpose as the two global wars. The speed of technical advancement accelerated between 1914 and 1918, and then again

between 1939 and 1945, as a result of entire warring countries forgoing prudence and economy in favor of investing enormous resources on a wide range of bold and imaginative initiatives. Many of these experiments were unsuccessful, but several resulted in the creation of nuclear weapons, tanks, radar, poison gas, supersonic planes, and intercontinental missiles. Similar to this, countries confronting a climate catastrophe would be tempted to place their faith in frantic technical bets. There are many legitimate worries that humanity has about AI and biotechnology, yet in times of crisis, people take risks. Whatever your opinion on regulating disruptive technology, consider if such restrictions are likely to remain in place even if global food shortages occur, cities throughout the globe experience flooding, and hundreds of millions of people flee their homes due to climate change.

By escalating global tensions and upending the nuclear balance of power, technological upheavals may potentially heighten the risk of cataclysmic conflicts. Superpowers have avoided hostilities since the 1950s because they all understood that war would result in mutually assured annihilation. However, when new categories of offensive and defensive weaponry emerge, a developing technical powerhouse may believe that it can annihilate its adversaries without consequence. A failing nation, on the other hand, could be concerned that its conventional nuclear weapons would soon become outdated and that it should use them before it loses them. Nuclear conflict has always resembled a highly strategic game of chess. What would happen if players had the ability to employ cyberattacks to seize control of an opponent's pieces, anonymous third parties had the ability to move pawns without anyone knowing who did it, or AlphaZero advanced from traditional chess to nuclear chess?

Just as the many difficulties are likely to exacerbate one another, so too is it possible that issues on one front may deplete the goodwill needed to tackle another one. Countries engaged in violent conflict are unlikely to agree to limit AI development, and nations vying to surpass the technical might of their competitors will find it very difficult to come to an agreement on a shared strategy to combat climate change. It will be exceedingly difficult to simultaneously overcome all three problems as long as the globe is still made up of competitive states, and failing on even one front might be disastrous. The global nationalist movement cannot go back in time to 1939 or 1914. Technology has fundamentally altered the world by posing a number of existential risks that no one country can address alone. The strongest catalyst for creating a shared identity is a common adversary, and humanity now faces three such foes: nuclear war, climate catastrophe, and technological upheaval. Humans may make decisions that are considerably worse than they did in 1914 and 1939 if they chose to prioritize their unique national allegiances above all other considerations in the face of these shared risks.

The European Union's Constitution, which states that "while remaining proud of their own national identities and history, the peoples of Europe are determined to transcend their former divisions and, united ever more closely, to forge a common destiny," lays out a far better course. This does not imply that all national identities, regional customs, and humankind as a whole should be eliminated. It also does not entail demonizing all acts of patriotism. In fact, it might be argued that the European Union encouraged local patriotism in regions like Flanders, Lombardy, Catalonia, and Scotland by creating a continental military and economic protective shell. When you can bank on a united European front against global warming and transnational businesses and you don't have to worry about a German invasion, the concept of forming an independent Scotland or Catalonia becomes more appealing.

Nationalists in Europe are consequently being leisurely. Few Europeans truly want to fight and be murdered for the nation's restoration, despite all the hype about it. In the era of William Wallace and Robert Bruce, the Scots needed to assemble an army in order to free themselves from London's control. Contrarily, no one died during the 2014 Scottish

referendum, and it is quite improbable that they will have to reenact the Battle of Bannockburn if they vote for independence again. Although the violence associated with the Catalan bid to secede from Spain has been significantly increased, it still pales in comparison to the devastation Barcelona saw in 1939 or in 1714.

Hopefully, the rest of the world can take a cue from Europe. There will still be plenty of place on a unified earth for the type of patriotism that highlights the particular qualities of my country and emphasizes my specific responsibilities to it. However, if civilization is to survive and thrive, we must balance such local allegiances with significant responsibilities to the global community. Why not include humanity and the planet Earth to that list of allegiances? A person may and should be devoted to her family, her neighborhood, her career, and her country at the same time. True, confrontations are sometimes unavoidable when you have different loyalties. But who said life was straightforward? Adapt to it.

National identities were formed in earlier ages as a result of the fact that people had to deal with issues and possibilities that were too big for small tribes to manage and required national collaboration. Nations today are in a similar predicament to the ancient tribes in that they lack the proper structure to address the most pressing issues of the day. National institutions can't handle a collection of unprecedented global problems, thus we need a new global identity. We now only have national politics, while having a global ecosystem, global economy, and global science. Due to this imbalance, the political system is unable to successfully address our most pressing issues. We must either deglobalize the ecosystem, the economy, and the advancement of knowledge in order to have effective politics, or we must globalize our politics. The only true answer is to globalize politics since it is difficult to stop the progress of science and ecology from becoming global, and because doing so would likely be too expensive. This does not entail the creation of a world government, which is an improbable and unachievable goal [11]–[13].

Instead, globalizing politics implies giving global issues and concerns far greater weight in local political processes inside nations and even towns. Nationalist feelings are probably not going to assist much with that. Then, maybe, we might look to the common religious practices of humanity to aid in unifying the globe. Religions like Christianity and Islam were already thinking globally rather than locally hundreds of years ago, and they were always deeply engaged in life's major concerns rather than merely the political conflicts of this or that country. But do ancient faiths still have any relevance today? Do they still have the ability to influence the world, or are they merely lifeless artifacts from the past that are being hurled about by the powerful forces of contemporary nations, economics, and technologies?

CONCLUSION

Nationalism is a substantial obstacle to tackling global concerns with global solutions, despite its capacity to foster identity and togetherness inside countries. The creation of comprehensive solutions that call for collaborative action is sometimes hampered by nationalism, which may be a motivating factor for domestic achievement and national pride but also erects obstacles to international collaboration. Global issues including climate change, pandemics, and economic inequality need interdisciplinary cooperation across international borders. In order to promote global collaboration while still recognizing and respecting national interests, a balance must be struck. Dialogue, diplomacy, and a common understanding of the interdependence of world problems may be used to attain this equilibrium. The international community may cooperate more successfully to solve the serious issues that concern us all by adopting a mentality that blends national self-interest with an understanding of the need for global solutions.

REFERENCES

- [1] D. R. Kanter, "Nitrogen pollution: a key building block for addressing climate change," *Clim. Change*, 2018, doi: 10.1007/s10584-017-2126-6.
- [2] P. Joseph, "Brick: sustainability through policy," *Urban Res. Pract.*, 2021, doi: 10.1080/17535069.2020.1819724.
- [3] D. K. Agaba, "Tackling inequality and governance challenges: Insights from the COVID-19 pandemic," *African Hum. Rights Law J.*, 2021, doi: 10.17159/1996-2096/2021/v21n2a35.
- [4] W. Wasino, "Maritime Content in Indonesian History Education: The Development and Alternative Solution," *J. Marit. Stud. Natl. Integr.*, 2017, doi: 10.14710/jmsni.v1i2.1997.
- [5] B. E. Johansen, "Introduction," *Nationalism: Past as Prologue*. 2021. doi: 10.4324/9780429451690-1.
- [6] Centre for International Governance Innovation, "A Call To Action: Transforming the Global Refugee System," *Alllen Lane*, 2019.
- [7] Q. Wu, J. Xiu, and Z. Wen, "Two Kinds of Analysis in the Issue of Dealing with EDPs," *Macro Manag. Public Policies*, 2021, doi: 10.30564/mmpp.v2i4.2194.
- [8] Wasino, "Maritime Culture in Indonesian History Curriculum and Textbooks, The Development and Alternative Solution," *J. Soc. Stud. Educ.*, 2015.
- [9] E. Council and R. Group, "Project Europe 2030," *Group*, 2010.
- [10] R. Sobiecki, "Why does the progress of civilisation require social innovations?," *Kwart. Nauk o Przedsiębiorstwie*, 2017, doi: 10.5604/01.3001.0010.4686.
- [11] H. Köhler, "Working for a Better Globalization," *Conference on Humanizing the Global Economy*. 2002.
- [12] Reflection Group on the Future of the EU 2030, "Project Europe 2030: Challenges and Opportunities," *Publications Office of the European Union*. 2010.
- [13] O. Hieronymi, "Agenda for a new monetary reform," *Futures*, 1998, doi: 10.1016/S0016-3287(98)00084-6.

CHAPTER 9

A STUDY ON RELIGION

Dr Navaneetha Kumar, Professor,
Department of Decision Sciences, CMS Business School, Jain (Deemed to be University), Bangalore,
Karnataka, India,
Email Id:dr.navaneethakumar@cms.ac.in

ABSTRACT:

Throughout history, religion has played a crucial role in molding the beliefs, values, and actions of human communities. An overview of the notion of religion is given along with an examination of its numerous manifestations and cultural relevance. While admitting religion's propensity for conflict and division, it looks at how it may provide people a sense of meaning, morality, and community. Religions often advocate for moral ideas and ethical standards, directing people's conduct and encouraging a feeling of obligation to others. Religion may cause conflict, however, since various interpretations and dogmas can breed hostility and prejudice. The concept emphasizes the need of respectful communication and understanding among many religious views in order to promote peace and harmony in a world that is becoming more linked.

KEYWORDS:

Community, Global Warming, Religion, Religious Issue, Traditional Faiths.

INTRODUCTION

National governments, scientific authorities, and contemporary ideologies have so far been unable to come up with a workable plan for humanity's future. Can one find inspiration for such a vision in the rich traditions of human religion? Perhaps the solution has been concealed within the pages of the Vedas, the Quran, or the Bible all along. This concept is likely to elicit scorn or trepidation from the secular population. Although the holy books may have been useful in the middle Ages, how can they serve as our leaders in the age of biotechnology, artificial intelligence, global warming, and cyberwar fare? However, they are a minority. Religious movements shape the politics of nations as different as India, Turkey, and the United States; millions of people still express stronger confidence in the Bible and the Quran than in the theory of evolution; and hostilities are fueled by religious animosities in places like Nigeria and the Philippines [1], [2].

Then how important are faiths like Christianity, Islam, and Hinduism? Can they aid us in resolving our most pressing issues? We must differentiate between three categories of issues in order to comprehend the place of traditional faiths in the twenty-first century:

1. **Technical Difficulties:**How, for instance, should farmers in dry nations respond to catastrophic droughts brought on by global warming?
2. **Issues with Policy:** What policies, for instance, should be put in place to first stop global warming?

3. **Issues with Identity:** Should I even be concerned with the issues facing farmers on the other side of the globe, or should I just be concerned about the issues facing members of my own tribe and nation?

The conventional faiths are generally unrelated to technological and policy issues, as we will see in the pages that follow. However, they often represent a significant portion of the issue rather than a viable remedy. In contrast, they are very important to identity concerns.

Technical Issues: Christian Agriculture

Before the advent of modern science, religions handled a broad variety of technological issues in everyday industries like agriculture. Divine calendars set the dates for planting and harvesting, while temple ceremonies ensured rain and warded off pests. Farmers asked priests to pray to the gods on their behalf when a drought or locust infestation threatened their crops. Medicine also lay within the purview of religion. Nearly all prophets, gurus, and shamans were also healers. Therefore, a large portion of Jesus' time was spent making the ill well, the blind sight, the deaf speak, and the insane sane. No matter where you lived in ancient Egypt or medieval Europe if you were unwell, you were more likely to visit a revered temple on a pilgrimage than a hospital or a witch doctor.

The priests and the miracle workers have recently been replaced by scientists and surgeons. Egyptians may readily seek Allah for assistance if they are now experiencing a locust epidemic - why not? But they won't neglect to enlist the help of chemists, entomologists, and geneticists to create stronger insecticides and wheat varieties that can fend off insects. If a devoted Hindu's kid develops a serious case of the measles, the father will pray to Dhanvantari and present flowers and treats at the neighborhood temple, but only after he has taken the toddler to the hospital and given him over to the care of the staff there. As neurology replaces demonology and Prozac replaces exorcism, even mental illness, the final refuge of spiritual healers, is increasingly falling into the hands of science. The triumph of science has been so total that it has altered our entire conception of religion. Religion is no longer associated with agriculture or medicine. Even many fanatics now have collective amnesia and would like to ignore the fact that conventional faiths formerly claimed these territories. The extremists ask, "So what if we consult with engineers and physicians?" "That shows nothing." What on earth does religion have to do with farming or medicine?

Since traditional faiths were, very simply, not very effective at farming or healthcare, they have lost a great deal of ground. Rainmaking, healing, prophecy, and magic have never really been the domain of priests and gurus. Instead, interpretation has always been the key. A priest is not someone who can do the rain dance to put an end to the drought. A priest is someone who can explain why the rain dance didn't work and why we should continue to believe in our god even if he doesn't appear to be listening to any of our pleas. However, as compared to scientists, religious leaders are at a disadvantage precisely because of their knack for interpretation. The ability to recognize failure and attempt a new approach is what distinguishes science, even when scientists are skilled at taking short cuts and manipulating the data. For this reason, scientists eventually learn how to produce better crops and treatments, but priests and gurus merely acquire the ability to produce better justifications. Since the beginning of time, even ardent believers have been aware of the difference, which is why religious authority has been eroding in an increasing number of scientific and

technological sectors. This is also the reason why humanity as a whole is merging into a single civilization. When something really works, everyone adopts it [3], [4].

Policy problems: Muslim economics

While science offers us precise solutions to technical issues like how to treat measles, there is significant debate among scientists over issues of policy. Nearly all scientists agree that global warming is a reality, but there is disagreement on how best to address this issue economically. But it does not imply that conventional religions can assist us in finding a solution. The primary dividing lines in current economics, such as those between capitalists and socialists, don't match up with the splits in traditional faiths, and ancient scriptures are simply not a reliable reference for modern economics. It is true that rabbis and ayatollahs directly influence the government's economic policies in nations like Israel and Iran, and even in more secular nations like the United States and Brazil, religious leaders have an impact on public opinion on issues like taxes and environmental laws. However, a deeper examination finds that traditional faiths really take a back seat to contemporary scientific beliefs in the majority of these situations.

The Quran will not provide Ayatollah Khamenei with the information he needs to make an important choice on the Iranian economy since Arabs in the seventh century had limited knowledge of the challenges and possibilities faced by contemporary industrial economies and the global financial markets. In order to find solutions, he or his assistants must consult Friedrich Hayek, Milton Friedman, Karl Marx, and other contemporary economists. Khamenei can then use his religious knowledge and authority to disguise the scientific solution in the form of this or that Quranic verse and present it to the people as Allah's will after deciding to increase interest rates, reduce taxes, privatize government monopolies, or sign an international tariff agreement. But attire doesn't really matter. Shiite Iran, Sunni Saudi Arabia, Jewish Israel, Hindu India, and Christian America all have different economic strategies, but the differences aren't all that noticeable.

Muslim, Jewish, Hindu, and Christian philosophers rebelled against contemporary materialism, soulless capitalism, and the excesses of the bureaucratic state throughout the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. They pledged that, given the opportunity, they would put an end to the problems of modernity and create a whole new socioeconomic order based on the timeless spiritual principles of their doctrine. They've had plenty of opportunities, but the only notable changes they've made to the structure of contemporary economies are to repaint it and add a massive crescent, cross, Star of David, or Om to the roof.

When it comes to economics, religion is meaningless due to the long-honed skill of religious academics in reinterpreting scriptures, much as in the case of rainmaking. Whatever economic strategy Khamenei opts for, he can always reconcile it with the Quran. As a result, the Quran is reduced from a source of authentic knowledge to one of merely binding authority. Reading Marx and Hayek carefully may help you better comprehend the economic system, evaluate things from a fresh perspective, and consider viable solutions when you are faced with a challenging economic problem. After coming up with a response, you head to the Quran and carefully study it in search of a surah that, if interpreted creatively enough, may support the answer you came up with from Hayek or Marx. If you are a skilled Quranic scholar, you will always be able to defend whatever answer you came up with there. Christian beliefs are no different. A Christian may be a capitalist just as readily as a communist, and

even if some of what Jesus taught during the Cold War smacked of outright communism, decent American capitalists continued to read the Sermon on the Mount with little thought. 'Christian economics,' 'Muslim economics,' or 'Hindu economics' just don't exist. The Bible, Quran, and Vedas all include economic concepts; it's only that these concepts are out of date. Following his studies of the Vedas, Mahatma Gandhi developed the idea of an independent India made up of small agricultural villages that could all produce their own khadi textiles while importing and exporting very little. He is shown spinning cotton with his own hands in the most well-known portrait of him, and he turned the simple spinning wheel into the emblem of the Indian independence struggle.

However, except from Gandhi's brilliant picture on billions of rupee notes, little much of this Arcadian ideal has survived simply because it cannot be reconciled with the reality of contemporary economy. It has become usual to explain even purportedly religious issues in terms of economics, yet no one ever considers doing the opposite, since modern economic ideas are so much more relevant than old dogmas. For instance, some argue that class disputes had a significant role in causing the Troubles between Catholics and Protestants in Northern Ireland. In Northern Ireland, the top classes were mostly Protestant due to several historical mishaps, while the lower classes were predominately Catholic. Therefore, what seemed to be a theological disagreement concerning the character of Christ was really a standard fight between the wealthy and the poor. Contrarily, very few people would argue that the 1970s wars in South America between communist insurgents and capitalist landowners were only a smokescreen for a far deeper theological dispute.

DISCUSSION

What impact would religion have on the main issues of the twenty-first century, then? Consider the debate over whether to give AI the power to make life choices for individuals, such as what to study, where to work, and who to marry. What is the Muslim viewpoint on the matter? What is the stance of Jews? No 'Muslim' or 'Jewish' viewpoints are present here. People who support and oppose granting AI great power are expected to make up the majority of humanity. Muslims and Jews are likely to be found in both groups, and they will utilize creative interpretations of the Talmud and the Quran to support whatever viewpoint they hold [5]–[7].

Of fact, religious organizations may become more dogmatic in their beliefs and make them into purportedly holy and everlasting doctrines. Liberation Theology, developed by Latin American theologians in the 1970s, gave Jesus a somewhat Che Guevara-like appearance. Similar to how it's simple to use Jesus in the global warming discussion to make contemporary political stances seem like timeless theological truths. This is already starting to take place. While some American Evangelical pastors preach with fire and brimstone against environmental legislation, Pope Francis is leading the fight against global warming in the name of Christ (as seen by his second encyclical, "Laudato si").

So maybe by 2070, your religious affiliation Evangelical or Catholic will make all the difference in the world when it comes to environmental issues. It goes without saying that Evangelicals would oppose any restriction on carbon emissions, while Catholics will hold that Jesus advocated for environmental protection. Even in their automobiles, the differences are obvious. While faithful Catholics will go about in sleek electric automobiles with a bumper sticker proclaiming "Burn the Planet - and Burn in Hell!," evangelicals will drive enormous gas-guzzler SUVs. However, despite the fact that they may use different biblical verses to support their claims, the true basis for their disagreement will be contemporary

scientific ideas and political ideologies, not the Bible. According to this viewpoint, religion doesn't actually have anything to say about the important policy discussions of our day. It is only a façade, as Karl Marx claimed.

Identity Issues: The demarcation of the Lines

However, Marx overstated his case when he regarded religion as nothing more than a façade for strong economic and technical forces. Islam, Hinduism, and Christianity may be vibrant ornaments on top of a contemporary economic system, but people often identify with the decorations, and identities are a significant historical force. Human power relies on mass collaboration, and mass collaboration depends on creating mass identities, all of which are founded on fictional narratives rather than scientific truths or even practical considerations. In the twenty-first century, religious myths continue to be used to categorize people as Jews, Muslims, or Russians and Poles. Since Nazis and communists' attempts to establish race and class as 'natural' human identities turned out to be risky pseudo-science, scientists have been adamantly opposed to helping defining any such identities for people.

Religions do not, then, deliver rain, heal diseases, or make bombs in the twenty-first century, but they do get to decide who is "us" and who is "them," who we should treat and who we should bomb. As was already said, Shiite Iran, Sunni Saudi Arabia, and Jewish Israel are strikingly similar in practice. All are bureaucratic nation governments that depend on chemists and physicists to create weapons and have policies that are more or less capitalist. Shiite bureaucracy, Sunni capitalism, or Jewish physics don't exist. How can one make individuals feel special, devoted to one human group while being antagonistic to another?

Religions employ rites, rituals, and ceremonies to establish boundaries in the sands of mankind. Orthodox Jews, Sunnis, and Shiites all dress differently, do various prayers, and adhere to distinct taboos. These many religious traditions often provide beauty to everyday life and inspire individuals to act more sweetly and charitably. The muezzin calls Muslims to pause from the rush of everyday activities and attempt to connect to a timeless truth five times a day, rising above the cacophony of bazaars, offices, and factories. Their Hindu neighbors may work toward the same objective with the aid of regular pujas and mantra recitation. Jewish families gather for a special supper of pleasure, appreciation, and camaraderie every Friday night. Christian gospel choirs provide millions of people hope by fostering links of love and trust among the community on Sunday morning, two days later.

Other religious practices cause a lot of ugly behavior in the world and among its inhabitants. For instance, there isn't much to be stated in favor of caste or misogynistic discrimination that has a theological basis. However, regardless of how attractive they may be, these religious traditions unify a group of people while setting them apart from their neighbors. When seen from the outside, religious traditions that separate individuals sometimes seem trivial, and Freud mocked people's concern with such things by calling it "the narcissism of small differences." But even little variations may have a big impact on politics and history. So whether you reside in Israel, Iran, or Saudi Arabia, it is literally a question of life and death if you happen to be homosexual or lesbian. LGBT people are legally protected in Israel, and some rabbis have even approved of the marriage of two women. Gays and homosexuals are often persecuted in Iran and sometimes even put to death. A lesbian could not even drive a vehicle in Saudi Arabia until 2018 - simply for being a woman, much alone being a lesbian.

Japan is perhaps the greatest illustration of the influence and significance of traditional faiths in contemporary society. A US naval force compelled Japan to embrace the modern world in 1853. In response, the Japanese government started a quick and very effective modernization drive. It quickly developed into a strong bureaucratic state that used science, capitalism, and

the most advanced military equipment to beat China and Russia, capture Taiwan, and afterwards scuttle the American navy at Pearl Harbor and topple the European empires in the Far East. Japan, however, didn't just follow the Western model. It was adamantly committed to preserving its own character and making sure that contemporary Japanese would be devoted to Japan rather than to modernity, science, or some ill-defined global community.

To that purpose, Japan supported Shinto as the fundamental component of the Japanese culture. In actuality, Shinto was reinvented by the Japanese state. Every town and temple had its own favorite spirits and regional practices, and traditional Shinto was a patchwork of animist beliefs in numerous deities, spirits, and ghosts. The Japanese government established an official Shinto religion in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, while actively opposing various regional customs. This "State Shinto" was combined with very contemporary notions of race and country that the Japanese aristocracy adopted from European imperialists. Every aspect of Buddhism, Confucianism, and the feudal attitude of the samurai was included in the mix in an effort to strengthen allegiance to the government. To top it all off, State Shinto made worshipping the Japanese monarch, who was seen as a living deity and a direct descendent of the sun goddess Amaterasu, its guiding principle.

At first glance, this strange fusion of the old and new appeared like an incredibly poor decision for a state starting a rapid modernization process. A real god? Witchcraft spirits? Feudal values? That didn't seem like a contemporary industrial power; it sounded more like a Neolithic chieftainship. Still, it performed like magic. The Japanese modernized at an amazing rate while also establishing a fervent allegiance to their nation. The fact that Japan was the first nation to develop and utilize precision-guided missiles is the most well-known indication of the achievement of State Shinto. Japan sunk hundreds of allied ships with precision-guided missiles decades before the USA deployed the smart bomb and at a period when Nazi Germany was only starting to use dumb V-2 rockets. These rockets are referred to as kamikaze. Modern precision-guided weapons are directed by computers, but the kamikaze were just regular aircraft that were equipped with explosives and flown by human pilots who were ready to embark on one-way missions. This readiness was the result of State Shinto cultivating a death-defying attitude of sacrifice. Thus, the kamikaze depended on fusing cutting-edge technology with cutting-edge religious indoctrination. Whether consciously or unconsciously, many governments now emulate Japan.

In order to maintain a distinct sense of national identity, they adhere to the universal structures and instruments of modernity. Shiite Islam in Iran, Catholicism in Poland, Wahhabism in Saudi Arabia, and Judaism in Israel all play a lesser or higher part in State Shinto than Orthodox Christianity does in Japan. No matter how antiquated a religion may seem, with a little creativity and reinterpretation, it can almost always be combined with the most cutting-edge contemporary institutions and technology. Sometimes governments may invent a whole new religion to support their distinct identity. Today's most severe example may be seen in North Korea, a former colony of Japan. The North Korean government indoctrinates its people with the fanatical Juche state religion. Marxism-Leninism, certain antiquated Korean customs, a racist conviction in the superior purity of the Korean race, and the glorification of Kim Il-sung's family line are all present in this. The Kims are venerated with greater fervor than nearly any deity in history, despite the fact that no one says they are decedents of a sun goddess. North Korean Juche for a very long period also insisted on adding nuclear weapons to the mix, portraying their development as a holy responsibility deserving of tremendous sacrifices, perhaps aware of how the Japanese Empire was ultimately crushed.

The handmaid of nationalism

We may anticipate that disputes over religious identities and rituals will continue to shape how new technologies are used, and they may even have the potential to ignite a global conflagration. A theological debate regarding medieval writings may be resolved by the most modern nuclear weapons and cyberbombs. As long as humankind's strength depends on widespread collaboration and that widespread cooperation depends on believing in common fictions, religions, rites, and rituals will continue to be significant.

Sadly, all of this really makes conventional faiths a contributor to humanity's problems rather than a part of the solution. Given their ability to forge national identities and even spark the Third World War, religions continue to have significant political sway. However, they don't appear to provide much in terms of resolving rather than igniting the world's issues of the twenty-first century. Although many ancient faiths uphold universal principles and assert the existence of the cosmos, they now serve primarily as the handmaid of contemporary nationalism, whether in North Korea, Russia, Iran, or Israel. As a result, they make it even more difficult to see beyond national boundaries and identify an international response to the dangers of nuclear war, ecological collapse, and technological upheaval.

Shiite clerics encourage Iranians to view global warming or nuclear proliferation from a limited Iranian perspective, Jewish rabbis encourage Israelis to care primarily about what's good for Israel, and Orthodox priests encourage Russians to think first and foremost about Russian interests. Since we are God's chosen people, everything that benefits our country also pleases God. There are religious sages who do indeed reject nationalist excesses in favor of far more global outlooks. Unfortunately, these wise men don't have a lot of political influence these days. As a result, we are in a difficult situation. Since all of humanity now belongs to the same civilisation, issues like nuclear war, ecological collapse, and technological disruption can only be resolved globally. However, nationalism and religion continue to create violent divisions throughout our human civilization. The European Union crisis, which now afflicts the world's biggest multicultural experiment, is one example of how local identities and global issues collide. The EU, which was founded on the promise of liberal universal ideals, is on the danger of disintegrating as a result of integration and immigration issues [8]–[11].

CONCLUSION

Religion has a big impact on people's lives and societies because it offers a framework for comprehending the world, establishing moral principles, and looking for meaning and purpose. Many people find comfort and direction in it, and it gives them a feeling of identity and belonging. Fostering communication and respect amongst many religious traditions is crucial in a society that is becoming more globalized and linked. To promote peace, collaboration, and cohabitation, it is important to acknowledge the plurality of religious views. People of various religious origins may cooperate to confront urgent global concerns and advance societal peace by concentrating on shared values and objectives. Striking a balance between religious freedom and the rights of others who may have opposing ideas or decide not to pursue a religious path is also essential. Building inclusive communities where everyone may live with dignity and freedom of conscience requires respecting religious diversity while preserving human rights ideals.

REFERENCES

- [1] M. R. Abdulla, "Culture, Religion, and Freedom of Religion or Belief," *Rev. Faith Int. Aff.*, 2018, doi: 10.1080/15570274.2018.1535033.

- [2] P. Siuda, "Mapping digital religion: Exploring the need for new typologies," *Religions*, 2021, doi: 10.3390/rel12060373.
- [3] S. Hjarvard, "Three forms of mediatized religion: Changing the public face of religion," *Gosudarstvo, Religii, Tserkov' v Rossii i za Rubezhom/State, Religion and Church in Russia and Worldwide*. 2020. doi: 10.22394/2073-7203-2020-38-2-41-75.
- [4] R. McKay and H. Whitehouse, "Religion and morality," *Psychol. Bull.*, 2015, doi: 10.1037/a0038455.
- [5] C. D. Ives and J. Kidwell, "Religion and social values for sustainability," *Sustain. Sci.*, vol. 14, no. 5, pp. 1355–1362, 2019, doi: 10.1007/s11625-019-00657-0.
- [6] C. G. Paul Victor and J. V. Treschuk, "Critical Literature Review on the Definition Clarity of the Concept of Faith, Religion, and Spirituality," *Journal of Holistic Nursing*. 2020. doi: 10.1177/0898010119895368.
- [7] K. Knibbe and H. Kupari, "Theorizing lived religion: introduction," *Journal of Contemporary Religion*. 2020. doi: 10.1080/13537903.2020.1759897.
- [8] J. Hordern, "Religion and culture," *Medicine (United Kingdom)*. 2016. doi: 10.1016/j.mpmed.2016.07.011.
- [9] W. Jenkins, E. Berry, and L. B. Kreider, "Religion and climate change," *Annual Review of Environment and Resources*. 2018. doi: 10.1146/annurev-environ-102017-025855.
- [10] D. van Aaken and F. Buchner, "Religion and CSR: a systematic literature review," *J. Bus. Econ.*, 2020, doi: 10.1007/s11573-020-00977-z.
- [11] E. Weng and A. Halafoff, "Media representations of religion, spirituality and non-religion in Australia," *Religions*, 2020, doi: 10.3390/rel11070332.

CHAPTER 10

A BRIEF DISCUSSION ON REASONS OF IMMIGRATION

Dr Jaykumar Padmanabhan, Associate Professor,
Department of Decision Sciences, CMS Business School, Jain (Deemed to be University), Bangalore,
Karnataka, India,
Email Id:p.jaykumar@cms.ac.in

ABSTRACT:

Immigration is a complicated phenomenon that is driven by a number of different variables that prompt people to leave their native nations and settle in other ones. This chapter will examine the causes of immigration by examining the socioeconomic, political, and individual variables that influence this widespread phenomenon. Policymakers and society may create plans to handle the difficulties and possibilities brought on by immigration by recognizing the underlying reasons. Immigration is a worldwide movement that offers societies opportunities and problems. On the one hand, it may put a pressure on societal cohesiveness, infrastructure, and public resources. Immigrants, on the other hand, support the cultural variety, labor force, and economic expansion of their host nations.

KEYWORDS:

Culture, Immigration, Immigrants, Host Nation, Political Factors.

INTRODUCTION

Globalization has drastically decreased cultural distinctions worldwide, but it has also made it much simpler to meet strangers and feel offended by their peculiarities. Although there were no direct flights between Delhi and London during the reign of King Alfred the Great, there were differences between Anglo-Saxon England and the Indian Pala Empire that were far bigger than those between contemporary Britain and modern India. The need to confront, absorb, or expel foreigners puts pressure on political structures and group identities that were developed in less fluid periods as more and more people cross borders in pursuit of employment, security, and a brighter future. The issue is particularly acute in Europe. The promise that French, Germans, Spaniards, and Greeks would put aside their cultural differences served as the foundation for the European Union. It could crumble if it can't control the cultural disparities between Europeans and Middle Eastern and African immigrants. Ironically, it was Europe's achievement in creating a flourishing multicultural society that first attracted so many migrants [1]–[3].

Instead of Saudi Arabia, Iran, Russia, or Japan, Syrians choose to go to Germany because of its reputation for embracing and integrating immigrants, not because it is closer or richer than any of the other possible destinations. Europeans' emotions to the expanding flow of refugees and immigrants are conflicted, and it has sparked contentious debates over Europe's character and destiny. Are some Europeans rejecting the cosmopolitan and tolerant principles of Europe or are they only acting sanely to avert calamity when they urge that Europe lock its gates shut? Others demand for widening the gates; are they true to the fundamental principles of Europe, or are they guilty of burdening the European project with unattainable goals? This immigration debate often turns into a yelling war when neither party can hear the other. Perhaps it would be beneficial to think of immigration as a transaction with three fundamental requirements or terms in order to make things clearer:

- i. **Term 1:** The immigrants are admitted by the host nation.
- ii. **Term 2:** In exchange, immigrants must accept at least the fundamental principles and values of the host nation, even if that means renunciations some of their own.
- iii. **Term 3:** If immigrants assimilate enough, they eventually become equal and contributing citizens of the host nation. "They" turn become "us."

From racism to culturism

The idea that certain races most notably the white race were innately superior to others was widely accepted in Europe a century ago. Such opinions were highly despised after 1945. Racism was seen as being both scientifically and ethically unsound. The biological distinctions between Europeans, Africans, Chinese, and Native Americans are quite small, according to life scientists, and particularly geneticists. However, a plethora of evidence has been gathered by anthropologists, sociologists, historians, behavioral economists, and even brain scientists to support the presence of substantial variations across human societies. Indeed, why would we even need anthropologists and historians if all human civilizations were fundamentally the same? Why spend money on researching insignificant differences? At the very least, we need to stop funding all those pricey field trips to places like the Kalahari Desert and the South Pacific and settle with studying people in places like Oxford or Boston. Whatever we learn about Harvard students should apply to Kalahari hunter-gatherers as well if cultural differences are minimal.

Most individuals acknowledge that there are at least some substantial cultural distinctions between people, in anything from sexual mores to political practices. So how should we handle these discrepancies? According to cultural relativists, there is no hierarchy based on difference, hence we should never favor one culture over another. Humans may think and act in a variety of ways, but we should treat all views and behaviors equally and appreciate this diversity. Unfortunately, such open-minded viewpoints cannot withstand the realities of life. Few people would consider witch-burning, infanticide, or slavery to be wonderful human quirks that ought to be saved against the encroachments of global capitalism and coca-colonialism, despite the fact that human variety may be fantastic when it comes to gastronomy and poetry.

Or think about how other cultures view outsiders, immigrants, and refugees. Not every culture exhibits precisely the same degree of acceptance. In the early twenty-first century, German culture is more open to immigrants and accepting of outsiders than Saudi culture. A Muslim can immigrate to Germany far more easily than a Christian can to Saudi Arabia. Indeed, even for a Muslim Syrian refugee, moving to Germany would likely be simpler than moving to Saudi Arabia, and since 2011, Germany has welcomed much more Syrian migrants than Saudi Arabia. Similar to California, the early twenty-first century seems to have a more welcoming attitude toward immigrants than does Japan. In light of this, shouldn't you also believe that, at the very least in this aspect, German culture is superior to Saudi culture and Californian culture is superior to Japanese culture if you believe that it is desirable to accept foreigners and welcome immigrants?

Additionally, even when two cultural standards are equally acceptable in principle, it may still be appropriate in the actual immigration setting to consider the host culture to be superior. Norms and ideals that are proper in one nation simply don't function well in another. Let's examine a specific instance in more detail. Let's envision Coldia and Warm land as two hypothetical nations to avoid falling victim to long-standing stereotypes. The two nations' approaches to interpersonal conflict and human connections are only two examples of the numerous cultural variations between them. From an early age, Coldians are taught that the

best course of action is to suppress any dispute you may have with someone at work, school, or even in your family. Avoid yelling, acting indignant, or confronting the other person since these actions only serve to escalate the situation. It's preferable to deal with your own emotions and let everything settle down. Limit your interactions with the individual in question in the meantime, and if you must, keep them brief but kind and steer clear of touchy subjects [4]–[6].

Warm landers, in contrast, learn to externalize conflict from an early age. Don't let a quarrel simmer and don't suppress anything if you find yourself in one. When you get the chance, express your feelings in public. It's OK to get enraged, to yell, and to express your feelings to the other person. There is no other way to resolve issues with one another in an open and transparent manner. Even though direct confrontation is never pleasant, it may fix a problem that could otherwise linger for years. You will all feel much better afterward. It is difficult to state that one of these approaches is always preferable to the other since both have advantages and disadvantages. But what would happen if a Warm lander immigrates to Coldia and lands a job there?

The Warm lander expects that pounding on the table and shouting at the top of his lungs will draw attention to the issue and hasten its resolution if a disagreement with a coworker develops. Later on, a senior post becomes available. Even if the Warm lander meets all requirements, the supervisor would rather promote a Coldian worker. She responds, "Yes, the Warm lander has many talents, but he also has a serious problem with human relations," when questioned about it. He agitates our company culture, has a short fuse, and stirs up unneeded conflict. Other Warm lander immigrants to Coldia suffer the same fate. The majority of them stay in entry-level jobs or are unable to get employment at all since bosses assume that if they are Warm landers, they would likely be irate and difficult workers. It is difficult for the Warm landers to alter the Coldian business culture since they never advance to top positions.

DISCUSSION

These three words spark three different debate about what each phrase really means. The fulfillment of the terms is the subject of a fourth debate. People often mix the four discussions while debating immigration, making it impossible for anybody to comprehend the true nature of the dispute. Therefore, it is best to examine each of these arguments independently.

Debate 1: The first provision of the immigration agreement merely states that immigrants may enter the nation of origin. Should this be seen as a responsibility or a favor, though? Is the receiving nation required to welcome everyone or does it have the freedom to select who enters and who leaves, or even to forbid immigration altogether? Pro-immigration advocates seem to believe that nations have a moral obligation to absorb not just refugees but also individuals from impoverished nations looking for work and a better future. All people have moral duties to one another, especially in today's globalized society. Egoists or even racists would shirk these duties. Many pro-immigration advocates also emphasize the fact that immigration cannot be totally stopped and that no matter how many barriers we erect, desperate individuals will always find a way around them. Therefore, legalizing immigration and dealing with it publicly is preferable than cultivating a sizable underworld of human trafficking, undocumented labor, and children [7]–[9].

Anti-immigration activists respond that you can entirely block immigration if you use enough force, and other than possibly in the instance of refugees escaping horrific persecution in a neighboring nation, you are never required to open your door to anybody. Turkey may be

required morally to open its border to desperate Syrian refugees. However, the Swedes are not required to welcome these migrants if they attempt to travel on to Sweden. It is entirely up to the host nation to decide whether to accept migrants looking for work and benefits and, if so, under what terms.

The right of every human collective to protect itself against invasion, whether it comes in the shape of troops or migrants, is emphasized by opponents of immigration. If the Syrians have failed to do the same, it is not the Swedes' fault; they have worked extremely hard and made many sacrifices to create a wealthy liberal democracy. It is well within the rights of Swedish voters to deny admittance to further Syrian immigrants for any reason they choose. And if they do take any immigrants, it must be very apparent that this is a favor rather than a requirement on Sweden's part. This implies that immigrants who are admitted to Sweden should be very appreciative of whatever they get rather than arriving with a list of demands and acting as if they control the country.

Furthermore, according to those who oppose immigration, a nation may adopt whatever immigration policy it pleases, screening potential immigrants not just for their criminal histories or professional skills but also for factors like religion. It may appear objectionable, but it is well within the rights of the Israeli or Polish voters if a nation like Israel wishes to admit in only Jews and a country like Poland agrees to accept Middle Eastern immigrants under the condition that they be Christians. The fact that many times individuals want to have their cake and eat it further complicates issues. In order to take advantage of the foreigners' enthusiasm, abilities, and inexpensive labor, many nations ignore illegal immigration or even welcome foreign employees on a temporary basis. However, the nation's later decline to provide these individuals legal status, claiming they do not desire immigration. Long-term, this might lead to hierarchical societies, as is the case in Qatar and other Gulf States today, where a wealthy upper elite abuses a helpless lower class of foreigners.

It is quite challenging to respond to any more inquiries concerning immigration as long as this dispute isn't resolved. Since proponents of immigration believe that individuals have the right to immigrate to another country if they so choose and that host nations have a responsibility to absorb them, they respond with moral indignation when both the right to immigrate and the duty to absorb are violated. Such opinions amaze those who oppose immigration. They see immigration as a privilege and assimilation as a goodwill gesture. Why call someone a racist or a fascist simply because they won't let them into their own country?

Even if welcoming immigrants is a favor rather than a duty, the host nation progressively owes them and their descendants a lot of obligations after they establish themselves. Therefore, you cannot use the justification that "we did your great-grandmother a favor by allowing her to enter this country in 1910, so we can now treat you however we like" to defend anti-Semitism in the USA today.

Debate 2: According to the second provision of the immigration agreement, if immigrants are admitted, they must adapt into the local culture. But how much assimilation is appropriate? Should immigrants who transition from a patriarchal to a liberal culture become feminists? Do they really need to embrace a secular worldview if they come from a profoundly religious society? Should they give up their customary clothing standards and dietary prohibitions? Pro-immigration advocates set the bar far lower than those who oppose immigration, who sometimes set it much higher.

Proponents of immigration contend that because of Europe's enormous diversity, its native inhabitants represent a vast range of viewpoints, customs, and values. This is precisely what

gives Europe its strength and vibrancy. Why should newcomers be compelled to uphold some unrealized notion of a European identity that only a small portion of Europeans truly embody? Do you want to make it mandatory for Muslim immigrants to the UK to convert to Christianity when many British people seldom attend church? Would you rather that Punjabi immigrants switch to fish and chips and Yorkshire pudding instead of curry and masala? If there are any true core values in Europe, they are the liberal values of tolerance and freedom, which suggest that Europeans should also be tolerant of immigrants and give them as much freedom as possible to practice their own traditions, so long as these do not interfere with the rights and freedoms of others. Many immigrant groups, particularly those from Muslim nations, are accused of intolerance, sexism, homophobia, and anti-Semitism by those who oppose immigration. They believe that tolerance and freedom are the most fundamental European values. Europe cannot accept too many intolerant individuals because it values tolerance so highly. While a tolerant society may tolerate a small number of illiberal individuals, when this number rises over a certain point, the character of society is altered. If Europe accepts an excessive number of immigrants from the Middle East, it will eventually resemble that region.

Some opponents of immigration go considerably further. They make the point that a country is much more than just a group of individuals who get along. Therefore, immigrants' adherence to European values of tolerance is insufficient. They must also embrace many of the distinctive features of Swedish, German, or any other country's culture. The local culture is incurring significant danger and cost by allowing them to enter. It has no motive to obliterate itself as well. It seeks complete absorption since it provides ultimate perfect equality. The immigrants are free to relocate if they object to any aspects of British, German, or Swedish culture.

The disagreements over immigrant intolerance and European identity are the two main topics of this discussion. Many liberal Europeans who today support immigration may eventually change their minds and become vehemently opposed to it if immigrants are in fact responsible for an unforgivable bigotry. In contrast, if most immigrants are found to be liberal and tolerant in their views on gender, religion, and politics, this will undermine some of the strongest arguments used against immigration. But the issue of Europe's distinctive national identities will still remain. Tolerance is a virtue shared by everybody. Are there certain Danish norms and values that immigrants to Denmark must embrace, and are there particular French norms and values that everyone moving to France should accept? As long as Europeans remain sharply split on this issue, they will find it difficult to establish a consistent immigration strategy. On the other hand, once Europeans are aware of who the migrants are, 500 million of them should have no trouble accepting a million of them or rejecting them.

Debate 3: The third provision of the immigration agreement states that the receiving nation must recognize immigrants as first-class citizens if they do make a true attempt to integrate, particularly by adopting the virtue of tolerance. But how much time must pass before the immigrants may join society as equals? Should first-generation Algerian immigrants be resentful if, after 20 years in France, they are still not totally accepted? What about immigrants of the third generation whose grandparents immigrated to France in the 1970s?

While opponents of immigration want a much longer probationary period, supporters of immigration often urge an immediate admission. According to proponents of immigration, the host nation is not upholding its commitments if third-generation immigrants are not recognized as equal citizens and treated as such. If this leads to tensions, animosity, or even bloodshed, the host nation is solely to blame due to its own intolerance. These unrealistic expectations are a major issue for those who are anti-immigration. Immigrants should have

patience. If your grandparents just recently immigrated here and you are now rioting in the streets because you don't feel like a local, then you have failed the test.

This debate's central focus is the discrepancy between individual and societal timescales. For human collectives, forty years is a brief period of time. It is difficult to anticipate that society will completely assimilate alien populations in a few decades. The transition of foreigners into full citizens took centuries rather than decades for previous civilizations like Imperial Rome, the Muslim caliphate, the Chinese emperors, and the United States.

However, forty years might seem like an eternity to one individual. Twenty years after her grandparents' migration to France, a teenager was born there, making the trip from Algiers to Marseilles seem like ancient history. She speaks French rather than Arabic, all of her pals are also locals, and she has never even gone to Algeria. She has only ever known France as her home. And now others are telling her that it's not her house and that she should go "back" somewhere she has never lived. It resembles transplanting an Australian eucalyptus tree seed to France. Eucalyptus trees are an invasive species from an ecological standpoint, and it will be decades or more before botanists designate them as native European flora. Yet it seems to be French from the perspective of each individual tree. It will wither if you don't water it with French water. If you attempt to pull it out, you will find that, like the native oaks and pines, it has deep roots in the French soil [10]–[12].

Debate 4: The most important issue is whether the immigration pact is genuinely functioning, notwithstanding all these differences over its precise wording. Immigrants, according to those who oppose immigration, often claim that term No. 2 is not being met. They are not really attempting to integrate, and a disproportionate number of them continue to hold racist and discriminatory viewpoints. As a result, the host nation has every motive to rethink term No. 1 (to admit them) and no incentive to fulfill term No. 3 (to treat them as first-class citizens). Why let more individuals from a certain culture enter and cause an even larger issue if they have repeatedly shown that they would not uphold the immigration agreement?

Opponents of immigration respond that the host nation is the one that breaks its end of the bargain. The hosts are making it impossible for the great majority of immigrants to integrate despite their sincere attempts. What's more, those immigrants who do assimilate well continue to be considered as second-class citizens even in the second and third generations. Of course, it is conceivable that both parties are not fulfilling their obligations, which would feed each other's suspicions and resentments in a vicious cycle.

Before defining the three concepts precisely, the fourth argument cannot be settled. We cannot assess whether the two sides are meeting their commitments unless we determine if assimilating newcomers is a responsibility or a favor, what amount of assimilation is expected of immigrants, and how fast host nations should accept them as equal citizens. There is also the issue of accounting. Both parties heavily favor breaches over compliance when assessing the immigration arrangement. Does it suggest that, overall, immigrants are following by the terms of the agreement or breaching them if, out of a million immigrants, one hundred join terrorist organizations and attack the host nation? Does it indicate acceptance or rejection of immigrants if a third-generation immigrant crosses the street a thousand times without being harassed yet once in a while a bigot yells insults at her?

However, there is a far more important topic that affects our understanding of human civilization that lies behind all of these arguments. Do we approach the immigration discussion assuming that all cultures are equal by nature, or do we consider the possibility that certain cultures may be superior to others? Can Germans ever be right in believing that

German culture is superior to Syrian culture while they debate whether or not to accept a million Syrian refugees?

The fate of Coldians who go to Warm land is much the same. When a Coldian first starts working for a Warm land company, they swiftly develop a reputation as snobs or cold fishes and make few, if any, friends. People believe he is dishonest or lacking in fundamental interpersonal abilities. He never moves up to a senior position, therefore he never has the chance to alter the business culture. Managers in the Warm land come to the conclusion that most Coldians are timid or unpleasant, and they prefer not to recruit them for jobs that involve close interaction with coworkers or client contact. Both of these situations could seem to be racist. They are not racist, though. They are "culturalist." Despite the fact that the front lines of the conflict have changed, people are still fighting a valiant war against conventional bigotry. Traditional racism is dwindling, but there are now many "culturists" throughout the globe.

Racism in the past had a strong biological foundation. In the 1890s or 1930s, it was generally thought in nations like Britain, Australia, and the USA that Africans and Chinese people are intrinsically less clever, entrepreneurial, and moral than Europeans due to some heritable biological feature. Their blood contained the issue. Both considerable scientific support and political legitimacy were accorded to such viewpoints. Today, however, despite the fact that many people continue to make such racist claims, they no longer have any scientific support and have lost the majority of their political credibility unless they are rephrased in terms of culture. Saying that black people commit crimes more often due of their poor genetics is out; but, claiming that they do it because of their dysfunctional subcultures is very much in.

For instance, in the USA, various parties and leaders openly support discriminating laws and often make derogatory statements against Muslims, African Americans, and Latinos, yet they seldom ever claim that anything is wrong with their DNA. Their culture is said to be the source of the issue. As a result, when President Trump referred to Haiti, El Salvador, and other regions of Africa as "shithole countries," he was likely commenting on these nations' cultures rather than their genetic make-up. Another time, Trump said that Mexico doesn't send the greatest individuals when it sends immigrants to the United States. They are sending individuals who are bringing with them a host of issues. Both narcotics and criminality are brought by them. They are rapists, yet I presume some of them are fine people. This is a really insulting statement to make, but it is objectionable from a societal one rather than a biological one. Trump just suggests that nice Mexicans prefer to remain south of the Rio Grande, not that having Mexican ancestry is a bar to virtue.

The discussion continues to revolve around the human body, namely the Latino, African, and Chinese bodies. Skin tone is important. If you have a lot of melanin pigment in your skin and go down a New York street, the cops may be more suspicious of you wherever you are going. However, leaders like President Trump and President Obama will discuss the relevance of skin color in terms of culture and history. The police are suspicious of you because of your skin tone, not for any biological reason, but rather because of the past. While the Trump camp will likely argue that black criminality is a terrible legacy of past mistakes made by white liberals and black communities, the Obama team is likely to argue that police racism is an unfortunate legacy of historical sins like enslavement. In any event, you will have to cope with the repercussions of that past, even if you are a visitor from Delhi who has no knowledge of American history. The transition from biology to culture involves more than simply a meaningless switch in lingo. It is a significant change that will have broad practical repercussions, some positive and some negative. For one thing, culture can be shaped more easily than biology. This implies, on the one hand, that modern culturalists could be more

accepting than classic racists — if only the 'others' embrace our culture, we will accept them as our equals. On the other side, it can lead to much more assimilation pressure on the "others" and much greater condemnation of their lack of assimilation.

A person with dark complexion can hardly be blamed for not lightening it, yet Africans or Muslims are often accused of not assimilating Western cultural standards and values. This is not to argue that these claims are always true. Adopting the prevailing culture is often not justified, and it is moreover frequently a near-impossible task. African Americans from a depressed slum who sincerely try to integrate into the dominant American culture may initially experience institutional discrimination, only to later be accused of not trying hard enough and being solely responsible for their problems.

The discussion of biology and culture vary significantly in another important way: unlike classic racial prejudice, culturist arguments may sometimes make sense, as in the cases of Warm land and Coldia. Real cultural differences between Warm landers and Coldians may be seen in their various interpersonal interactions. Is it immoral for a Warm lander company to punish Coldians for acting in line with their cultural history as human connections are essential to many jobs? This topic makes anthropologists, sociologists, and historians very uncomfortable. On the one hand, everything comes out as dangerously racist. The scientific foundation for racism is significantly less than that of culturism, and in particular, academics in the humanities and social sciences cannot discount the significance and presence of cultural distinctions. Of fact, even if we believe some of the claims made by culturists to be true, we do not have to believe them all.

Numerous statements made by culturists have three basic problems. First off, culturalists often mix up subjective superiority with local superiority. Therefore, the Warm land method of conflict resolution may be preferable to the Coldian method in the Warm land context. In this case, a warm land company operating in warm land has a good reason to discriminate against introverted employees which will unfairly harm Coldian immigrants. But it does not imply that the warm land approach is better in every way. The Coldians may teach the Warm landers a thing or two, and if circumstances change for example, if the warm land corporation expands internationally and has offices in other nations diversity could suddenly turn into a strength.

Second, culturalist statements could be empirically valid if a yardstick, a period of time, and a location are all well-defined. However, it happens much too frequently that individuals embrace vague, culturalist ideas. It is thus possible to assert that "Coldian culture is less tolerant of public angry outbursts than warm land culture," but it is far less plausible to assert that "Muslim culture is very intolerant." The latter assertion is just too ambiguous. What does the term "intolerant" mean? What or person is intolerant? A society may be relatively forgiving of old individuals or fat people while being intolerant to religious minority and unconventional political viewpoints. And what do we mean when we refer to "Muslim culture"? Do we mean the seventh century on the Arabian Peninsula?

In the sixteenth century, what was the Ottoman Empire? Pakistan at the start of the 21st century? What is the benchmark, to finish? When comparing the Ottoman Empire in the sixteenth century with Western Europe in the same period, those who care about tolerance toward religious minorities would come to the conclusion that Muslim culture is very tolerant. We would come to a totally different conclusion if we made the same comparison between modern Denmark and Afghanistan under the Taliban.

The main issue with culturist assertions, however, is that despite their statistical character, they are much too often used to make general judgments about people. The management may

choose to employ a Warm lander native over a Coldian immigrant when both apply for the same job in a Warm lander company because "Coldians are frosty and unsociable." Even though statistically speaking, could it be that this Coldian is genuinely friendlier and outgoing than this Warm lander? While culture is significant, a person's genes and specific personal experience also play a role in shaping who they are. Individuals often contradict statistical norms. It makes sense for a company to favor social staff over stone ones, but it makes no sense to favor Warm landers over Coldians.

However, all of this alters specific culturist assertions without invalidating culturism as a whole. Unlike racism, which is an unfounded bias, cultural arguments may sometimes be quite persuasive. If we examine data and find that Coldians hold few high positions in Warm lander businesses, this may not be the product of racial prejudice but rather of sound judgment. Should Coldian immigrants accuse warm land of breaking its promise to them in light of this circumstance? Should we use 'affirmative action' legislation to compel Warm lander businesses to recruit more Coldian management in an effort to moderate Warm land's volatile corporate culture? Or possibly Coldian immigrants are to blame for their failure to integrate into the community, and as a result, we should exert more and stronger effort to teach Coldian kids Warm lander standards and values?

Returning from the world of fiction to the world of reality, we can see that the European immigration issue is not a simple conflict between good and evil. Both labeling all opponents of immigration as "fascists" and all supporters of immigration as engaging in "cultural suicide" are incorrect. As a result, the discussion of immigration should not be framed as a conflict over an unalterable moral principle. It is a debate between two respectable political viewpoints that should be resolved through traditional democratic processes [13]–[15].

It is now unclear if Europe can find a medium ground that would allow it to remain open to outsiders without being shaken by those who don't share its beliefs. If Europe is successful in discovering such a way, maybe the global community will adopt its recipe. However, if the European effort fails, it will show that faith in liberal principles of tolerance and freedom is insufficient to end global cultural disputes and bring humanity together in the face of nuclear catastrophe, ecological collapse, and technological upheaval. What hope do humans have of resolving the far more serious issues that plague our global civilization if Greeks and Germans can't agree on a shared future and if 500 million wealthy Europeans can't take in a few million poor refugees?

By reducing the frenzy around terrorism, Europe and the globe as a whole may be able to better integrate and maintain open borders and minds. It would be very regrettable if the European experiment in tolerance and freedom came to an end due to an exaggerated fear of terrorism. That would not only accomplish the terrorists' own objectives but also give this small group of extremists an excessive amount of influence over the course of civilization. The weapon of a marginal and helpless section of mankind is terrorism. How did it come to rule politics on a worldwide scale?

CONCLUSION

Numerous interrelated variables, from socioeconomic to political to personal conditions, influence immigration. People go overseas in search of better lifestyles and economic possibilities due to socioeconomic problems such as poverty, a lack of career options, and restricted access to healthcare and education. Forced migration occurs as a result of political issues such as political unrest, violence, and persecution when individuals abandon dangerous surroundings. Personal considerations like the desire for a higher standard of living, family reunion, or the pursuit of educational and professional possibilities all play a big part in

immigration choices. Policymakers must understand the complex issues surrounding immigration and put in place comprehensive plans that cater to their requirements while promoting social integration and inclusive development. Societies may create policies that try to address the underlying causes and provide support networks for immigrants by understanding the driving forces behind immigration. This involves encouraging political stability, stimulating economic growth, eliminating inequality, and implementing just and compassionate immigration laws. In an increasingly linked world, countries must embrace variety and promote social inclusion if they are to be peaceful and successful.

REFERENCES

- [1] S. Park and G. Kim, "Factor Structures of Reasons for Immigration among Older Asian and Latino Immigrants in the United States," *Innov. Aging*, 2019, doi: 10.1093/geroni/igz039.
- [2] O. Giuntella, Z. L. Kone, I. Ruiz, and C. Vargas-Silva, "Reason for immigration and immigrants' health," *Public Health*, 2018, doi: 10.1016/j.puhe.2018.01.037.
- [3] T. Hormenu *et al.*, "Stress measured by allostatic load varies by reason for immigration, age at immigration, and number of children: The africans in america study," *Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health*, 2020, doi: 10.3390/ijerph17124533.
- [4] D. Maskileyson, M. Semyonov, and E. Davidov, "Economic integration of first- and second-generation immigrants in the Swiss labour market: Does the reason for immigration make a difference?," *Popul. Space Place*, 2021, doi: 10.1002/psp.2426.
- [5] R. M. Nilsen *et al.*, "Preeclampsia by maternal reasons for immigration: A population-based study," *BMC Pregnancy Childbirth*, 2018, doi: 10.1186/s12884-018-2034-4.
- [6] J. N. Utumatwishima, R. L. Baker, B. A. Bingham, S. T. Chung, D. Berrigan, and A. E. Sumner, "Stress Measured by Allostatic Load Score Varies by Reason for Immigration: The Africans in America Study," *J. Racial Ethn. Heal. Disparities*, 2018, doi: 10.1007/s40615-017-0368-7.
- [7] J. Chen, G. C. Gee, M. S. Spencer, S. H. Danziger, and D. T. Takeuchi, "Perceived social standing among Asian immigrants in the US: Do reasons for immigration matter?," *Soc. Sci. Res.*, 2009, doi: 10.1016/j.ssresearch.2009.06.003.
- [8] E. S. Vik, V. Aasheim, E. Schytt, R. Small, D. Moster, and R. M. Nilsen, "Stillbirth in relation to maternal country of birth and other migration related factors: A population-based study in Norway," *BMC Pregnancy Childbirth*, 2019, doi: 10.1186/s12884-018-2140-3.
- [9] M. R. *et al.*, "High stress reasons for immigration may increase risk for diabetes: The Africans in America study," *Circulation*, 2019.
- [10] S. M. Briker *et al.*, "Abstract P119: High Stress Reasons for Immigration Affect Diabetes Risk, Body Size and Behavior: The Africans in America Study," *Circulation*, 2018, doi: 10.1161/circ.137.suppl_1.p119.
- [11] R. M. Nilsen *et al.*, "Preeclampsia by maternal reasons for immigration: A population-based study 11 Medical and Health Sciences 1114 Paediatrics and Reproductive Medicine," *BMC Pregnancy Childbirth*, 2018, doi: 10.1186/s12884-018-2034-4.

- [12] R. Mugeni *et al.*, “Abstract P346: High Stress Reasons for Immigration May Increase Risk for Diabetes: The Africans in America Study,” *Circulation*, 2019, doi: 10.1161/circ.139.suppl_1.p346.
- [13] B. A. Bingham *et al.*, “The Association between Stress Measured by Allostatic Load Score and Physiologic Dysregulation in African Immigrants: The Africans in America Study,” *Front. Public Heal.*, 2016, doi: 10.3389/fpubh.2016.00265.
- [14] K. S. Mæland, N. H. Morken, E. Schytt, V. Aasheim, and R. M. Nilsen, “Placental abruption in immigrant women in Norway: A population-based study,” *Acta Obstet. Gynecol. Scand.*, 2021, doi: 10.1111/aogs.14067.
- [15] O. Giuntella, Z. Kone, I. Ruiz, and C. Vargas-Silva, “Reason for Immigration and Immigrant’s Health,” *SSRN Electron. J.*, 2018, doi: 10.2139/ssrn.3037545.

CHAPTER 11

A BRIEF DISCUSSION ON TERRORISM

Dr Yavana Rani.S, Associate Professor,
Department of Decision Sciences, CMS Business School, Jain (Deemed to be University), Bangalore,
Karnataka, India,
Email Id:dr.yavanarani@cms.ac.in

ABSTRACT:

The complexity and diversity of terrorism present serious threats to the stability and security of the world. It highlights the profound effects that terrorism has on society, from the loss of life and physical devastation to the financial fallout and psychological suffering. Strong counterterrorism policies that include proactive information collecting, law enforcement activities, and international collaboration are essential to combating this threat. The major elements of terrorism, such as its definition, goals, methods, and effects on society, are briefly summarized in this chapter. In order to combat this global danger, it also examines counterterrorism tactics and the significance of international collaboration.

KEYWORDS:

Political, Terrorism, Terrorists, Violence.

INTRODUCTION

The art of mind control is perfected by terrorists. They hardly cause any deaths, yet they nonetheless manage to frighten countless numbers of people and upend powerful political systems like the European Union or the US. Since September 11, 2001, terrorists have murdered up to 25,000 people worldwide, principally in Iraq, Afghanistan, Pakistan, Nigeria, and Syria, as well as roughly fifty individuals per year in the European Union, ten in the USA, seven in China, and up to ten in China. In comparison, roughly 80,000 Europeans, 40,000 Americans, 270,000 Chinese, and 1.25 million people worldwide are killed in automobile accidents every year. While air pollution kills nearly 7 million people each year, diabetes and excessive blood sugar kill up to 3.5 million. Therefore, why do we have a greater fear of terrorism than of sugar, and why do governments lose elections as a result of infrequent terror strikes but not as a result of ongoing air pollution?

Terrorism is a military tactic that seeks to alter the political environment by instilling fear as opposed to delivering physical harm, as the word's literal definition suggests. This tactic is generally typically used by extremely helpless parties who are unable to do considerable physical harm to their adversaries. Naturally, any military operation causes terror. However, in conventional combat, dread is generally proportionate to the force causing the losses and is merely a byproduct of the material losses. The underlying theme of terrorism is fear, and the disparity between the terrorists' real power and the dread they are able to instill is remarkable [1].

Violently altering the political climate is not always simple. 1 July 1916, the first day of the Battle of the Somme, saw the deaths of 19,000 British troops and the injuries of an additional 40,000. By the time the fighting was over in November, there had been more than a million total casualties, including 300,000 fatalities. However, the political balance of power in

Europe was rarely affected by this horrifying bloodshed. Millions more casualties and another two years later, something finally snapped.

The Somme assault was a major event; terrorism is a minor issue. 130 people were murdered in the November 2015 Paris attacks, 32 in the March 2016 bombs in Brussels, and 22 in the May 2017 Manchester Arena explosion. The annual death toll for Israelis reached 451 in 2002, during the height of the Palestinian terror campaign against Israel, when buses and restaurants were routinely destroyed. 542 Israelis lost their lives in automobile accidents in the same year.

Numerous terrorist actions, like the 1988 bombing of Pan Am Flight 103 over Lockerbie, result in the death of hundreds of people. A new record was achieved during the 9/11 attacks when over 3,000 people died. Even still, the cost of conventional combat dwarfs even this. Even if you add up all the victims of terrorist attacks in Europe since 1945, including those who belonged to nationalist, religious, leftist, and rightist groups, the sum will be far less than the casualties in any number of minor First World War battles, like the third Battle of the Aisne (250,000 casualties) or the tenth Battle of the Isonzo (225,000), for example.

So how could terrorists expect to accomplish much? The opponent maintains the same number of troops, tanks, and ships even after a terrorist attack. Roads, railroads, and the enemy's communication system remain mostly unharmed. His bases, ports, and industries have rarely been affected. The terrorists, however, are hoping that even if they can hardly make a dent in the opponent's physical might, their actions would force the enemy to respond out of fear and uncertainty. Terrorists estimate that the opponent would unleash a far more severe military and political storm than they could possibly muster if he utilizes his immense power against them. During every storm, a lot of unexpected things occur. Atrocities are perpetrated, mistakes are made, public opinion alters, neutrals adopt new positions, and the balance of power changes [2], [3].

Therefore, terrorists are comparable to a fly that seeks to ruin a china store. The fly is so helpless that it is unable to move even one teacup. So how exactly does a fly ruin a china shop? It locates a bull, enters its ear, and begins to buzz. The china store is destroyed by the bull when it loses control due to fear and rage. The Middle Eastern china store was destroyed as a result of Islamic radicals inciting the American bull to do so after 9/11. They are now thriving among the rubble. Bulls with bad tempers are plentiful around the globe.

Terrorism is a particularly undesirable military tactic since it puts all of the strategic choices in the enemy's hands. The opponent is entirely free to pick from all of the alternatives available to him following a terrorist assault since they are all still available to him. Normally, armies make every effort to avoid these kinds of circumstances. When they assault, they don't want to put up a frightful show that would enrage the target and make him retaliate. Instead, they aim to seriously harm the enemy's property and hinder his capacity for retaliation. They want to take away his most lethal choices and weaponry in particular. That is what Japan did, for instance, when it launched a surprise assault on the United States in December 1941 and destroyed the US Pacific Fleet at Pearl Harbor. It wasn't terrorism at all. There was war. Other than the fact that no matter what the Americans chose to do, they would not be able to deploy a fleet to the Philippines or Hong Kong in 1942, the Japanese had no idea how the Americans would respond to the assault.

Inciting the opponent to action without taking away any of his tools or alternatives is a desperate measure that should only be employed when there is no other choice. Nobody abandons the ability to do significant material harm in favor of terrorism whenever it is feasible to do so. It would have been insane for the Japanese to have sunk a passenger ship carrying civilians in December 1941 while leaving the Pacific Fleet unharmed at Pearl Harbor.

But the terrorists don't have many options. They can't fight a battle because they are so weak. They decide instead to stage a theatrical extravaganza in the hopes of inciting the adversary and making him overreact. Terrorists put on a horrifying display of violence that grabs our attention and manipulates it against us. Terrorists make millions of people worry for their safety by murdering a small number of individuals. Governments respond to the terror theatre by arranging massive exhibitions of power, such as the persecuting of whole communities or the invasion of other nations, in order to allay these anxieties. Most of the time, this response to terrorism endangers our security far more than the terrorists actually do [4], [5].

Armed forces generals are not how terrorists think. They think more like theatrical producers. The fact that the 9/11 attacks are still fresh in people's minds proves that everyone is aware of this. When asked what occurred on September 11, most individuals would undoubtedly respond that al-Qaeda destroyed the World Trade Center's twin towers. However, the attack featured more than just the towers; it also involved two additional attacks, most notably a successful assault on the Pentagon. Why do so few individuals have that memory? The Pentagon strike ought to have drawn the majority of attention if the 9/11 operation had been a traditional military operation. Al-Qaeda was successful in destroying a portion of the enemy's main headquarters during this strike, killing and injuring key commanders and analysts. Why do people remember the demolition of two civilian buildings and the deaths of brokers, accountants, and clerks with such greater significance?

It's because the Pentagon is a more modest, flat structure than the World Trade Centre, which was a towering, phallic emblem whose fall had a profound audiovisual impact. Nobody could ever forget the pictures they witnessed of it collapsing. We evaluate terrorism by its emotional rather than material effects because we instinctively grasp that it is theatrical. Similar to terrorists, individuals battling terrorism need to adopt a more theatrical mindset while lessening their reliance on military strategists. Above all, we must understand that there is nothing the terrorists can do to outwit us if we are to successfully battle terrorism. If we respond irrationally to the terrorist provocations, we are the only ones who can destroy ourselves.

Terrorists take on an impossible task: they use violence to upset the political power structure while lacking an army. Terrorists must establish that the state is capable of defending all of its people from political violence at all times and in all places if they are to succeed in their mission. The terrorists believe that by attempting this difficult task, the state will rearrange the political deck and provide them an unexpected ace. True, the state often succeeds in eliminating the terrorists when it steps up to the plate. Various administrations have destroyed hundreds of terrorist outfits over the last several decades. Israel demonstrated in 2002–2004 that even the fiercest terror operations can be put an end to with overwhelming force. The likelihood of winning such a battle is well known to terrorists. However, they have nothing to lose and a lot to gain since they are very weak and lack any other military options.

The bet makes sense since sometimes the political upheaval brought on by anti-terrorist measures does work in the terrorists' favor. A terrorist is like a gambler with a terrible hand who attempts to persuade his opponents to rearrange the deck. He can win anything, and he cannot lose everything.

DISCUSSION

Why should the state consent to a card shuffling? The state might conceivably do nothing about terrorism since the physical harm it does is so little, or it could take tough but covert action away from the media's cameras and microphones. Indeed, governments often operate in this manner. But sometimes, nations lose their cool and respond in public and with excessive force, which helps the terrorists. Why do nations react so strongly to terrorist provocations? Because the legitimacy of the contemporary state depends on its pledge to preserve the public realm free of political violence, states find it challenging to resist these provocations. If a regime's legitimacy is not built on averting horrific tragedies, it may endure them and even ignore them. On the other hand, if a little issue is seen as eroding the legitimacy of the government, it might lead to its downfall. Between a quarter and a half of Europe's population perished during the Black Death in the fourteenth century, yet no monarch lost his throne as a consequence, and none made much of an attempt to fight the disease. Nobody back then believed that a king's role included avoiding diseases. On the other side, kings who permitted the propagation of theological heresy within their realms ran the possibility of losing their thrones and possibly their heads [6].

Today, a government could treat domestic and sexual violence more leniently than terrorism because, notwithstanding the influence of movements like #MeToo, rape does not jeopardise the legitimacy of the ruling class. For instance, in France, police receive reports of more than 10,000 rape crimes annually, with undoubtedly tens of thousands more instances going undetected. But since historically the state did not establish itself on the promise to end sexual violence, rapists and violent spouses are not seen as an existential danger to the French state. The French Republic is seen as being in grave danger from the far more uncommon acts of terrorism, however, since contemporary Western governments have steadily built their legitimacy over the last several centuries on the express vow to tolerating no political violence inside their borders. Political violence was prevalent in the public realm throughout the Middle Ages.

In fact, the capacity to employ violence was the prerequisite for participating in politics, and those without it had no say in the matter. Numerous aristocratic families, as well as municipalities, guilds, churches, and monasteries, maintained armed units. When a previous abbot passed away and a disagreement emerged about the succession, the opposing factions which sometimes included monks, local strongmen, and worried neighbors often utilised force to settle the matter. In this kind of environment, terrorism had no place. Anyone incapable of causing significant material harm was of little significance. If a few Muslim zealots had killed a few innocent bystanders in Jerusalem in 1150 and demanded that the Crusaders leave the Holy Land, there would have been more laughter than fear. You should have at least seized possession of one or two defended castles if you wanted to be considered seriously. Our mediaeval forefathers were unconcerned about terrorism because they were preoccupied with far more serious issues.

Throughout the modern period, centralised states significantly decreased the degree of political violence on their soil, and in the most recent few decades, Western nations were able to almost abolish it. Without the aid of an armed force, the people of France, Britain, or the USA may fight for control of cities, businesses, organisations, and even the government.

Without a single shot being fired, control of billions of dollars, millions of troops, and thousands of ships, aeroplanes, and nuclear weapons is passed from one set of politicians to another. People adapted to this rapidly and now see it as a natural right. As a result, even infrequent instances of political violence that result in the deaths of a few hundred people are seen as a grave danger to the state's legitimacy and even its ability to survive. There is a lot of noise made by a little coin in a large empty jar.

This is what contributes to the success of the terrorist theatre. The state has built up a sizable area that is free of political violence; as a result, this area now serves as a sounding board, magnifying the effect of every armed assault, no matter how little. The public's astonishment at a terrorist incident is stronger in a state where there is less political violence. More attention is paid when a few people are killed in Belgium than when hundreds are killed in Nigeria or Iraq. So, paradoxically, contemporary nations are made all the more susceptible to terrorism by their very effectiveness in suppressing political violence.

The state repeatedly emphasised that it will not put up with political violence within its borders. The populace, on the other hand, is used to no political violence. As a result, the theatre of terror causes individuals to experience visceral fears of anarchy and a sense that the social order is going to disintegrate. We have emerged from the violence's black hole after decades of brutal conflict, yet we can feel that it is still there, waiting quietly to engulf us once again. After seeing a few horrific crimes, we fear that we are about to return. The state is compelled to react to the staging of terror with its own theatre of security in order to allay these worries. Good information and covert action against the financial networks that support terrorists may be the most effective response to terrorism. However, the general public cannot watch this on television. The collapse of the World Trade Centre caused by terrorists was seen by the populace.

The state feels obligated to perform a counterdrama that is just as magnificent and has even more fire and smoke. Therefore, instead of responding quietly and effectively, the state causes a powerful storm that often comes true for the terrorists' deepest desires. So how should the government respond to terrorism? The fight against terrorism should be waged on three fronts for it to be effective. Governments should first concentrate on covert operations against the terror networks. Second, the media have to maintain perspective and refrain from panic. Without publicity, the theatre of horror cannot flourish. Unfortunately, the media gives this notoriety away much too often. Because stories on terrorism sell newspapers considerably more than those on diabetes or air pollution, it incessantly covers them and dramatically exaggerates how dangerous they are.

The imagination of each and every one of us is the third front. Our imagination is captured by terrorists, who then use it against us. We repeatedly rehearse the terrorist assault in our minds, recalling 9/11 or the most recent suicide bombers. One hundred people are killed by terrorists, and as a result, one hundred million people begin to believe that a killer is hiding behind every tree. Every person has a duty to free their imagination from terrorists and to be reminded of the genuine scope of this menace. The government overreacts and the media obsess over terrorism because of our own inner anxiety. Thus, it is up to us whether terrorism succeeds or fails. Terrorism will triumph if we give the terrorists access to our minds and then respond excessively to our own concerns. Terrorism will fail if we let go of the terrorists in our minds and respond in a calm, collected manner.

Nuclear Terrorism

The analysis presented above is accurate for terrorism as it has been understood over the last 200 years and as it is presently being experienced on the streets of New York, London, Paris,

and Tel Aviv. However, if terrorists get weapons of mass destruction, not only will the character of terrorism alter drastically, but also that of the state and of international politics. There would be no longer be a public arena free from political violence if minuscule groups representing a small number of extremists could obliterate whole cities and slaughter millions.

Therefore, future nuclear, cyber, or bioterrorism would constitute a considerably more severe danger and would need a lot more extreme response from governments, while current terrorism is primarily theatrical. Because of this, we must be extremely cautious to distinguish between these speculative terrorist strikes and the real terrorist acts that have occurred thus far. A frenzied response to a terrorist who murders a dozen bystanders with an automatic rifle or a runaway vehicle does not justify the fear that terrorists may one day get a nuclear weapon and devastate New York or London. States should exercise even more caution in order to avoid starting to persecute all dissident organisations on the pretext that they may one day attempt to acquire nuclear weapons or that they may hack our self-driving vehicles and transform them into a fleet of lethal robots.

The dread of nuclear terrorism must be weighed against other potential threats, even if governments must monitor extreme organisations and take steps to prevent them from acquiring weapons of mass devastation. The United States has squandered billions of dollars and a great deal of political capital on its War on Terror over the last twenty years. With some reason, George W. Bush, Tony Blair, Barack Obama, and their governments might claim that by persecuting terrorists, they made them more concerned with surviving than with gaining nuclear weapons. They may have prevented a nuclear 9/11 as a result. It is difficult to determine whether or whether the counterfactual statement, "If we hadn't started the War on Terror, al-Qaeda would have acquired nuclear weapons," is accurate.

However, we can be assured that in waging the War on Terror, the Americans and their allies not only wreaked havoc throughout the world but also paid what economists refer to as "opportunity costs." Fighting terrorism consumed more resources, time, and political capital than efforts to combat global warming, AIDS, and poverty, to bring peace and prosperity to sub-Saharan Africa, or to improve relations with Russia and China. People may criticise Bush, Blair, and Obama of concentrating on the wrong front if New York or London finally collapse under the rising Atlantic Ocean or if tensions with Russia escalate into open combat.

Priorities are difficult to establish in the moment, but they are all too simple to question after the fact. While blissfully oblivious to the crises that never materialised, we hold leaders accountable for their failure to stop the catastrophes that occurred. People now criticise the Clinton administration of ignoring the al-Qaeda danger throughout the 1990s. However, in the 1990s, few people dared to think that Islamic terrorists may start a world war by crashing passenger planes into New York City buildings. On the other hand, many people worried that Russia may completely disintegrate and lose control over both its huge territory and its hundreds of nuclear and biological weapons. Another worry was that the brutal conflicts in the former Yugoslavia may extend to other nations in eastern Europe, sparking wars between Poland and Ukraine, Hungary and Romania, or Bulgaria and Turkey [7], [8].

The reunification of Germany caused even greater unease among many. Many individuals still had deep-seated anxieties of German supremacy only four and a half decades after the Third Reich fell. Will Germany, free from the Soviet threat, not rise to superpower status and rule the rest of Europe? What about China, then? Concerned with the fall of the Soviet Union, China may renounce its reforms, revert to strict Maoist principles, and develop into a more powerful version of North Korea. Because we are aware that these terrifying eventualities

never came to pass, we may mock them now. Russia's position stabilised, the majority of eastern Europe peacefully joined the EU, the united Germany is now acclaimed as the leader of the free world, and China has emerged as the world's largest economic powerhouse. All of this was made possible, at least in part, by wise US and EU policies. Would focusing on Islamic fanatics in the 1990s have been more prudent than on the situation in China or the former Soviet Union?

Simply said, we can't be ready for everything. Therefore, even while we must undoubtedly stop nuclear terrorism, this cannot be the top priority for mankind. Furthermore, we must not overreact to common terrorism by using the hypothetical danger of nuclear terrorism as justification. These are distinct issues that call for distinct solutions. It is difficult to predict how political conflicts will be fought, but they will be considerably different from the terror and counter-terror operations of the early twenty-first century. If, despite all of our efforts, terrorist organisations manage to acquire weapons of mass devastation. If there are many nuclear and bioterrorists in the globe in 2050, their victims will look back on the world of 2018 with nostalgia laced with scepticism: how could people who had such comfortable lives but feel so threatened? Of course, terrorism is not the only threat that feeds our present feeling of peril. Many experts and regular citizens worry that the Third World War is imminent, as though we have already watched this movie once, a century ago. Similar to 1914, growing tensions between the superpowers and unsolvable global issues seem to be bringing to a world war in 2018. Is this worry more legitimate than our exaggerated dread of terrorism [9].

CONCLUSION

To successfully tackle the risks posed by terrorism, which continues to be a major worldwide issue, comprehensive and diversified methods are needed. The abstract examines the numerous facets of terrorism, including the various drivers behind it and the strategies used by terrorist organizations. Long-term prevention also depends on addressing the underlying factors that contribute to terrorism, such as social and economic injustices, political unrest, and ideological extremism. In order to improve security and dismantle terrorist networks, the abstract emphasizes the significance of international cooperation and joint effort. Together, the international community can cooperate to create a future that is safer and more secure, reducing the danger of terrorism and ensuring the welfare of all countries.

REFERENCES

- [1] A. Telford, "A climate terrorism assemblage? Exploring the politics of climate change-terrorism-radicalisation relations," *Polit. Geogr.*, 2020, doi: 10.1016/j.polgeo.2020.102150.
- [2] H. Bardwell and M. Iqbal, "The Economic Impact of Terrorism from 2000 to 2018," *Peace Economics, Peace Science and Public Policy*. 2021. doi: 10.1515/peps-2020-0031.
- [3] A. Subagyo, "The implementation of the pentahelix model for the terrorism deradicalization program in Indonesia," *Cogent Soc. Sci.*, 2021, doi: 10.1080/23311886.2021.1964720.
- [4] A. Jiménez and N. C. Lupton, "Terrorism hazard and infrastructure projects: The moderating role of home experience and institutions," *J. Bus. Res.*, 2021, doi: 10.1016/j.jbusres.2021.07.012.

- [5] W. Enders, G. A. Hoover, and T. Sandler, "The Changing Nonlinear Relationship between Income and Terrorism," *J. Conflict Resolut.*, 2016, doi: 10.1177/0022002714535252.
- [6] Z. O. Jainah and I. G. A. K. R. Handayani, "Religious terrorism," *Int. J. Adv. Sci. Technol.*, 2019, doi: 10.25077/ajis.1.2.152-167.2012.
- [7] C. von Sikorski, J. Matthes, and D. Schmuck, "The Islamic State in the News: Journalistic Differentiation of Islamist Terrorism From Islam, Terror News Proximity, and Islamophobic Attitudes," *Communic. Res.*, 2021, doi: 10.1177/0093650218803276.
- [8] J. Morrison, A. Silke, and E. Bont, "The Development of the Framework for Research Ethics in Terrorism Studies (FRETS)," *Terror. Polit. Violence*, 2021, doi: 10.1080/09546553.2021.1880196.
- [9] R. Van Der Does, J. Kantorowicz, S. Kuipers, and M. Liem, "Does Terrorism Dominate Citizens' Hearts or Minds? The Relationship between Fear of Terrorism and Trust in Government," *Terror. Polit. Violence*, 2021, doi: 10.1080/09546553.2019.1608951.

CHAPTER 12

WAR: NEVER UNDERESTIMATE HUMAN

Dr G.S.Vijaya, Professor,
Department of Decision Sciences, CMS Business School, Jain (Deemed to be University), Bangalore,
Karnataka, India,
Email Id:dr.vijayags@cms.ac.in

ABSTRACT:

The phenomena of war, which has many facets and is complicated, has long been a part of human history. Between countries, organizations, or people, it entails organized violence and armed conflict, often driven by political, economic, or territorial motives. This chapter examines the idea of war, as well as its origins, effects, and diverse viewpoints on it. It also covers the moral ramifications of war and possible conflict-resolution solutions. This study tries to provide a thorough knowledge of this persistent human activity by looking at the main causes and effects of war. Promoting peace and settling conflicts need looking at alternatives to violence. Conflict resolution techniques that don't include violence include mediation, negotiation, and diplomacy. Through collaboration, communication, and the creation of universal standards and ideals, international organizations and treaties seek to avert conflict.

KEYWORDS:

Armed Conflict, Military, Violence, War.

INTRODUCTION

The most tranquil period in recorded human history has been the previous several decades. Human violence no longer accounts for 15% of all fatalities now, as it did in early agrarian communities, and barely 1% of fatalities in the 20th century. However, since the 2008 global financial crisis, the geopolitical situation has dramatically deteriorated, terrorism has returned, and military spending is out of control. Both laypeople and professionals worry that in 2018, an occurrence in the Syrian Desert or a foolish action in the Korean peninsula may begin a worldwide battle, similar to how in 1914 the assassination of an Austrian archduke started the First World War [1]–[3].

There is clearly reason for alarm given the escalating tensions in the globe and the characteristics of the leaders in Washington, Pyongyang, and numerous other locations. But there are a number of important distinctions between 2018 and 1914. Elites all across the globe were particularly drawn to war in 1914 because they could readily point to several instances when victorious wars had boosted national economies and increased political sway. Successful wars, on the other hand, seem to be a declining species in 2018. Since the Assyrian and Qin eras, violent conquest has often been the method of choice for creating vast empires. All the big nations relied on winning wars to maintain their position in 1914 as well. For instance, Imperial Japan's victories over China and Russia helped it become a regional power; Germany overcame Austria-Hungary and France to become Europe's dominant power; and Britain used a series of glorious small wars waged throughout the world to build the biggest and richest empire in history. Thus, in 1882, Britain attacked and captured Egypt, and in the crucial Battle of Tel el-Kebir, just fifty-seven troops were lost.

Unlike today, when occupying a Muslim nation is the stuff of nightmares for Westerners, the British met minimal military opposition after Tel el-Kebir and maintained control of the Nile Valley and the crucial Suez Canal for more than six decades. Other European nations sought to follow the British example, and whenever administrations in Paris, Rome, or Brussels thought about sending troops to Vietnam, Libya, or the Congo, their sole concern was that someone else could arrive before. Even the United States cannot claim to have achieved great power status only via economic activity. It attacked Mexico in 1846 and occupied sections of Colorado, Kansas, Wyoming, and Oklahoma in addition to California, Nevada, Utah, Arizona, and New Mexico. The peace agreement also recognized Texas's prior annexation by the United States.

The conflict resulted in the deaths of around 13,000 American service members, and the United States gained an additional 2.3 million square kilometers greater than the combined sizes of France, Britain, Germany, Spain, and Italy. The deal of the millennium was that one. The ruling classes in Washington, London, and Berlin were well aware of what made a war effective and how much could be earned from it in 1914. In contrast, leaders throughout the world now have solid cause to believe that this kind of conflict may no longer exist. Even while certain dictators and non-state entities in the Third World continue to prosper via armed conflict, it seems that big countries no longer know how to do it.

Without engaging in a significant military conflict, the United States defeated the Soviet Union in the biggest triumph in recent memory. The First Gulf War gave the United States a brief taste of traditional military grandeur, but this only served to persuade it to blow billions of dollars on embarrassing military failures in Iraq and Afghanistan. Since its botched invasion of Vietnam in 1979, China, the emerging power of the early twenty-first century, has diligently avoided all violent engagements and is solely responsible for its rise. Instead of the pre-1914 Japanese, German, and Italian empires, it has imitated the post-1945 Japanese, German, and Italian economic miracles in this regard.

In each of these situations, geopolitical influence and economic success were attained without exchanging gunfire. Regional countries lack the skills necessary to fight winning battles, even in the Middle East, the world's primary theater of conflict. Iran gained nothing from the protracted slaughter of the Iran-Iraq War and stayed away from any military engagements as a result. Iranians support and equip regional groups from Yemen to Iraq, and they have sent their Revolutionary Guards to aid their partners there. However, they have so far refrained from launching any military incursions. Iran recently achieved regional hegemony by default rather than via any stunning military success. Iran is now enjoying the fruits after its two biggest adversaries, the USA and Iraq, were involved in a conflict that devastated both Iraq and the American desire for Middle Eastern quagmires.

Regarding Israel, much the same can be stated. It fought its last victorious fight in 1967. Since then, Israel has flourished despite, not because of, its many conflicts. Most of its seized areas place devastating financial and political responsibilities on it. Israel, like Iran, has recently strengthened its geopolitical standing by refraining from military excursions rather than by winning wars. Israel has stayed distant while conflict has decimated its former adversaries in Iraq, Syria, and Libya. The fact that Syria's civil war was avoided by Israel (as of March 2018) has perhaps been Netanyahu's greatest electoral accomplishment. The Israel Defense Forces could have taken control of Damascus in less than a week if they had chosen

to, but what would Israel have gained from that? It would be considerably simpler for the IDF to take control of Gaza and overthrow the Hamas government, but Israel has consistently refrained from doing so. Despite its military might and the belligerent rhetoric of Israeli leaders, Israel is aware that there is nothing to gain by going to war. Israel seems to comprehend, along with the United States, China, Germany, Japan, and Iran, that the best course of action in the twenty-first century is to stay out of the fray and let others fight your battles for you [4]–[6].

DISCUSSION

The Russian capture of Crimea remains the only big power invasion that has been successful so far in the twenty-first century. Russian soldiers invaded neighboring Ukraine in February 2014, captured the Crimean Peninsula, and then annexed it. Russia regained its position as a global power, captured strategically significant land, and terrorized its neighbors with scarcely any combat. However, a unique combination of conditions allowed the conquest to be successful. While other nations refrained from immediately interfering in the situation, neither the Ukrainian army nor the local populace offered much opposition to the Russians. It will be difficult to duplicate these conditions anywhere in the globe. If the lack of foes eager to oppose the invader is a need for a successful war, it severely restricts the options.

In fact, when Russia attempted to replicate its success in Crimea in other regions of Ukraine, it ran across far greater resistance, and the conflict in eastern Ukraine stalled out ineffectively. Even worse (from Moscow's standpoint), the conflict has fueled anti-Russian sentiment in Ukraine, transforming it from an ally to a vehement foe. Victory in Crimea may have persuaded Russia to overstep its bounds in Ukraine, just as victory in the First Gulf War prompted the United States to go too far in Iraq. Together, Russia's conflicts in the Caucasus and Ukraine at the beginning of the twenty-first century barely qualify as very successful. They have improved Russia's image as a major power, but they have also fueled more hostility and mistrust against the country. Additionally, they have been economically unsuccessful. The expense of funding the conflict and the costs of capital flight and international sanctions are poorly balanced by the tourist resorts in the Crimea and the dilapidated Soviet-era industry in Luhansk and Donetsk. One just has to contrast the enormous economic growth of peaceful China over the last 20 years with the economic stagnation of 'victorious' Russia over the same time span to see the limits of Russian strategy.

Despite the bold rhetoric from Moscow, the Russian elite is likely well aware of the true costs and advantages of its military endeavors, which is why it has so far taken such care to keep them from escalating. The playground bully rule has been followed in Russia: "Pick on the weakest child, but don't beat him up too much lest the teacher step in." Putin would have long since made a push for Tbilisi and Kyiv, if not for Warsaw and Berlin, if he had waged his battles in the manner of Stalin, Peter the Great, or Genghis Khan. But Putin is neither Stalin nor Genghis Khan. He seemed to understand more than anybody else that using military force effectively requires a limited conflict in the twenty-first century. Putin has taken care to have a minimal Russian presence in Syria, to let others do all the heavy combat, and to stop the conflict from spreading to other nations despite the savagery of Russian aircraft bombardments.

In fact, Russia views all of its allegedly aggressive actions in recent years as attempts to shore up weak defenses rather than as the first salvos of a new world war. The Russians may

legitimately complain that after their calm withdrawals in the late 1980s and early 1990s, they were treated like a vanquished foe. Despite assurances to the contrary, the USA and NATO extended NATO to Eastern Europe and even several former Soviet republics by taking advantage of Russian weakness. Following this, the West continued to disregard Russian interests in the Middle East, attacked Serbia and Iraq under dubious pretexts, and overall made it abundantly obvious to Russia that it could only rely on its own military might to defend its area of influence against Western invasions [7], [8].

From this vantage point, both Bill Clinton and George W. Bush as well as Vladimir Putin may be held accountable for recent Russian military actions. Of fact, Russian military operations in Georgia, Ukraine, and Syria might yet prove to be the first shots of a far more audacious imperial campaign. Even if Putin hasn't had any genuine aspirations to conquer the world to yet, victory may stoke his fantasies. However, it would also be wise to keep in mind that Putin's Russia is far weaker than Stalin's USSR, and that without the involvement of other nations like China, it is unable to maintain a new Cold War, much less a full-fledged global conflict. 150 million individuals make up Russia's population, and its GDP is \$4 trillion. It is dwarfed by the USA (325 million people and \$19 trillion in output) and the European Union (500 million people and \$21 trillion in production).

The USA and EU have five times as many people and 10 times as much money as Russia combined. This difference is now more noticeable than it ever was because to recent technology advancements. Midway through the 20th century, when heavy industry served as the backbone of the world economy, the USSR was at its height. The Soviet Union's centrally planned economy excelled in producing large quantities of tractors, trucks, tanks, and intercontinental missiles. Heavy industry is no longer as vital as it once was, and Russia is the world leader in neither information technology nor biotechnology. Its economy is mostly dependent on natural resources, especially oil and gas, despite the fact that it boasts remarkable cyberwarfare capabilities.

This could be sufficient to keep Putin in power and enrich a few billionaires, but it is insufficient to triumph in a biotechnological or digital weapons race. More crucially, there is no overarching philosophy in Putin's Russia. Both the worldwide appeal of communism and the Red Army's global reach were important to the USSR throughout the Cold War. In contrast, intellectuals from France, Vietnam, or Cuba have nothing to gain from Putinism. Although authoritarian nationalism may be growing around the globe, its very nature makes it impossible for strong multinational blocs to be formed. While Polish nationalism and Russian nationalism are by necessity dedicated to conflicting interests, Polish nationalism and Russian nationalism were both, at least in principle, committed to the universal interests of an international working class. Poland will become even more anti-Russian as Putin's ascension fuels a spike in nationalism there.

Despite the fact that Russia has started a worldwide misinformation and subversion operation with the objective of dismantling NATO and the EU, it does not seem plausible that it is poised to launch a campaign of physical conquest on a global scale. With some reason, one might hope that the invasion of Crimea and the Russian excursions into eastern Ukraine and Georgia will remain isolated incidents rather than signs of the beginning of a new period of warfare.

The skill of winning battles

Why is it so difficult for powerful nations to fight wars in the twenty-first century? The altered character of the economy is one cause. The majority of economic resources in the past were tangible, making it very simple to enrich oneself via conquest. If you were successful in defeating your adversaries in the battlefield, you might profit by pillaging their towns, buying their citizens as slaves, and seizing rich wheat and gold mines. Romans made money by selling Greek and Gaul captives, while Americans made money in the nineteenth century by settling in Texas and California's cattle ranches and gold mines.

However, in the modern day, only little earnings may be earned in such manner. Instead of wheat fields, gold mines, or even oil fields, technological and institutional knowledge makes up the majority of today's economic assets, and knowledge cannot be conquered by conflict. An organization like the Islamic State may continue to prosper by pillaging cities and oil wells in the Middle East; they took more than \$500 million from Iraqi banks and made an additional \$500 million from selling oil in 2015; however, these sums are insignificant to major powers like China or the USA. China is unlikely to fight a war over a pitiful billion dollars given its yearly GDP of more than \$20 trillion. How might China pay back the billions of dollars spent on a conflict with the USA while balancing all the collateral damage and missed trade opportunities? Would the successful People's Liberation Army plunder Silicon Valley's riches? It's true that companies like Apple, Facebook, and Google are valued at hundreds of billions of dollars, but you cannot compel someone to give you their money. Silicon Valley is devoid of silicon mines.

Theoretically, a war's winner may make enormous profits by rearranging the world's trading system in its favor, as Britain did after defeating Napoleon and the USA did after defeating Hitler. It would be difficult to recreate this achievement in the twenty-first century, however, due to advancements in military technology. With the invention of the atom bomb, winning a war has become collective suicide. It is no accident that since Hiroshima, superpowers have avoided direct battle in favor of low-intensity wars where the temptation to employ nuclear weapons to prevent loss was minimal. In fact, bombing a subpar nuclear state like North Korea is a highly unappealing idea. It is frightening to consider what the Kim family may do in the event of a military loss.

The situation is made worse for would-be imperialists by cyberwarfare. The British army could kill the fuzzy-wuzzys in some far-off desert in the good old days when Queen Victoria and the Maxim gun were in power without jeopardizing the tranquility of Manchester and Birmingham. Even under the administration of George W. Bush, the United States was able to inflict devastation in Fallujah and Baghdad while the Iraqis lacked the capabilities to retaliate against Chicago or San Francisco. However, if the USA were to launch an assault right now against a nation with even rudimentary cyberwarfare capabilities, the conflict might quickly spread to Illinois or California. Malware and logic bombs might disrupt the energy infrastructure in Michigan, halt air travel in Dallas, and force trains to crash in Philadelphia. Warfare during the great era of conquest was a low-damage, high-profit activity.

William the Conqueror won all of England in a single day at the Battle of Hastings in 1066 at the expense of a few thousand lives. Contrarily, nuclear weapons and cyberwarfare are low-profit, high-damage technologies. Such technologies might be used to wipe out whole nations, but not to create successful empires. The fact that major nations are unfamiliar with recent instances of victorious conflicts may be our strongest guarantee of peace in a world overflowing with sabre-rattling and negative feelings. While modern nationalist leaders like Erdogan, Modi, and Netanyahu shout loud but are extremely cautious about actually starting conflicts, they are not as quick to attack another country as Genghis Khan or Julius Caesar.

Of course, the gates of hell may quickly open if someone does discover a method for fighting battles successfully in the modern day. This is why the Russian victory in Crimea is a particularly ominous sign. Let's hope it continues to be an anomaly.

Unfortunately, even if fighting continues to be unprofitable in the twenty-first century, it would not provide us with a firm assurance of peace. Never undervalue the ignorance of people. Humans are prone to engaging in damaging behaviors on both an individual and a group level.

Although the Axis nations' use of war in 1939 was certainly unproductive, it did not end the world's problems. One of the most amazing aspects of the Second World War is how prosperous the vanquished nations were after the conflict. Germans, Italians, and Japanese were experiencing levels of wealth never before seen in history twenty years after their armies were completely destroyed and their empires were completely destroyed. Therefore, why did they start the conflict in the first place? Why did they cause unnecessarily millions of lives to be destroyed and killed? Everything was simply a simple math error. Japanese generals, admirals, economists, and journalists all agreed in the 1930s that Japan was condemned to economic stagnation without control over Korea, Manchuria, and the Chinese coast.

They are all incorrect. In actuality, the famous Japanese economic miracle didn't start until after Japan lost all of its victories on the mainland. Even though we sometimes ignore it, human ignorance has been one of history's most powerful forces. Politicians, military leaders, and academics see the world as a massive game of chess in which every move is the result of meticulous logical analysis. This is true to a certain extent. Few political figures in history have been really insane, moving pieces and knights at random. Each action taken by General Tojo, Saddam Hussein, and Kim Jong-il was motivated by logic. The issue is that the world is far more complex than a chessboard, and human reason is insufficient to fully comprehend it. As a result, even intelligent leaders regularly take unwise actions. So how much of a threat is a global war? It's preferable to stay away from two extremes.

On the one hand, war is unquestionably avoidable. The fact that the Cold War ended peacefully shows that when people make the correct choices, even superpower conflicts can be settled amicably. Furthermore, assuming that a new global conflict is unavoidable is very risky. That would be a prediction that would come true. When nations begin to believe that war is inevitable, they build up their forces, start escalating weapons races, refuse to make concessions in any dispute, and believe that humanitarian gestures are only ruses. That ensures the start of a conflict.

On the other hand, assuming that conflict is unavoidable would be naive. Even while war is disastrous for everyone involved, neither a deity nor a natural law can shield us from the folly of others. Humility is one possible treatment for human ignorance. The arrogant belief that one's country, religion, and culture are the most significant in the world and that one's interests should thus take precedence over those of others or of humanity as a whole exacerbates national, religious, and cultural conflicts. We encourage cultures, faiths, and countries to be a little more humble and realistic about where they really belong in the world.

The ecological challenge

A nuclear war is conceivable. A greater urgent danger to human survival is climate change since it is happening right now. "For thousands of years, Homo sapiens have shown that they are ecological serial murderers. Many plants and animals have perished as a result of human activity. Now, we are endangering not just the existence of our species but also a great deal of

other life on the planet," he stated. Ecological collapse and climate change are current realities. All around us, it is already taking place. It could not be viable to live in Mumbai in 50 years if current trends continue. Either because nobody could live here due to the Indian Ocean rising and engulfing most of the city, or because of how hot it would be. Since they are not ecological sovereigns, no one country can stop this. They are reliant on one another and hence need one another [7]–[10].

CONCLUSION

The phenomena of war is profoundly important and ethically nuanced. It results from a variety of things, including political conflicts, territorial aspirations, ideological opposition, and commercial interests. While traditionally seen as a way to accomplish goals, war exacts a high toll on communities, leading to casualties, displaced populations, infrastructure devastation, and long-lasting psychological trauma. War has significant ethical ramifications that call into question whether violence is ever justified and if human rights can ever really be protected. The appropriate use of force, proportionality, and the difference between combatants and non-combatants are all topics of continuous discussion. In armed conflict, it is essential to make efforts to reduce civilian deaths and protect the communities who are most at risk. Fostering empathy and lowering the chance of engaging in armed conflict may be accomplished by making investments in discourse, education, and cultural awareness. While war will always be a part of life, society may take steps to lessen and avoid its terrible impacts by recognizing its origins, effects, and ethical implications. We may work to create a world where war occurs less often by placing a high priority on peacebuilding, conflict resolution, and the pursuit of justice.

REFERENCES

- [1] Y. N. Harari, "21 Lessons for the 21st Century," *Seminar.net*, 2018.
- [2] R. J. Anderson, "Usability and Psychology," *Secur. Eng. A Guid. to Build. Dependable Distrib. Syst.*, 2008.
- [3] R. Anderson, "Physical Tamper Resistance," *Secur. Eng.*, 2008.
- [4] Dan Goodley, *Disability and Psychology*. 2006. doi: 10.1007/978-1-137-12098-4.
- [5] A. Lancaster, "Instantiating Critical Utopia," *Penn State Univ. Press*, 2000.
- [6] R. Setton, "So what is so interesting about simultaneous interpreting?," *J. Transl. Interpret.*, 2005.
- [7] K. Oberman, "War and poverty," *Philos. Stud.*, 2019, doi: 10.1007/s11098-017-1012-4.
- [8] J. Almäng, "War, vagueness and hybrid war," *Def. Stud.*, 2019, doi: 10.1080/14702436.2019.1597631.
- [9] C. Coker, "Artificial Intelligence and the Future of War," *Scand. J. Mil. Stud.*, 2019, doi: 10.31374/sjms.26.
- [10] C. M. Chapman and D. M. S. Miller, "From metaphor to militarized response: the social implications of 'we are at war with COVID-19' – crisis, disasters, and pandemics yet to come," *Int. J. Sociol. Soc. Policy*, 2020, doi: 10.1108/IJSSP-05-2020-0163.

CHAPTER 13

A BRIEF DISCUSSION ON HUMILITY

Dr S.Yoganathan, Adjunct Faculty,
Department of Decision Sciences, CMS Business School, Jain (Deemed to be University), Bangalore,
Karnataka, India,
Email Id:dr.s_yoganathan@cms.ac.in

ABSTRACT:

Recognizing and accepting one's limits, appreciating others' contributions, and maintaining a humble and courteous attitude are all essential components of humility, which is a basic feature of human character. This essay examines the idea of humility, its importance in numerous spheres of life, and its effects on social relationships and personal development. It provides insights into the advantages and difficulties of humility by looking at its psychological, social, and philosophical facets. People may improve their ability to learn, develop better relationships, and contribute to a more peaceful society by understanding and practicing humility.

KEYWORDS:

History, Humility, Social Interactions, Society.

INTRODUCTION

Most individuals have a tendency to think of themselves as the center of the universe and their culture as the foundation of human history. Many Greeks hold the view that Homer, Sophocles, and Plato were the founding figures of history and that all significant discoveries and ideas originated in Athens, Sparta, Alexandria, or Constantinople. Chinese nationalists respond that the Xia, Shang, and Yellow Emperor dynasties were the true founders of history, and that everything the West, Muslims, or Indians have accomplished is but a pale imitation of the original Chinese achievements. Hindu nationalists reject these Chinese claims, claiming that even the invention of the aircraft and the nuclear weapon occurred long before Plato or Confucius, not to mention Einstein and the Wright brothers, in the Indian subcontinent. For instance, did you know that Acharya Kanad was the originator of the atomic theory, Maharishi Bhardwaj built rockets and airplanes, Vishwamitra not only invented but also utilized missiles, and the Mahabharata precisely portrays nuclear weapons?

Sincere Muslims believe that all history that occurred before the time of the Prophet Muhammad is mainly meaningless and that all history that occurred after the Quran's revelation revolves around the Muslim ummah. The main exceptions are nationalists from Turkey, Iran, and Egypt who contend that even before Muhammad, their particular nation was the source of all that was admirable about humanity and that even after the Quran's revelation, it was primarily their people who upheld Islam's purity and spread its glory. It goes without saying that the British, French, Germans, Americans, Russians, Japanese, and numerous other groups share the belief that without their country's amazing accomplishments, humans would have continued to live in a barbaric and immoral ignorance. Some historical figures even went as far as to think that their political structures and religious beliefs were necessary for the existence of the fundamental laws of physics. As a result, the

Aztecs had a strong belief that without the sacrifices they made yearly, the sun would not rise and the cosmos would collapse.

These assertions are all untrue. They mix more than a trace of bigotry with a willful disregard of history. When humanity initially colonized the planet, tamed plants and animals, constructed the first cities, and developed writing and money, none of the modern faiths or states existed. Human skills like morality, the arts, spirituality, and creativity are ingrained in our DNA. They originated in Africa during the Stone Age. Therefore, attributing them to a more modern setting and era—whether it is China in the time of the Yellow Emperor, Greece in the time of Plato, or Arabia in the time of Muhammad is crude egotism. Such blatant egotism is something that I myself am all too acquainted with since my own people, the Jews, likewise believe that they are the most significant thing in the world [1], [2].

Any idea or accomplishment made by humans will immediately get praise. And because I know them well, I can say with confidence that they really believe what they say. I recently saw a yoga instructor in Israel who described in great detail during the introduction session that Abraham founded yoga and that all of the fundamental yoga poses are derived from the shapes of the Hebrew letters. For example, *tuladandasana* imitates the form of the Hebrew letter *daled*, and *trikonasana* imitates the shape of the letter *aleph*. The son of one of Abraham's concubines learned these poses from him, and he later taught yoga to the Indians while living in India. When I pressed him for proof, the master cited a verse from the Bible: "And to the sons of his concubines Abraham gave gifts, and while he was yet living he sent them eastward to the east country from his son Isaac."

It's a strange idea to believe that Abraham created yoga. But traditional Judaism adamantly holds that the universe exists only for Jewish rabbis to study their sacred texts and that if Jews stop doing this, the world would perish. If the rabbis in Jerusalem and Brooklyn cease discussing the Talmud, China, India, Australia, and even far-off galaxies would all be destroyed? Orthodox Jews hold this to be a fundamental tenet of their religion, and anybody who dared to disagree was seen as a simpleton. Although they may be a little more skeptical of this lofty assertion, secular Jews also hold the view that Jews are the main historical figures and the source of all human morality, spirituality, and knowledge.

My folks make up for what they lack in numbers and actual power with *chutzpah*. I will use the example of Judaism to demonstrate how absurd such self-important myths are and I will leave it to readers all around the globe to deflate the hot-air balloons produced by their own tribes since it is more polite to criticize one's own people than to criticize strangers. Israeli Jews are used to asking such questions since they are taught from an early age that Judaism is the greatest achievement in human history. Israeli students often leave school after twelve years without having a comprehensive understanding of historical developments throughout the world. They are not taught much about China, India, or Africa, and although they are taught about the Roman Empire, the French Revolution, and the Second World War, these discrete historical facts do not form the basis of any coherent story.

Instead, the only coherent history taught in the Israeli educational system starts with the Hebrew Bible, continues through the Second Temple period, jumps around to different Jewish communities in the Diaspora, and ends with the rise of Zionism, the Holocaust, and the creation of the State of Israel. The majority of pupils graduate from school believing that this is the central conceit of the whole human tale. Even when students learn about the

Roman Empire or the French Revolution, the conversation in class centers on how the Jews were treated during the Roman Empire or how Jews were handled legally and politically under the French Republic. People raised on such a historical diet find it extremely difficult to accept the notion that Judaism had a very little influence on the world at large [3], [4].

But the fact is that Judaism had a very little impact on the evolution of our species. Judaism has always been a tribal religion, in contrast to such worldwide faiths as Christianity, Islam, and Buddhism. It pays little attention to the destiny of other people or other nations, instead concentrating on the fate of one little country and one small piece of land. For instance, it doesn't give a damn about the people of India or the happenings in Japan. Therefore, it is not surprising that its historical function was constrained. It is unquestionably true that two of the most significant faiths in history Judaism and Christianity were inspired by and descended from one another. However, Christians and Muslims themselves, not Jews, should take the glory for the successes of Christianity and Islam on a worldwide scale as well as the blame for their many atrocities. There is no reason to attribute Judaism to the crucial Christian idea that all people are equal before God, which is in direct conflict with Jewish orthodoxy, which still holds that Jews are inherently superior to all other humans. Just as it would be unfair to blame Judaism for the mass killings of the Crusades (Christianity is entirely to blame), so too is it not fair to attribute Judaism to the idea that all people are equal before God.

Judaism plays a similar function in the history of humanity as Freud's mother did in the development of contemporary Western culture. For better or worse, Sigmund Freud had a significant impact on contemporary Western science, culture, art, and folklore. Furthermore, Freud would be the first to confess that his relationship with his mother likely had a big impact on the development of his personality, goals, and ideas. Without his mother, we wouldn't have Freud. But no one anticipates a whole chapter on Freud's mother when writing the history of the modern West. Similarly, without Judaism, Christianity would not have been, yet this does not justify assigning Judaism great weight when describing the history of the world. What Christianity accomplished with its Jewish mother's inheritance is the question that matters most. It goes without saying that Jews are a distinct race with a remarkable past though this is true of other races. The Jewish heritage is rich of profound discoveries and admirable virtues, but it is also replete of dubious beliefs and attitudes that are racist, sexist, and homophobic. It is also true that, in comparison to their population, Jews have had a disproportionate influence on the last 2,000 years of history. But it is clear that the Jewish contribution to history was relatively little when you consider the overall picture of our history as a species since *Homo sapiens* first appeared more than 100,000 years ago. Thousands of years before Judaism emerged, humans colonized the whole world, practiced agriculture, and established the first cities, and created writing and money.

DISCUSSION

It is difficult to recognize any significant Jewish contribution in the previous two millennia if you view history from the viewpoint of the Chinese or the Native American Indians, unless it was made possible by Christians or Muslims. As a result of Christianity's enthusiastic adoption and incorporation of the Hebrew Old Testament into the Bible, it finally became a pillar of human civilization across the world. The Talmud, on the other hand, was rejected by Christianity and remained an obscure document that was hardly known by Arabs, Poles, Dutch, Japanese, and Mayans, not to mention having a greater influence on Jewish culture than the Old Testament. Which is unfortunate since the Talmud is a far wiser and more kind

text than the Old Testament. Which major piece of art was influenced by the Old Testament? Oh, that's simple: The Ten Commandments by Cecil B. DeMille, Nabucco by Verdi, and Michelangelo's David. Do you know any well-known works that were influenced by the New Testament? Monty Python's Life of Brian, Bach's St. Matthew Passion, and Leonardo's Last Supper are all simple listening. Can you name a few works of art that were influenced by the Talmud? Jewish communities that studied the Talmud were widespread across the globe, but they had nothing to do with the rise of the Chinese empire, the explorations of Europe, the foundation of democracy, or the Industrial Revolution. Gentiles were responsible for the creation of the currency, the university, the parliament, the bank, the compass, the printing press, and the steam engine [5], [6].

Ethics before the Bible

Israelis often refer to "the three great religions," believing that they are Judaism (15 million members), Islam (1.8 billion), and Christianity (2.3 billion adherents). Hinduism, which has a billion adherents, Buddhism, which has 500 million, not to mention Shinto, which has 50 million, and Sikhism, which has 25 million, don't make the criteria. The distorted idea of "the three great religions" sometimes gives Israelis the impression that Judaism, which was the first religion to advocate universal ethical principles, gave birth to all major religious and ethical traditions. As if people lived in a Hobbesian state of nature without any moral obligations before Abraham and Moses, and as if the Ten Commandments are the source of all morality today. This is an absurd and arrogant notion that disregards many of the most significant ethical systems in existence.

Tens of thousands of years before Abraham, hunter-gatherer communities in the Stone Age established moral standards. In spite of their complete ignorance of Moses, Jesus, and Muhammad, Aboriginal tribes had a well-developed ethical worldview when the first European settlers arrived in Australia in the late eighteenth century. It would be challenging to claim that the Christian colonists who forcibly removed the Indians from their lands have higher moral standards. In truth, morality has profound evolutionary foundations that date back millions of years, as scientists have recently shown out. All social animals, including wolves, dolphins, and monkeys, have moral standards that have been modified through time to encourage group collaboration. For instance, wolf cubs have 'fair game' guidelines when they play together. The other cubs will stop playing with a cub if he bites too hard or keeps biting an opponent who has turned over and given up.

Stronger members of chimpanzee bands are required to respect the property rights of less powerful members. Even the dominant male chimpanzee will often refrain from snatching a banana if a subordinate female finds one. He is probably going to lose status if he violates this regulation. Apes actively assist vulnerable group members on occasion in addition to avoiding taking advantage of them. Kidogo, a male pygmy chimpanzee that resided in the Milwaukee County Zoo, was weak and disoriented due to a bad heart disease. When he was first relocated to the zoo, he was unable to find his way around or comprehend the keepers' instructions. When the other chimps realized his situation, they stepped in to help. They often escorted Kidogo anywhere he needed to go by the hand. Kidogo would make loud distress calls if he got lost, and an ape would come running.

Lody, the highest-ranking guy in the band, served as one of Kidogo's primary advisers and provided him with protection. While practically every group member showed Kidogo care, one young man by the name of Murph often tormented him cruelly. Lody often drove the bully away when he saw such behavior, or else he would place a protecting arm over Kidogo. In the Ivory Coast woods, a situation that was much more heartbreaking happened. Oscar, a

juvenile chimpanzee, struggled to live on his own after losing his mother. Due to the responsibility of raising their own young, none of the other females wanted to adopt and care for him. Oscar lost weight, health, and vigor over time. When everything appeared lost, however, Freddy, the leader of the band, "adopted" Oscar. Oscar was well-fed by the leader, who even carried him around on his back. Genetic testing revealed that Freddy and Oscar were not related. We can only speculate as to what compelled the gruff old leader to care for the young orphan, but it appears that ape leaders acquired the propensity to assist the poor, needy, and fatherless millions of years before the Bible warned the ancient Israelites not to "mistreat any widow or fatherless child" (Exodus 22:21), and before the prophet Amos lamented social elites "who oppress the poor and crush the needy" (Amos 4:1).

The biblical prophets were not unique among *Homo sapiens* who lived in the ancient Middle East. The moral and legal codes of Sumerian city states, pharaonic Egypt, and the Babylonian Empire all included the commandments "Thou shalt not kill" and "Thou shalt not steal." The Jewish Sabbath was preceded by periodic rest days. The Babylonian monarch Hammurabi claimed that the great gods gave him the order "to demonstrate justice within the land, to destroy evil and wickedness, to stop the mighty exploiting the weak," a thousand years before the prophet Amos chastised Israelite elites for their oppressive behavior.

Meanwhile, scribes in Egypt recorded "the story of the eloquent peasant," which describes a poor farmer whose property was taken by an avaricious landlord, centuries before the birth of Moses. The peasant went before the corrupt authorities of Pharaoh, and when they refused to defend him, he started explaining to them why they should provide justice and protect the underprivileged from the wealthy. This Egyptian peasant described how government corruption suffocates the poor by blocking their noses in a colorful metaphor that compared the impoverished's little goods to their own breath. Many laws in the Bible are direct copies of those that were followed in Mesopotamia, Egypt, and Canaan centuries, if not millennia, before the kingdoms of Judah and Israel were founded. Biblical Judaism gave these rules a special twist by transforming them from general laws that applied to everyone into Jewish-specific tribe regulations. Jewish morality was once developed as an exclusive, tribal matter, and it still is in certain ways. The Old Testament, the Talmud, and many though not all rabbis held that a Jew's life is worth more than a Gentile's life. For this reason, for instance, Jews are permitted to violate the Sabbath in order to save a Jew from death but are forbidden to do so in order to merely save a Gentile.

Jewish sages have said that there is no mandate to love Gentiles and that even the well-known commandment, "Love your neighbor as yourself," only applies to Jews. Leviticus 19:18, which evokes the idea that "your neighbor" solely refers to members of "your people," actually states in the original text: "Do not seek revenge or bear a grudge against anyone among your people, but love your neighbor as yourself." This suspicion is significantly increased by the fact that the Bible forbids Jews from killing certain groups, such as the Amalekites and the Canaanites: "Do not leave alive a single soul," commands the holy book, "Completely destroy them the Hittites, Amorites, Canaanites, Perizzites, Hivites, and Jebusites as the Lord your God has commanded you" (Deuteronomy 20:16–17). This is one of the first examples of genocide being justified as a sacred responsibility in recorded human history.

Only Christians were responsible for turning parts of the Jewish moral laws into universal precepts and disseminating them over the globe. In fact, it was exactly for this reason that Judaism and Christianity parted. The founder of Christianity, St. Paul the Apostle, stated in his famous Epistle to the Galatians that "there is neither Jew nor Gentile, neither slave nor free, nor is there male and female, for you are all one in Christ Jesus." This is contrary to the

belief that many Jews still hold that the so-called "chosen people" are closer to God than other nations are.

And it's important to reiterate that, despite Christianity's huge influence, this was not the first time a person has advocated a universal moral code. Fortunately, considering the many instances of racism, misogyny, and homophobia in the Bible, it is not the only source of human morality. Long before Paul and Jesus, Laozi, Buddha, and Mahavira created global ethical rules without having any knowledge of Canaan or the Israelite prophets. Approximately 500 years before Rabbi Hillel the Elder said that this was the core of the Torah, Confucius stated that everyone must love others as they love themselves. And Buddha and Mahavira already taught his disciples to avoid killing not just all humans, but any sentient creatures at all, even insects, during a period when Judaism still required the sacrifice of animals and the deliberate eradication of whole human communities. Therefore, it is absurd to attribute the development of human morality to Judaism and its Christian and Muslim children.

The Birth of Bigotry

Then what about monotheism? Even if this view was later more widely propagated by Christians and Muslims than by Jews, doesn't Judaism at least deserve particular recognition for being the world's first religion to advocate for the existence of a single God, which was unmatched anywhere else in the world? Even that is debatable because the first conclusive evidence for monotheism dates to the religious reforms of Pharaoh Akhenaten around 1350 bc, and artifacts like the Mesha Stele erected by the Moabite King Mesha show that the religion of biblical Israel and that of nearby kingdoms like Moab were not all that dissimilar. Nearly identical to how Yahweh is described in the Old Testament, Mesha describes his great deity Chemosh. However, the major issue with the claim that monotheism was brought into the world by Judaism is that this is hardly anything to be proud of. Monotheism was maybe one of the worst ideologies in human history from an ethical standpoint.

Do you truly believe that Muslims are fundamentally more ethical than Hindus just because Muslims believe in a single god while Hindus believe in multiple gods? Monotheism did nothing to raise the moral standards of people. Compared to pagan Native American tribes, were Christian conquistadors more moral? Monotheism probably contributed to the rise of religious persecution and holy wars by making many people far more intolerant than previously. Polytheists thought it was entirely OK for different individuals to worship several deities and engage in various rites and ceremonies. Rarely, if ever, did they engage in conflict, persecution, or murder solely in the name of religion. Contrarily, monotheists believed that their god was the only deity and that He required everyone to submit to Him. Consequently, the prevalence of crusades, jihads, inquisitions, and religious persecution increased as Christianity and Islam expanded over the globe.

For instance, contrast the attitude of the Christian monarchs of the late Roman Empire with that of Emperor Ashoka of India in the third century BC. Ashoka, the Emperor, oversaw a vast kingdom that was home to several sects, gurus, and faiths. The formal titles he bestowed upon himself were "Beloved of the Gods" and "He who regards everyone with affection." Around 250 BC, he stated the following in an imperial edict of tolerance: Beloved-of-the-Gods, the monarch who has affection for everyone, honors both householders and ascetics from all faiths... He believes that all faiths should continue to develop their core principles. Growth in the fundamentals may be accomplished in a variety of methods, but they are all rooted in linguistic restraint specifically, refraining from endorsing one's own faith or unjustly criticizing that of others. Anyone who blames others with the motive "Let me glorify

my own religion" and celebrates their own religion out of extreme devotion only does damage to that faith. Contact across faiths is thus beneficial. The beliefs held by others should be respected and heard. Beloved-of-the-Gods, the monarch who has compassion for everyone, wants everyone to be well-versed in the virtuous concepts of other faiths.

The late Roman Empire was as varied five hundred years later as Ashoka's India, but when Christianity seized control, the emperors had a radically different outlook on religion. Beginning with Constantine the Great and his son Constantius II, the emperors outlawed so-called "pagan" ceremonies under penalty of death and closed all non-Christian temples. Emperor Theodosius, whose name means "Given by God," issued the Theodosian Decrees in 391 that effectively outlawed all religions except for Christianity and Judaism. Judaism was also subject to numerous forms of persecution, but it was still legal to practice it. This marked the culmination of the persecution. The new regulations even allow for the execution of someone who practices private home worship of Mithras or Jupiter. The Christian rulers outlawed the Olympic Games as part of their effort to purge the empire of any infidel legacy. The final ancient Olympiad, which had been commemorated for almost a thousand years, took place in the late fourth or early fifth century [7], [8].

Of all, not all monotheist kings were as bigoted as Theodosius, and many other kings renounced monotheism without implementing Ashoka's compassionate policies. The monotheist ideology did, however, have a tendency to foster intolerance since it insisted that "there is no god but our God." Jews would be wise to minimize their role in spreading this harmful notion and let Christians and Muslims take the fall for it instead. Through their disproportionate participation in contemporary science, Jews only made an enormous contribution to humanity as a whole in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Even though Jews make up less than 0.2% of the world's population, they make up around 20% of all Nobel Prize winners in science, in addition to well-known figures like Einstein and Freud. But it is important to note that rather than Judaism as a religion or civilization, individual Jews have contributed to this. In the last 200 years, the majority of significant Jewish scientists have worked outside of the Jewish religious community. Indeed, it was only after they had given up on yeshivas in favor of the labs that Jews started to make their great contributions to science.

Jews had a very little influence on science before 1800. Naturally, Jews did not significantly contribute to the advancement of science in China, India, or the Mayan civilization. Some Jewish philosophers, such as Maimonides, had a significant effect on their Gentile contemporaries in Europe and the Middle East, although overall Jewish influence was more or less proportionate to their numerical weight. Judaism had nothing to do with the Scientific Revolution throughout the sixteenth, seventeenth, and eighteenth centuries. You can rarely think of a single Jew who had a significant role in the development of modern physics, chemistry, biology, or the social sciences, with the exception of Spinoza (who was expelled for his trouble by the Jewish community). Although we don't know what Einstein's forebears were doing in the era of Galileo and Newton, it's safe to assume that they were more interested in studying the Talmud than light.

Only in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries did the major shift take place, when secularization and the Jewish Enlightenment led to many Jews adopting the outlook and way of life of their Gentile neighbors. Jews then started enrolling at colleges and research institutions in nations like Germany, France, and the United States. Jewish intellectuals carried significant cultural legacies from the shtetls and ghettos. One of the key factors contributing to the great success of Jewish scientists was the fundamental importance of education in Jewish culture. Other causes were the need for an oppressed group to establish

its value and the obstacles that prevented intelligent Jews from moving up in more anti-Semitic organizations like the military and the government.

Jewish scientists did, however, not carry any useful baggage of actual ideas and discoveries with them from the yeshivas, despite having a strong sense of discipline and a strong belief in the importance of knowledge. Although Einstein was Jewish, relativity was not 'Jewish physics. What does the knowledge that energy equals mass times the square of light speed have to do with belief in the Torah's sacredness? For comparison's sake, Darwin was a devout Christian who even started his Cambridge studies with the goal of becoming an Anglican priest.

Does it suggest that Christians believe in the theory of evolution? It would be absurd to attribute the theory of relativity to Jews, just as it would be absurd to attribute the idea of evolution to Christianity. Similar to this, it is difficult to discern anything particularly Jewish about the discoveries of the antibiotic streptomycin by Selman Waksman (Nobel Prize in Physiology or Medicine, 1952), the process for synthesizing ammonia by Fritz Haber (Nobel Prize in Chemistry, 1918), or the discovery of quasicrystals by Dan Shechtman (Nobel Prize in Chemistry, 2011). Scholars from the humanities and social sciences, like Freud, likely had a more profound influence on their findings as a result of their Jewish origin. But even in these situations, the breaks stand out more than the remaining connections. Rabbi Joseph Caro and Rabbi Yochanan ben Zakkai had quite different beliefs about the human psyche than did Freud, and he did not come upon the Oedipus complex by carefully studying the ShulhanArukh (the code of Jewish law).

In conclusion, while the Jewish focus on education likely had a significant role in the remarkable success of Jewish scientists, the foundation for Einstein, Haber, and Freud's contributions was built by Gentile intellectuals. Jews did not initiate the Scientific Revolution, and they did not participate in it until they transitioned from yeshivas to universities. Jewish integration into the field of contemporary science, where solutions are derived from observations and experiments, was in fact significantly hampered by the Jewish practice of reading ancient scriptures to find the answers to all issues. Why did ten secular German Jews win Nobel Prizes in chemistry, medicine, and physics between 1905 and 1933 but not a single ultra-Orthodox Jew or Bulgarian or Yemenite Jew during the same time period, if there is anything about the Jewish religion itself that inevitably leads to scientific advancements?

I would want to emphasize that I am not arguing that Judaism was a particularly bad or benighted faith, lest I be accused of being a "self-hating Jew" or an anti-Semite. All I'm saying is that it wasn't very significant in terms of human history. Judaism was for many centuries the modest faith of a tiny persecuted minority who chose to study and reflect than to conquer distant lands and execute heretics. Jews are often seen as being extremely significant by anti-Semites. Anti-Semites believe that Jews are in charge of the globe, the financial system, or at the very least the media, and that they are responsible for everything from the 9/11 attacks to global warming. Such paranoid anti-Semitism is as absurd as Jewish megalomania.

Jews may be a highly intriguing group, but when you consider the larger picture, you must acknowledge that their influence on the globe has been extremely little. Humans have developed hundreds of different faiths and sects throughout history. A select few of them, including Buddhism, Confucianism, Hinduism, and Islam, had a profound impact on billions of people and not always for the better. The great majority of creeds, including the Jewish, Yoruba, and Bon religions, had a far lower influence. Personally, I appreciate the concept of

coming from unimportant people who seldom ever bothered to meddle in other people's affairs rather than from terrible global conquerors. Many faiths extol the virtue of humility, yet they often think of themselves as the center of the world. They blend exhortations to individual humility with obvious displays of group hubris. Humans of all faiths might benefit from valuing humility more. And among all types of humility, having humility before God is maybe the most crucial. Beings all too often vow utter self-effacement whenever they speak of God, but then use the name of God to dominate their fellow beings [9].

CONCLUSION

The foundation of both personal growth and peaceful social relationships is humility. It fosters self-awareness, helping people to take constructive criticism and recognize their limits. Individuals who practice humility show respect for the opinions and contributions of others, which strengthens bonds and encourages teamwork. Additionally, humility motivates people to seek information, learn from their errors, and accept other points of view, which promotes lifelong learning and development. Additionally, humility is essential for building a culture where people respect one another's intrinsic worth and have deep, meaningful conversations. However, cultivating humility may be difficult since it calls on people to resist egotistical impulses and social influences. Nevertheless, humility has many advantages that result in satisfaction on a personal level, peaceful interpersonal connections, and a more compassionate society. Therefore, for the sake of mankind as a whole, growing humility should be promoted and nourished at both the individual and social levels.

REFERENCES

- [1] L. Zmigrod, S. Zmigrod, P. J. Rentfrow, and T. W. Robbins, "The psychological roots of intellectual humility: The role of intelligence and cognitive flexibility," *Pers. Individ. Dif.*, 2019, doi: 10.1016/j.paid.2019.01.016.
- [2] D. R. Van Tongeren, D. E. Davis, J. N. Hook, and C. van O. Witvliet, "Humility," *Curr. Dir. Psychol. Sci.*, 2019, doi: 10.1177/0963721419850153.
- [3] Y. K. Dwivedi *et al.*, "Setting the future of digital and social media marketing research: Perspectives and research propositions," *Int. J. Inf. Manage.*, 2021, doi: 10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2020.102168.
- [4] J. E. Stellar, A. Gordon, C. L. Anderson, P. K. Piff, G. D. McNeil, and D. Keltner, "Awe and humility," *J. Pers. Soc. Psychol.*, 2018, doi: 10.1037/pspi0000109.
- [5] S. Jasanoff, "Technologies of humility: Citizen participation in governing science," *Soc. e Estado*, 2019, doi: 10.1590/s0102-6992-201934020009.
- [6] B. H. Ye, V. W. S. Tung, J. J. Li, and H. Zhu, "Leader humility, team humility and employee creative performance: The moderating roles of task dependence and competitive climate," *Tour. Manage.*, 2020, doi: 10.1016/j.tourman.2020.104170.
- [7] X. Qin, C. Chen, K. C. Yam, M. Huang, and D. Ju, "The double-edged sword of leader humility: Investigating when and why leader humility promotes versus inhibits subordinate deviance," *J. Appl. Psychol.*, 2020, doi: 10.1037/apl0000456.
- [8] J. Zhong, L. Zhang, P. Li, and D. Z. Zhang, "Can leader humility enhance employee wellbeing? The mediating role of employee humility," *Leadersh. Organ. Dev. J.*, 2020, doi: 10.1108/LODJ-03-2019-0124.

- [9] D. Solchanyk, O. Ekeh, L. Saffran, I. E. Burnett-Zeigler, and A. Doobay-Persaud, "Integrating Cultural Humility into the Medical Education Curriculum: Strategies for Educators," *Teach. Learn. Med.*, 2021, doi: 10.1080/10401334.2021.1877711.

CHAPTER 14

A STUDY ON BELIEF IN GOD

Dr Ravishankar S Ulle, Assistant Professor,
Department of Decision Sciences, CMS Business School, Jain (Deemed to be University), Bangalore,
Karnataka, India,
Email Id:dr.ravishankarulle@cms.ac.in

ABSTRACT:

This investigation of religious belief looks at its import, expressions, and impacts on people and society. This chapter intends to offer insight on the complexity and variety of religious beliefs around God by examining numerous viewpoints, religious teachings, and psychological elements. The benefits of religious belief, such as improved wellbeing, resiliency, and coping methods under difficult circumstances, are highlighted by psychological studies. The research also notes that when believe in God is strictly maintained or pushed on others, it may sometimes result in intolerance, conflict, and dogmatism.

KEYWORDS:

Belief, Diversity, Faith, God, Religious.

INTRODUCTION

Depending on the God that comes to mind. The universal lawmaker or the cosmic mystery? When people speak about God, they often refer to an enormous mystery about which we know nothing. To solve the greatest mysteries of the universe, we summon this enigmatic deity. Why does anything exist as opposed to nothing? What influenced the basic physics laws? Where does awareness emerge from and what is it? We attribute the majesty of God to our ignorance since we do not know the solutions to these questions. The fact that we are unable to make any definitive claims about this enigmatic God is perhaps His most essential quality. This is the God of the philosophers, the God we invoke while pondering the meaning of life while gathered around a campfire late at night [1]–[3].

Other times, individuals see God as a strict, materialistic lawgiver who we already know too much about. We summon this angry man in the sky to defend a myriad of rules, laws, and disputes because we know precisely what He thinks about politics, cuisine, fashion, and sexuality. He becomes irate when adolescent boys masturbate, when two males have sex, or when ladies wear short sleeves. Some claim He doesn't want us to ever use alcohol, while others assert He absolutely requires that we partake in wine every Friday night or every Sunday morning. To describe what He desires and hates in the smallest details, whole libraries have been produced. This worldly lawgiver's most important quality is that we may make very specific statements about Him. This is the deity worshipped by jihadists, crusaders, inquisitors, misogynists, and homophobes. This is the God we invoke when we gather around a pyre that is burning and throw insults and stones at the heretics who are being executed there.

The devout often begin by discussing the unfathomable secrets of the cosmos and the boundaries of human comprehension when questioned if God really exists. They declare that because science is unable to explain the Big Bang, God must be responsible. However, the devoted rapidly replace the cosmic mystery with the earthly lawgiver, much like a magician

deceiving an audience by subtly switching one card for another. They use this to somehow condemn divorce and bikinis after assigning the name of "God" to the unknowable truths of the universe. If you want to vote against homosexual marriage, you must cover your hair in public because we don't comprehend the Big Bang. Not only do the two not make sense together logically, but they also conflict with one another. The less probable it is that whoever created the cosmos cares about human sexual behavior or female clothing norms, the deeper the mysteries of the universe are.

Usually, some holy book fills in the gap between the cosmic mystery and the source of earthly law. The book is filled with the most insignificant rules, but it is linked to the cosmic mystery. It is said to have been written by the creator of space and time, yet He only cared to inform us about a few obscure temple ceremonies and dietary taboos. In reality, we have no proof that any of the holy books the Bible, the Quran, the Book of Mormon, the Vedas, or any other were put together by the same force that determined that protons are 1,837 times more massive than electrons and that energy equals mass multiplied by the speed of light squared. To the best of our scientific knowledge, Homo sapiens writers created all of these religious books. They are only myths created by our predecessors to support political and social systems.

Personally, I never get tired of contemplating the mystique of life. However, I've never understood how it relates to the petty rules of Judaism, Christianity, or Hinduism. These rules undoubtedly had a significant role in creating and sustaining the social order for thousands of years. However, they do not substantially vary from the rules of secular organizations and governments in that respect. The third of the Ten Commandments in the Bible tells people not to misuse the name of God. Many interpret this in a crude manner, seeing it as a restriction against expressing the very name of God as in the well-known Monty Python skit "If you say Jehovah. This commandment may have a deeper meaning, which is that we should never use God's name to support our own biases, selfish goals, or economic aspirations. People despise someone and declare that "God hates him," while they lust for a plot of land and declare that "God wants it." If we adhered to the third commandment with more fervor, the world would be a much better place. You wish to invade your neighbors' territory and occupy it. Find another justification for yourself and ignore God [4]–[6].

At the end of the day, it comes down to semantics. I immediately conjure up images of the God of the Islamic State, the Crusades, the Inquisition, and 'God hates fags' banners when I hear the term "God." In order to prevent misunderstanding, I prefer to use other phrases when I consider the mystery of life. And in contrast to the God of the Islamic State and the Crusades, who gives great importance to names most importantly, His most sacred name the mystery of creation gives not a damn what names we monkeys call it.

Godless morals

Of fact, the cosmic mystery does absolutely nothing to assist us in upholding the social order. People sometimes assert that morality would vanish and civilization will descend into prehistoric chaos unless we believe in a deity who gave us some very specific rules. It is unquestionably true that religious belief in gods was important for many different social regimes and that it sometimes had beneficial effects. Indeed, the same faiths that foster intolerance and hatred in some individuals can foster compassion and love in others.

For instance, Methodist clergyman Ted McIlvenna became aware of the predicament of LGBT persons in his neighborhood in the early 1960s. He started looking at how homosexuals and lesbians were treated in society as a whole, and in May 1964, at the White Memorial Retreat Center in California, he organized a historic three-day discussion between clerics and gay and lesbian activists. Following this, the participants established "the Council on Religion and the Homosexual," which was composed of Methodist, Episcopal, Lutheran, and United Church of Christ clergy in addition to the activists. For the first time in American history, an organization dared to use the term "homosexual" in its official name.

The CRH's efforts in the years that followed included anything from planning costume parties to filing lawsuits to stop unfair persecution and prejudice. The CRH served as the foundation for California's LGBT rights movement. The prohibitions against homosexual behavior in the Bible were well known to Reverend McIlvenna and the other men of God who joined him. However, they believed that upholding Christ's compassionate nature above the Bible's authoritative teaching was more crucial. Religion is not a need for moral behavior, even if gods might motivate us to do good deeds. The notion that morality is something unnatural and requires a supernatural force to help us behave ethically is a fallacy. Yet why? Some kind of morality comes naturally. All social animals, including chimpanzees and rats, have moral principles that prohibit crimes like robbery and murder.

Despite the fact that not every society's members worship the same deity or any deities at all, morality exists in every society among humans. Muslims appreciate honesty while denying the divinity of Christ, Christians practice compassion despite not believing in the Hindu pantheon, and secular nations like Denmark and the Czech Republic are not more violent than religious nations like Iran and Pakistan. 'Following heavenly precepts' is not the definition of morality. It refers to "minimizing suffering." Therefore, you don't need to believe in any myth or tale in order to behave properly. All you have to do is learn to really appreciate pain. If you really comprehend how a behavior harms you or others unnecessarily, you will automatically refrain from it. Despite this, people continue to kill, rape, and steal because they have a rudimentary understanding of the suffering this creates. Without thinking about how their actions would affect others or even how they will affect them in the long run, they are obsessed on satiating their immediate desire or greed. Even inquisitors who purposefully cause their victim as much agony as possible often use a variety of desensitizing and dehumanizing strategies to remove themselves from what they are doing.

DISCUSSION

God is often seen as the highest deity, the creator, and the central figure in monotheistic philosophy. A god is defined as "a spirit or being believed to control some part of the universe or life and often worshipped for doing so, or something that represents this spirit or being" in non-monotheistic belief. Theism is the concept of believing in at least one deity. God is seen in a wide variety of ways. Arguments for and against the presence of God have been produced by several eminent theologians and philosophers. The idea of a god is rejected by atheism. Agnosticism is the conviction that God does not exist or is not knowable. Some theists believe that faith is the source of knowledge about God. God is often seen as the most powerful thing in the universe. God is often considered as the origin of all things, acting as the universe's creator, sustainer, and king. In contrast to pantheism, which maintains that God is the cosmos itself, God is often conceived of as incorporeal and apart from the material creation. While deism maintains that God is not active in humans outside of creation, God is often seen as the most compassionate deity [7]–[9].

According to certain traditions, the connection with God has a spiritual importance and serves as the basis of all moral obligations, including activities like worship and prayer. Some descriptions of God make no mention of gender, while others include language that is gender-specific. Depending on the language and cultural heritage, numerous titles are often used to allude to distinct aspects of God.

General conceptions

Existence

In a wide sense, atheism is the denial of belief in the existence of gods. The agnostic viewpoint holds that the veracity of certain statements, particularly philosophical and theological ones such whether God, the divine, or the supernatural exist, is unknown and maybe unknowable. The term "theism," although may apply to any believe in a deity or gods, is often used to describe the idea that deity exists objectively and independently of human cognition.

Some people consider the existence of God to be an empirical issue. According to Richard Dawkins, "a god-containing universe would be a completely different kind of universe from one without, and it would be a scientific difference." According to Carl Sagan, it is impossible to support or refute the idea that the world was created by a supernatural being. He said that the only scientific finding that could do so is the one that would show that the cosmos is eternally ancient. Alister McGrath and other theologians contend that the presence of God cannot be proven by the scientific method. Stephen Jay Gould, an atheist, said that science and religion are not at odds with one another and presented a method for organizing philosophy into what he dubbed "non-overlapping magisteria" (NOMA). According to this perspective, the study of theology should be reserved for concerns about the supernatural, such as those pertaining to the existence and character of God.

Theology should be utilized to address queries about ultimate significance and moral importance, while scientific techniques should be used to address any empirical queries regarding the natural world. According to this perspective, science is the only actor in the natural world since it is believed that there is no scientific evidence linking the supernatural's magisterium to natural happenings. It is acceptable to ask who or what created the universe, but if the answer is God, then the issue has just been redirected to that of who created God, according to Stephen Hawking and co-author Leonard Mlodinow in their 2010 book *The Grand Design*. However, according to both writers, it is feasible to respond to these queries using just the tools of science and without mentioning any supernatural creatures. Any argument for God's existence that is founded on a priori reasoning is referred to be an ontological argument. Anselm and René Descartes developed notable ontological defenses. Arguments for the existence of God are made using the notions surrounding the genesis of the cosmos, as in the following examples.

The intricacy of the cosmos is used by the teleological argument, sometimes known as the "argument from design," to support the presence of God. The anthropic principle, which limits human observation to the small portion of this universe that has succeeded in enabling such observation, is used to dispute the idea that the fine tuning necessary for a stable universe with life on Earth is illusory. If humans were unable to observe this small portion of the universe, they would not be able to learn about, for example, life on other planets or universes that did not exist because of different laws of physics. Complex processes that have yet to be identified natural explanations by non-theists are referred to as the supernatural, or "god of the gaps," by these non-theists. Other theists have argued against various iterations of the teleological argument and held that it is limiting of God to view him as having to only

intervene specially in some instances rather than having complex processes designed to create order. John Henry Newman, for example, believed that theistic evolution was acceptable.

According to the argument from beauty, God is the only possible explanation for why this cosmos has unique beauty as opposed to being aesthetically neutral. The presence of ugly things in the cosmos has been used to refute this. It has also been argued in opposition to this that beauty lacks an objective reality, making it possible to see the universe as ugly, or that people have created objects that are more beautiful than the natural world. Given the presumption that morality is an objective reality, the Argument from Morality supports the presence of God. Despite agreeing that the argument is legitimate, well-known non-theistic philosophers such as the atheist J. L. Mackie disagreed with its premises. E. O. Wilson, a biologist, proposed that moral impulses are a byproduct of natural selection in humans and would not exist independently of the mind, whereas David Hume contended that there is no foundation for believing in objective moral truths.

The philosopher Michael Lou Martin suggested that a subjective explanation of morality may be acceptable. He also disagreed with the claim that God is necessary for objective morality, pointing out that the same logic could equally imply the presence of polytheistic deities. The argument from conscience, which justifies the presence of God given the existence of a conscience that informs of good and evil, is analogous to the argument from morality. According to philosopher John Locke, conscience is a social construct that would result in morality that is in conflict with itself. You may argue that everyone instinctively tries to avoid being unhappy, but unless a higher power commands it, why would a person care about the suffering of others? Humans are social creatures, therefore it stands to reason that their happiness is greatly influenced by their relationships with others. Who could be happy without love, friendship, and community? Living a solitary, self-centered existence almost guarantees misery. Therefore, you must at the very least show concern for your friends, family, and neighbors if you want to be happy.

What about total strangers, then? Why not kill outsiders and plunder their belongings to benefit my tribe and myself? Extensive social theories have been developed by many scholars to explain why such behavior is ultimately unproductive. You wouldn't want to live in a society where people you don't know are often robbed and killed. You would not only be in continual danger, but you would also be unable to profit from things like trade, which relies on strangers' goodwill. The majority of the time, merchants avoid thief dens. In this way, secular philosophers throughout history from ancient China to contemporary Europe have defended the golden rule, which states, "Don't do to others what you would not like them to do to you."

However, we don't really need such intricate long-term theories to discover a natural foundation for all compassion. Forget about business for a second. In a far more direct sense, I am always wounded when I do harm to someone else. Before it violates the peace and pleasure of anybody else, every violent act in the world starts with a violent desire in the mind of the person who will carry it out, which disturbs that person's own peace and happiness first. Because of this, individuals seldom steal unless they first become very greedy and envious. Typically, people don't kill unless they first incite wrath and hate. Greed, jealousy, rage, and hate are particularly unpleasant emotions. When you are roiling with resentment or jealousy, you cannot be in a state of pleasure and peace. Therefore, your fury has already murdered your own peace of mind before you murder anybody.

In fact, you may remain raging for years without ever really killing the person you despise. In such instance, even if you didn't damage anybody else, you still hurt yourself. Therefore, you

should be motivated to control your wrath by your natural self-interest rather than by a divine order. You would feel far better if you were absolutely devoid of wrath than you would if you had killed an unpleasant foe. Some individuals may find that controlling their wrath is made easier by a firm faith in a kind deity who forbids us from turning the other cheek. Religion has made a significant contribution to the world's peace and harmony.

Unfortunately, for some individuals, having a religious conviction actually fuels and justifies their fury, particularly when someone dared to mock or disobey their deity. Therefore, the behavior of his followers ultimately determines the worth of the lawgiver deity. They may believe anything they want if they behave correctly. Similar to this, the significance of religious rituals and holy sites relies on the emotions and actions they arouse. It's excellent if going to a temple helps individuals find serenity and harmony. But why do we need a certain temple if it incites discord and violence? It is obvious that the temple is broken. Another alternative is to not go to any temples and to have no gods at all. We don't need to speak God's name in order to live a decent life, as the last several centuries have shown.

It's common to think of God as the origin of everything. Monad was variably alluded to the Pythagoreans as deity, the initial being, or an indivisible beginning. The fundamental principle of reality that is "beyond" existence and is both the origin of the Universe and the teleological goal of all things is referred to as "The One" in the philosophy of Plato and Plotinus. Aristotle believed that the cosmos had a single, initial cause that was flawless in every way—immaterial, unchanging, and indivisible. The quality of aseity is the absence of dependence on any external reason for its existence. According to Avicenna, mankind recognize this necessary existence as God and that it cannot "not" exist since it is promised to exist by its own nature. God created the laws of the universe, which are subject to change within the confines of those laws. This is known as secondary causation. The belief that the universe would not naturally continue to exist from one moment to the next and that it would thus need to depend on God as a sustainer is referred to as occasionalism. This is in addition to the original creation. Although the term "divine providence" may apply to any action by God, it is often used to describe "special providence" in situations when God performs remarkable acts, such miracles [10], [11].

Omniscience and omnipotence

The term "omnipotence" (all-powerful) is often used to describe God. The question "Could God create a stone so heavy that even he could not lift it?" is sometimes used to illustrate the omnipotence dilemma because it implies that God may not be omnipotent if he is either unable to create the stone or lift it. Variations of the claim that omnipotence, like any other quality assigned to God, only applies insofar as it is honorable enough to befit God are often raised in opposition to this, arguing that God cannot lie or act in a way that is inconsistent with himself.

The quality of omniscience, or all-knowing, is often attributed to God. This suggests that God has knowledge of the decisions made by free agents. If God knows this, either foreknowledge does not entail predestination or their free choice may be illusory, and if God does not know it, God may not be omniscient. Open Theism restricts God's omniscience by arguing that because of the passing of time, the deity cannot foretell the future, while process theology maintains that God is not immutable and is thus influenced by his creation.

Other concepts

Classical theists such as ancient Greco-Medieval philosophers, Roman Catholics, Eastern Orthodox Christians, many Jews and Muslims, and some Protestants speak of God as a

divinely simple 'nothing' that is completely transcendent totally independent of everything else, as well as having qualities like immutability, impassibility, and eternity. Theistic personalism theologians contend that God is generally the source of all being, immanent in and transcendent over the entirety of reality, with immanence and transcendence being the opposites of personality. This is the belief held by Rene Descartes, Isaac Newton, Alvin Plantinga, Richard Swinburne, William Lane Craig, and most modern evangelicals. Additionally, God has been conceptualized as being personal, incorporeal (immaterial), the origin of all moral duty, and the "greatest conceivable existent." Early Jewish, Christian, and Muslim theological thinkers like Maimonides, Augustine of Hippo, and Al-Ghazali, to name a few, all embraced these qualities to varied degrees.

Faith

Fideism is the belief that faith is preferable to reason when it comes to discovering facts in certain areas, most notably theology, such as in reformed epistemology. Some theists contend that there is benefit in taking a chance on faith and that there wouldn't be a gamble if the evidence for God's existence were as logical as the rules of science. Such theists often argue that because the heart is drawn to righteousness, truth, and beauty, it would be preferable to make decisions regarding God, as Blaise Pascal famously put it: "The heart has its reasons that reason does not know." According to a hadith, God once said, "I am what my slave thinks of me." In Islam, the term "innate nature" or fitra is used to describe a person's inborn knowledge of God. In the Confucian tradition, Confucius and Mencius advocated that there is only one universal basis for the Way and that the sole reason for moral behavior, or the Way, is what is mandated by Heaven, a more or less anthropomorphic higher power, and is implanted in humanity.

Revelation

Revelation alludes to a message that God sent via some manner. Typically, it is suggested that angels or prophets will be used to accomplish this. Al-Maturidi made the case that revelation was necessary because, even if people are intellectually capable of comprehending God, human desire might distract from this realization and because certain information can only be learned via revelation given to prophets in particular. General revelation is the word used to describe information about God that is given independently of direct or special revelation, such as the Bible. In particular, studying nature often referred to as the Book of Nature is included in this. The Qur'an is described as a universe that talks in an Arabic proverb. The Cosmos is a Quiet Book.

Reason

A belief is only justified if it has a reason behind it, as opposed to being held as a core belief, according to certain theologians, such as Richard Swinburne. Traditionalist theology disapproves of justifications like speculative theology and maintains that one should not extrapolate from revelation in order to grasp God's character. Notably, they leave any uncertainty to God, known as tafwid, without questioning how, in the case of anthropomorphic depictions like the "Hand of God" and qualities of God rather than nullifying such scriptures or accepting an actual hand. While sola scriptura holds that the Bible is the sole source of authority for Christian belief and practice, prima scriptura holds that the biblical canon should serve as the main source of guidance above other sources, such as reason or professional judgment.

Relationship with humanity

Worship

Theistic religious systems often demand the worship of God and even argue that it is the purpose of life to worship God. It is believed that worship is for the benefit of the worshipper rather than for God, in order to solve the problem of an all-powerful entity wanting to be worshiped. Gandhi said that "Prayer is not an asking" and that God does not need his supplication. It is a soul-deep need. One is everyday admitting their vulnerability. Many Christians place a lot of importance on praying to God. Depending on the tradition, God may be seen as a personal being who should only be summoned directly, while other traditions permit prayer to intermediaries, such saints, to act as advocates. Supplication, such as requesting forgiveness, is often included in prayer. It's common to think that God is merciful. For instance, according to a hadith, God would swap out a spotless individual for one who had sinned but still pleaded for forgiveness. Fasting and almsgiving are only two examples of acts of devotion that can include sacrifice for God. God is remembered in everyday life via words of worship like repeating chants while engaging in other tasks or stating interjections praising God while feeling grateful.

Salvation

While transtheistic religious systems accept the presence of gods, they reject their spiritual importance. The phrase has been used to refer to certain schools of Jainism, Buddhism, and Stoicism. Religions that do connect spirituality to a connection with God have different ideas about how to worship God and what God's purpose for humanity is. Different methods may be used to make the conflicting claims of monotheistic faiths coherent. One point of view is held by exclusivists, who feel that they are the only ones having access to perfect truth, often via revelation or a divine experience, and that followers of other faiths do not. There is also the plurality of religions. Although he does not reject the partial truth of other faiths, a pluralist often thinks his religion is the correct one.

The Bahá' Faith, Hinduism, and Sikhism place a lot of emphasis on the idea that, whether they realize it or not, all theists essentially worship the same deity. The Bahá' Faith emphasizes that great prophets and teachers from many major religious traditions, including Krishna, Buddha, Jesus, Zoroaster, Muhammad, and Bahá'u'lláh, are examples of divine manifestations. It also emphasizes the unity of all religions and emphasizes that these various epiphanies are necessary to meet the needs of humanity at various points in history and for various cultures, as well as being a component of a plan of progressive revelation and education of humanity. The idea that one's religion is the culmination of earlier faiths, or supersessionism, is an illustration of a pluralist viewpoint in Christianity. A third strategy is relativistic inclusivism, which holds that everyone has equal rights; an example of this is the belief that everyone will ultimately find redemption. A fourth strategy is syncretism, which combines components from several faiths. Syncretism is shown by the New Age movement. We can get all the principles we need from secularism[12]–[14].

CONCLUSION

For people and communities all throughout the world, faith in God is of utmost importance. This research has looked at a range of viewpoints on the subject, including philosophical, scientific, and religious ones. It is clear that religious ideas are firmly ingrained in human history and culture and that many people turn to them for meaning, morality, and spiritual satisfaction. To illustrate the intrinsic variety of human thinking and experience, this viewpoint also touches on skepticism, atheism, and agnosticism. Religious principles provide

believers foundations and direction, generating a feeling of community and encouraging communal actions. This investigation also acknowledges the possibility of those who reject or doubt the existence of God, opting for other worldviews or continuing to be unsure owing to a lack of proof or personal experiences. For those seeking purpose and moral guidelines outside of religious environments, atheism and agape provide other routes.

REFERENCES

- [1] C. Lemos and I. Puga-Gonzalez, "Belief in God, confidence in the church and secularization in Scandinavia," *Secul. Nonreligion*, 2021, doi: 10.5334/SNR.143.
- [2] Z. E. Magin, A. B. David, L. M. Carney, C. L. Park, I. A. Gutierrez, and L. S. George, "Belief in god and psychological distress: Is it the belief or certainty of the belief?," *Religions*, 2021, doi: 10.3390/rel12090757.
- [3] B. Mercier, S. R. Kramer, and A. F. Shariff, "Belief in God: Why People Believe, and Why They Don't," *Curr. Dir. Psychol. Sci.*, 2018, doi: 10.1177/0963721418754491.
- [4] O. Yilmaz and O. Isler, "Reflection increases belief in god through self-questioning among non-believers," *Judgm. Decis. Mak.*, 2019, doi: 10.1017/s1930297500005374.
- [5] K. Laurin and A. C. Kay, "The Motivational Underpinnings of Belief in God," in *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 2017. doi: 10.1016/bs.aesp.2017.02.004.
- [6] A. Shenhav, D. G. Rand, and J. D. Greene, "Divine intuition: Cognitive style influences belief in God," *J. Exp. Psychol. Gen.*, 2012, doi: 10.1037/a0025391.
- [7] M. B. Kitchens and R. E. Phillips, "A curvilinear relationship between clear beliefs about God and self-concept clarity.," *Psycholog. Relig. Spiritual.*, 2021, doi: 10.1037/rel0000181.
- [8] V. Krause, J. A. Goncalo, and C. T. Tadmor, "Divine inhibition: Does thinking about God make monotheistic believers less creative?," *Organ. Behav. Hum. Decis. Process.*, 2021, doi: 10.1016/j.obhdp.2021.03.001.
- [9] K. Laurin, A. C. Kay, and D. A. Moscovitch, "On the belief in God: Towards an understanding of the emotional substrates of compensatory control," *J. Exp. Soc. Psychol.*, 2008, doi: 10.1016/j.jesp.2008.07.007.
- [10] S. A. Saribay, O. Yilmaz, and G. G. Körpe, "Does intuitive mindset influence belief in god? A registered replication of shenhav, rand and greene (2012)," *Judgm. Decis. Mak.*, 2020.
- [11] C. R. Critcher and C. J. Lee, "Feeling Is Believing: Inspiration Encourages Belief in God," *Psychol. Sci.*, 2018, doi: 10.1177/0956797617743017.
- [12] R. C. Roberts, "Virtues and belief in God," *J. Posit. Psychol.*, 2017, doi: 10.1080/17439760.2016.1228003.
- [13] C. J. M. White, A. K. Willard, A. Baimel, and A. Norenzayan, "Cognitive Pathways to Belief in Karma and Belief in God," *Cogn. Sci.*, 2021, doi: 10.1111/cogs.12935.
- [14] K. Laurin, "Belief in God: A Cultural Adaptation With Important Side Effects," *Curr. Dir. Psychol. Sci.*, 2017, doi: 10.1177/0963721417709811.

CHAPTER 15

A BRIEF DESCRIPTION ON SECULARISM

Dr Vinoth Kumar.V, Assistant Professor,
Department of Decision Sciences, CMS Business School, Jain (Deemed to be University), Bangalore,
Karnataka, India,
Email Id:dr.vinothkumar_v@cms.ac.in

ABSTRACT:

The idea of secularism stresses the separation of the state from religious organizations, guaranteeing that everyone is treated equally and has the right to practice their religion as they see fit. The main ideas of secularism, as well as its importance and social effects, are examined in this chapter. It examines how secularism aids in establishing societal cohesiveness, defending individual rights, and encouraging religious tolerance. The research also emphasizes the difficulties and debates surrounding the application of secular ideas in various cultural situations. This chapter provides insights into the intricacies of secularism and its effects on contemporary communities by examining many viewpoints and instances from throughout the globe.

KEYWORDS:

Human Rights, Religious, Secular, Secularism.

INTRODUCTION

What does the term "secular" mean? Since secularism is frequently characterized as the denial of religion, secular individuals are identified by their lack of religious belief and behavior. Secular individuals, according to this description, do not attend churches or temples, do not practice rituals, and do not believe in any gods or angels. As a result, the secular world seems to be amoral, hollow, and nihilistic an empty vessel just waiting to be filled. Few individuals would want to identify in such a bad way. Self-described secularists have a completely different perspective on secularism. For them, secularism is a very constructive and active way of looking at the world that is characterized by a set of shared principles rather than by rejecting one particular religion in favor of another. Many secular principles are, in fact, shared by a wide range of religious traditions. One of the main features of secular individuals is that they do not claim a monopoly over all knowledge and kindness, in contrast to other cults that do. They do not believe that morality and knowledge descended from heaven at a certain location and time [1]–[3].

Instead, all people are born with morals and knowledge. Because of this, it is only natural that at least certain values would emerge in human communities throughout the globe and be shared by Muslims, Christians, Hindus, and Atheists. Religious authorities sometimes give their adherents an extreme either/or decision: either you are a Muslim or you are not. And if you practice Islam, you must renounce all other beliefs. Secular individuals, in contrast, are at ease with various hybrid identities. As far as secularism is concerned, you may continue to identify as a Muslim, pray to Allah, consume halal food, and perform the haj to Mecca while simultaneously contributing positively to secular society as long as you follow the secular ethical code. This moral code upholds the ideals of honesty, compassion, equality, freedom, bravery, and responsibility. It is really embraced by millions of Muslims, Christians, Hindus, and atheists. It serves as the framework for contemporary democratic and scientific organizations.

The secular code is an ideal to strive towards rather than a social reality, like any ethical standards. Similar to how Christian organizations and cultures often depart from the Christian ideal, secular institutions and societies frequently fall far short of the secular ideal. Although it professed itself to be a Christian country, medieval France engaged in a variety of activities that were not very Christian ask the oppressed peasants. Despite its claim to be a secular state, modern France began to take questionable liberties with the notion of liberty after the time of Robespierre ask women. That does not imply that secular individuals, whether they live in France or elsewhere, lack moral conviction or a sense of ethics. It simply indicates that achieving an ideal is difficult.

Secularism as a goal

Therefore, what is the secular ideal? The most significant secular commitment is to the truth, which is founded not on simple belief but on observation and evidence. Secularists make an effort not to mix up belief with fact. Although having a strong believe in a particular narrative may reveal a lot about your psychology, your upbringing, and your brain's structure, it does not guarantee that the story is factual. Strong convictions are often required exactly when the tale is false. Secularists also avoid elevating any individual, organization, or book to the status of being the exclusive custodian of the truth. Instead, secular people revere the truth wherever it may be found, whether it be in the literature of diverse human traditions, old fossilized bones, pictures of distant galaxies, or statistical figures. Modern science, which has allowed humanity to grasp the history of humanity itself and split the atom, interpret the DNA, and monitor the development of life, is based on this devotion to the truth. Compassion is the secularists' second main commitment. Instead of adhering to the rules of one deity or another, secular ethics rely on a profound understanding of suffering. For instance, agnostics refrain from murder because it causes great misery to sentient creatures, not because it is forbidden in some old text. People who don't murder simply because "God says so" are highly unsettling and dangerous. Such individuals are driven more by obedience than by compassion, and what will they do if they start to think that their deity is ordering them to murder immigrants, witches, adulterers, heretics, or other people?

Of fact, because there are no unambiguous divine commands, secular ethics often encounters challenging conundrums. What transpires when a certain activity harms one individual while benefiting another? Is it moral to tax the wealthy heavily in order to aid the underprivileged? to launch a deadly conflict in order to overthrow a cruel dictator? To let unrestricted numbers of refugees to enter our nation? When non-religious persons face such problems, they do not inquire as to "What does God command?" Instead, they carefully consider the opinions of all parties involved, consider a broad variety of observations and scenarios, and look for a middle ground that will do the least amount of damage. Think about how people feel about sexuality, for example. How do agnostics choose to support or condemn rape, homosexuality, bestiality, and incest? Through investigating emotions. Rape is plainly wrong because it harms people, not because it violates some heavenly law. Contrarily, there is no justification for forbidding a love connection between two guys as it does no damage to anybody.

From a secular standpoint, the solution is clear-cut. Depth in emotional, intellectual, and even spiritual interactions is necessary. You will feel irritated, lonely, and mentally stunted in a marriage that lacks such depth. A relationship with a goat cannot satiate the emotional, intellectual, or spiritual demands of the other party in the same way that two men can. Therefore, if you believe in the institution of marriage as secular people do, you would never consider posing such an absurd question. People who see marriage as some kind of supernatural ceremony are the only ones who could accomplish it.

What about a father's relationship with his daughter? What's wrong with the fact that they are both humans? Numerous psychological studies have shown that these relationships do the kid great damage that is often irreversible. Additionally, kids amplify and mirror the parent's harmful behaviors. Relationships between parents and children just don't work properly because of the way that evolution has sculpted the Sapiens mind. Therefore, to fight against incest, you don't need God or the Bible just study the relevant psychological research. This is the fundamental justification for why agnostics value scientific truth. They want to know how to lessen suffering in the world, not only to quench their curiosity. Our sympathy is often blind without the direction of scientific study. A commitment to equality follows from the dual commitments to truth and compassion. Though views on issues of economic and political equality vary, secularists are inherently wary of any a priori hierarchies. No matter who suffers it, sorrow is suffering, and whomever learns wisdom, knowledge is knowledge. We are prone to become both uninformed and heartless if we give a certain country, class, or gender more credit for experiences or discoveries. Secular people undoubtedly take pride in the distinctiveness of their own nation, country, and culture, but they do not equate distinctiveness with superiority. Therefore, secular people understand their specific obligations to their country and nation, but they do not believe that these obligations are exclusive, and they also recognize their obligations to mankind as a whole.

Without the freedom to contemplate, inquire, and experiment, we are unable to look for the reality and the solution to pain. People who identify as secular value freedom and avoid considering any book, organization, or leader to be the final arbiter of what is true and what is good. Humans should always be allowed to question, double-check, get a second view, and choose an alternative course of action. The masses of common people who stormed the Bastille in 1789 and overthrew Louis XVI's despotic government, as well as Rosa Parks, who had the guts to take a seat on a bus seat designated for white passengers only, are all heroes in the eyes of the secular world. They are also heroes of Galileo Galilei, who dared to question whether the earth really is at the center of the universe.

Fighting against prejudices and oppressive systems requires a lot of bravery, but it also takes a lot of courage to confess ignorance and take risks. Secular education teaches us that we shouldn't be scared to admit when we don't know something and seek for further information. Even when we are confident in our knowledge, we shouldn't be scared to evaluate our assumptions. Many individuals need certain solutions to all their questions because they are terrified of the unknown. More than any ruler, our fear of the unknown may render us powerless. People have expressed concern throughout history that human civilization may disintegrate unless we place all of our confidence in a set of unchanging truths. In reality, contemporary history has shown that cultures with brave individuals prepared to confess ignorance and pose challenging questions are often more affluent and peaceful than societies where everyone must blindly accept a single solution. Violence is more common among those who fear losing their truth than in those who are used to seeing the world from a variety of perspectives. In most cases, it is far preferable for you to ask questions than to accept an answer without further inquiry.

Finally, secular individuals value accountability. They don't think there is a greater force that governs the universe, punishes evil, rewards good, and shields us from poverty, pestilence, and war. As humans made of flesh and blood, we are fully accountable for all we do and say. It is our responsibility to create solutions if the world is filled with suffering. Secular people are proud of the enormous accomplishments of contemporary society, including the eradication of diseases, the provision of food for the needy, and the establishment of peace in many regions of the globe. These accomplishments are not the work of any heavenly

guardian; rather, they are the product of humankind's growth in wisdom and compassion. But for precisely the same reason, we must fully accept responsibility for the wrongs and shortcomings of modernity, from genocidal acts to environmental destruction. We should ask what we can do to assist rather than asking for miracles in our prayers [4]–[6].

These are the primary secular global values. None of these values are wholly secular, as was previously said. Christians value compassion, Muslims value equality, Hindus value responsibility, and so on. Jews also value the truth. Insofar as the secular code and religious doctrine conflict, secular communities and organizations are delighted to recognize these connections and to accept religious Jews, Christians, Muslims, and Hindus. For instance, in order to be accepted into secular society, Orthodox Jews must treat non-Jews equally, Christians must refrain from putting heretics on stakes, Muslims must recognize the right to free speech, and Hindus must give up caste-based prejudice.

On the other hand, there is no expectation that religious people should reject their ancient rites and rituals or deny the existence of God. In the secular world, behavior is used to assess individuals rather than their preferred attire or rituals. A person may behave out of a strong devotion to the fundamental secular ideals while adhering to the most weird sectarian dress code and performing the most peculiar religious rituals. There are many Jewish scientists, Christians who care about the environment, Muslims who are feminists, and Hindus who are human rights campaigners. There is simply no justification for demanding that people remove their yarmulkes, crosses, hijabs, or tilakas if they are devoted to scientific truth, compassion, equality, and freedom. They are complete citizens of the secular world if they uphold these ideals. For the same reasons, secular education does not imply that children are taught not to believe in God and not to participate in any religious rituals. Secular education, on the other hand, teaches children to distinguish between fact and belief, to grow in compassion for all suffering beings, to value the knowledge and experiences of all earthlings, to think critically without being afraid of the unknown, and to accept responsibility for their own actions as well as those of the rest of the world.

DISCUSSION

Secularism is the idea that human matters should be managed independently of religion and in accordance with naturalistic principles. Secularism is most often understood to mean separating religion from public life and the state, but it may also refer to any stance that seeks to eliminate or significantly reduce the influence of religion in public life. In its most basic form, the phrase "secularism" may refer to any position that supports the secular in any particular setting. However, the term has a wide variety of interpretations. It may imply atheism, non-sectarianism, anti-clericalism, neutrality toward religious issues, or the full elimination of religious symbols from government buildings.

Secularism, as a philosophy, aims to explain reality without the aid of religion, using only ideas found in the physical world. The emphasis is shifted away from religion and onto "temporal" issues. There are several secularist traditions in the West, including those of the French, Benelux-German, Turkish, and American models. There are also secularist traditions outside of the West, including as in India, where the focus is more on equality before the law and state neutrality than on total separation. Secularism has many different goals and justifications, ranging from claims that it is an essential component of modernisation or that religion and traditional values are outdated and polarizing to the belief that it is the sole guarantee of unrestricted religious practice [7], [8].

Variations

various varieties of secularism hold various positions on how and where religion should be kept apart from other facets of society. Any religious group may support a secular society, although non-religious people, including atheists, are more likely to identify as secularists than believers. The secularism schools of thought that take into account a secular state regulating religion fall under the heading of political secularism. Members of the dominant religion in a nation often reject political secularism, whereas members of religious minorities and non-religious individuals generally favor it. People who embrace political secularism inside their own nation-state are known as secular nationalists.

Political secularism in society exists in a variety of forms, according to scholars. The purest type, connected with the French *laïque* model, promotes a state that, in all of its manifestations and official interactions, without exception, is both firmly and formally far from all faiths and non-religious intellectual ideas. A more "humanistic" form is unconcerned with religions in general but supports states operating on a purely rational foundation of evidence-based policy and a focus on human needs and welfare, entails non-discrimination between people of various religious and non-religious philosophical convictions in society. A third "liberal" or "pillarized" form of secularism maintains that, as long as states treat these convictions equally and are neither hostile nor preferential towards any particular set of religious and those of non-religious philosophical conviction, they may occasionally express sympathy with, provide funding to, license state services to, or otherwise allow unique special treatment of religions (common in German-speaking and Benelux secular states). The financial guidelines used to offer public money to religious organizations also apply to secular humanism organizations in these nations. The derogatory term "pseudo-secularism" is often used in Indian political discourse to emphasize occasions when it is thought that, despite the state's claims to be secular, indifferent to, or impartial toward faiths, its policies really favor one religion over others.

All facets of political secularism share a number of guiding concepts. It often opposes a legal hierarchy based on religious belief or lack thereof and advocates for legal equality amongst members of various faiths. It is also linked to the idea that the government and the church are two independent institutions that need to be handled differently. Internal restriction is a secular theory that opposes governmental control over an individual's personal life, while state supremacy is a secular philosophy that favors adherence to the law above religious diktat or canon law. Political secularism holds that the government may regulate behavior but not beliefs. Similar to this, secularism supports freedom of opinion. Secularists favor order, especially in the sense that one's views shouldn't be allowed to cause civic unrest. Both the lack of piety shown by adherents of one's own faith and tolerance for those of other religions are justified. Political secularism also affirms the value of reason. In addition to supporting freedom of religion, secularists also promote freedom from religion.

State secularism

Secularism is a political philosophy that advocates for the division of church and state, sometimes known as the separation of church and state. This might include severing links between a government and a state religion, substituting civil law for religious law such as Halakha, Dharmashastra, Sharia, and ending discrimination against people of a particular faith. It is claimed that by defending the rights of religious minorities, this would strengthen democracy. The separation of religion and state is one tactic that secular governments may use. Such administrations, whether democratic or dictatorial, all share the desire to keep the religious component of the relationship to a minimum. There may be several distinct policy recommendations for each state. Separation, strict oversight, and control of organized religion, as seen in France, Turkey, and other countries, may be some of these.

Secularists often favor that politicians make choices based on secular, as opposed to religious, considerations, in line with their belief in the separation of religion and state. In this regard, American secularist organizations like the Center for Inquiry and others place a strong emphasis on policy choices on issues like abortion, contraception, embryonic stem cell research, same-sex marriage, and sex education. Religious extremists sometimes reject a secular form of governance, contending that it goes against the nature of traditionally religious societies or restricts their freedom of speech. These attempts led to the term "secularism" being synonymous with "anti-religion" in the United States, for instance. But religious minority often favor secularism to protect their rights from the majority.

State secularism is often linked to the European Age of Enlightenment and has a significant impact on Western culture. The United governments, France, Turkey, India, Mexico, and South Korea are among of the most well-known examples of "constitutionally secular" governments, despite the fact that none of these countries have a similar system of religiously neutral government. For instance, whereas secularism forbids such engagement in France, it does not entirely separate state and religion in India.

Was Stalin secular?

Therefore, it is unjustified to accuse secularism of lacking moral convictions or social obligations. Actually, the major issue with secularism is the exact opposite. The ethical standard is perhaps set too high. The majority of individuals simply cannot live up to such a high standard, and vast communities cannot function on the basis of an unending search for compassion and truth. Societies must respond quickly and firmly in emergency situations, such as war or economic catastrophe, even if they are unsure of the facts or what is the most humanitarian course of action. They need unambiguous rules, memorable catchphrases, and motivating rallying cries. Secular movements sometimes transform into dogmatic creeds because it is difficult to lead troops into combat or enact dramatic economic transformations in the name of dubious hypotheses.

Karl Marx, for instance, said from the outset that all religions were repressive forgeries and urged his followers to look into the nature of the world order for themselves. Marxism became more rigid as a result of the pressures of revolution and war in the ensuing decades. By the time of Stalin, the Soviet Communist Party's official line was that the world order was too complex for the average person to comprehend, so it was best to always trust the party's judgment and follow its instructions, even when it planned the imprisonment and extermination of tens of millions of innocent people. Although it may be unattractive, revolution isn't a picnic, and you have to break a few eggs to make an omelette, as party ideologues never grew weary of emphasizing.

Therefore, it depends on how we define secularism whether we should consider Stalin to be a secular leader. Stalin was unquestionably secular if we apply the purest sense of the term that "secular people don't believe in God" to him. Marx was a secular icon, but Stalin was everything but if we apply the positive meaning of "secular": "secular people reject all unscientific dogmas and are committed to truth, compassion, and freedom." He served as the prophet of Stalinism, an atheistic yet fiercely fanatical religion. Stalinism is hardly the only instance of this. On the opposite end of the political spectrum, capitalism also started out as a very open-minded scientific hypothesis but eventually became a dogma. In spite of the reality on the ground, many capitalists continue to chant the mantra of free markets and economic progress.

Despite the sometimes terrible effects of modernization, industrialization, or privatization, capitalism believers dismiss them as minor "growing pains" and assure that all will be fixed

with a little bit more progress. The secular quest of compassion and truth has had more support among moderate liberal Democrats, yet even they sometimes forgo it in favor of consoling dogmas. Liberals often have unwavering trust in the magnificent ritual of general elections as a result of being faced with the mess of terrible dictatorships and failing governments. They believe that having general elections would suddenly transform these areas into brighter copies of Denmark, so they wage war and spend billions in places like Iraq, Afghanistan, and the Congo. This is true notwithstanding many failures and the fact that even in areas with a long history of general elections, these rites sometimes usher in authoritarian populist governments that are little more than simple majority dictatorships.

You won't be condemned to the gulag if you dispute the purported wisdom of general elections, but you could receive a very cold shower of dogmatic abuse instead. Of course, not all dogmas are destructive in the same way. Some secular dogmas have helped mankind in the same ways that some religious ideas have. The human rights doctrine is a good example of this. Rights only exist in the tales people make up and share with one another. During the fight against religious intolerance and authoritarian regimes, these tales were codified as a self-evident ideology. Although it is untrue that people have an inherent right to life and liberty, the idea that they do has helped millions of people avoid the harshest effects of poverty and violence, shielded minorities from damage, and restrained the power of authoritarian governments. Thus, more than any other philosophy in history, it contributed to human pleasure and wellbeing.

But it remains a dogma. Therefore, everyone has the right to freedom of thought and expression, according to article 19 of the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights. This is absolutely reasonable if we recognize that the demand that "everyone should have the right to freedom of opinion" is political. However, if we think that censorship is against some natural law since everyone is born with the "right to freedom of expression," we fail to see how human beings really are. You won't know who you really are and you won't comprehend the historical causes that molded your society and your own mentality including your belief in "natural rights" as long as you identify yourself as "an individual possessing inalienable natural rights."

Perhaps people didn't pay much attention to such misinformation throughout the 20th century because they were too busy opposing Hitler and Stalin. But in the twenty-first century, it may be deadly as biotechnology and artificial intelligence now aim to redefine what it means to be human. Do we have to employ biotechnology to defeat death if we are devoted to the right to life? Should we give algorithms the ability to decode and gratify our secret wants if we are devoted to the right to liberty? Do superhuman have super-rights if all people have the same human rights? As long as they are devoted to a dogmatic belief in "human rights," secular individuals will find it difficult to deal with such problems.

Prior centuries created the theology of human rights as a defense against the Inquisition, the ancient régime, the Nazis, and the KKK. Superhuman, cyborgs, and artificially intelligent computers are all threats that it is ill-prepared to handle. Human rights movements have amassed an incredible arsenal of justifications and defenses against racial prejudice and human dictators, but this armory does nothing to save us against rampant consumerism and technological utopias.

Recognizing the Shadow

It is incorrect to connect secularism with Stalinist dogmatism or with the unpalatable effects of Western imperialism and unchecked industrialization. But it also cannot abdicate all accountability for them. With promises to elevate mankind and use Earth's resources for the

sake of our species, secular movements and scientific organizations have enraptured billions of people. Such assurances led to the eradication of gulags and the melting of ice caps, as well as the defeat of plagues and famines. You may make the case that this is all the result of individuals misinterpreting and misrepresenting the fundamental secular principles and the actual results of science. And you are entirely correct. But all significant movements face the same issue. For instance, Christianity has been held accountable for terrible atrocities like the Inquisition, the Crusades, the enslavement of indigenous civilizations worldwide, and the subjugation of women. This would offend a Christian, who might respond that all of these acts were the consequence of a fundamental misinterpretation of Christianity.

Jesus solely advocated for love, and the Inquisition's foundation was a horrifying misinterpretation of his message. Although we might sympathize with this argument, it would be unwise to exonerate Christianity so readily. Christians who are horrified by the Inquisition and the Crusades must ask themselves some very difficult questions rather than just wringing their hands over these horrors. How precisely did their so-called "religion of love" let this to happen again, not just once? It is suggested that Protestants who attempt to attribute everything on Catholic fanaticism read a book about the actions of Protestant colonists in Ireland or North America. Similar to how scientists should consider how the scientific endeavor lends itself so easily to destabilizing the global ecosystem, Marxists should ask themselves what it was about the teachings of Marx that paved the way to the Gulag, and geneticists in particular should take caution from the way the Nazis hijacked Darwinian theories.

No matter what creed you adhere to, you should recognize your darkness and reject the naive certainty that "it cannot happen to us." Every religion, philosophy, and creed has a dark side. The fact that secular science is not afraid of own shadow and is, in theory, prepared to confess its errors and blind spots, gives it at least one significant advantage over most traditional faiths. If you think there is a universal truth that has been revealed by a transcendent force, you cannot allow yourself to make any mistakes since doing so would make your whole worldview invalid. But if you think that imperfect people are searching for the truth, then you must accept that making mistakes is part of the process.

Additionally, this explains why non-dogmatic secular groups often make small promises. They aim to make little, gradual improvements, such as increasing the minimum wage by a few dollars or decreasing infant mortality by a few percentage points, while being aware of their flaws. Because of their overwhelming self-confidence, dogmatic ideologies often make unachievable promises. Their leaders talk too casually about "eternity," "purity," and "redemption," as if passing some legislation, erecting a structure, or claiming some area will somehow result in the world's salvation. When it comes time for us to make the most significant choices in human history, I personally would have more faith in people who freely confess their ignorance than in those who assert their infallibility. My first question to you is, "What was the biggest error your religion, ideology, or world view committed?" If you want your religion, ideology, or world view to lead the world. What went wrong, exactly? I for one would not put my faith in you if you were unable to think of anything significant.

Frameworks

The separation of religion and state is upheld by separatist secularism. In this system, the state does not financially or otherwise promote any one religion or set of religious rules. The difficulties confronting separationist secularism include how to rule apart from religion when people, including government officials, are religious and how to control the secular activities of religious organizations. Based on the theories of John Locke and Thomas Jefferson, the

federal courts of the United States construed the US Constitution as endorsing this system throughout the 20th century.

The secularist framework known as *laïcité* was created and is used in France. In this system, the state controls all matters of faith on a legal level and upholds the ban on practicing religion in public. A 1905 statute created it, and successive regulations have prohibited youngsters from using religious imagery in public. *Laiklik*, a modification of *laïcité* that Mustafa Kemal Atatürk enshrined in Turkey in the 1920s and 1930s, is known as kemalist secularism. A method of aggressively promoting religion in general without favoring any one particular religious denomination is known as accommodationism. This system allows for little limitations on religion and often supports religious organizations financially. India employs this system, combining Indian heritage with Western secularism and ethnic and religious diversity. The right of Muslims to live under the civil law and Sharia concurrently, as well as the complexities that follow, are two sources of contention about accommodationism in India. The United States has a long history of accommodationism, and in the twenty-first century, it has become more prevalent. A complete outlawing of religion is state atheism. In this system, the state upholds laws that prohibit religious speech in public or the practice of religion. State atheism, in contrast to other secularist ideologies, forbids both freedom of thought and the separation of religion and state. This difference allows state atheism to be either regarded or not to be a kind of secularism. It is often linked to Marxism and Communist countries, where it is referred to as "scientific atheism".

Secular Culture

Modern democracies are often seen as secular in religious studies. Due to the almost total freedom of religion (religious views are often not subject to legal or social punishments) and the absence of religious leaders' influence over political choices, this is the case. However, it has been said that Pew Research Center polls reveal that Americans are typically more at ease with religion having a significant part in public life, while in Europe the influence of the church on public life is diminishing. Instead than being influenced by a determined secular movement, most cultures grow more secular as a consequence of social and economic advancement. Since Max Weber, the issue of power in secularized society as well as secularization as a sociological or historical process has often been the focus of modern sociology. The West's current ethical discourse is sometimes referred to be "secular" since it is disassociated from religious issues. Carl L. Becker, Karl Löwith, Hans Blumenberg, M. H. Abrams, Peter L. Berger, Paul Bénichou, and D. L. Munby are a few of the 20th-century academics whose work has aided in comprehending these issues.

Since diverse individuals identify as secularists for various reasons and according to various belief systems, there is no one specific secular culture. Secularism is often linked to social liberalism and progressivism. White urban men of middle and upper class with advanced degrees are more likely than any other demographic group to identify as secularists in democracies. The demographics of secularists are more evenly distributed in cultures where secularism is more prevalent, like as Western Europe. When supposedly spiritual views become a part of public or private life without being recognized as religious, a society's definition of what is secular may likewise alter. Secularism is sometimes stigmatized since it is a minority in most cultures. On the basis of morality, proponents of religious society argue that secular society is flawed because it lacks effective incentives for members to act morally.

Secular philosophy

Political philosophy and religious philosophy both take secularism into account. Secularism as a philosophy is strongly related to naturalism and materialism since it disregards the

existence of immaterial or supernatural entities like a soul in favor of a material cosmos. The vast majority of contemporary empirical research is founded on this secular materialism and rationalism. Liberal European intellectuals including Baruch Spinoza, John Locke, Montesquieu, Voltaire, David Hume, Adam Smith, and Jean-Jacques Rousseau all advocated for different types of separation of religion and state throughout the Age of Enlightenment. Well-known moral philosophers like Derek Parfit and Peter Singer have characterized their work as openly secular or non-religious, as has the whole field of current bioethics.

The nature of morality in a material world is a key topic in secular philosophy. Systems of good and evil that are independent of religion or supernatural ideas are referred to as secular ethics and secular morality. Friedrich Nietzsche's philosophy was largely created in reaction to this problem. Instead of being an abstract or idealized notion, "good" is often defined in terms of how it advances "human flourishing and justice" in secular ethics. Humanism is often seen through the lens of secular ethics [9], [10].

CONCLUSION

A fundamental tenet of creating inclusive and diverse society is secularism. Secularism promotes religious tolerance and freedom by arguing for the separation of religious organizations and the state. It encourages a society where people of all religious backgrounds may live in harmony and on an equal footing with one another. Although putting secularism into practice may be difficult, especially in environments with a variety of cultures, it continues to be a crucial foundation for maintaining justice and avoiding religious prejudice. The effective application of secular principles in several nations serves as an example of the advantages of this strategy, including improved social cohesiveness and respect for variety. To solve issues and preserve a fair secular framework that respects both religious and non-religious viewpoints, continual communication and involvement with various religious groups are important. Overall, secular societies that preserve basic human rights and promote peaceful coexistence amongst people of different religions or views are based on secularism.

REFERENCES

- [1] A. Wohab, "'Secularism' or 'no-secularism'? A complex case of Bangladesh," *Cogent Soc. Sci.*, 2021, doi: 10.1080/23311886.2021.1928979.
- [2] L. A. Jensen, "The Cultural Psychology of Religiosity, Spirituality, and Secularism in Adolescence," *Adolescent Research Review*. 2021. doi: 10.1007/s40894-020-00143-0.
- [3] L. Schnabel, "Secularism and Fertility Worldwide," *Socius*, 2021, doi: 10.1177/23780231211031320.
- [4] C. Blencowe, "Disenchanted secularism (or the cultivation of soul) as pedagogy in resistance to populist racism and colonial structures in the academy," *Br. Educ. Res. J.*, 2021, doi: 10.1002/berj.3665.
- [5] H. Arik, "Emotional and corporeal formations of secularism: a case study of military bases in Turkey, 1980s-2000s," *Soc. Cult. Geogr.*, 2021, doi: 10.1080/14649365.2018.1559344.
- [6] D. B. Abramov, "The crisis of secularism in India," *World Econ. Int. Relations*, 2021, doi: 10.20542/0131-2227-2021-65-4-132-138.
- [7] T. Modood, "Rethinking political secularism: the multiculturalist challenge," *Patterns Prejudice*, 2021, doi: 10.1080/0031322X.2020.1866873.

- [8] M. J. Fatima, “Essays on Secularism and Multiculturalism,” *Turkish J. Diaspora Stud.*, 2021, doi: 10.52241/tjds.2021.0031.
- [9] M. Y. Ibrahim, “Secularism: The Propagated Factors And Steps To Overcome From The Islamic Perspective,” *Int. J. Humanit. Philos. Lang.*, 2019, doi: 10.35631/ijhpl.280015.
- [10] T. Hjelm, “The Oxford handbook of secularism,” *Relig. State Soc.*, 2020, doi: 10.1080/09637494.2020.1841981.

CHAPTER 16

A BRIEF INTRODUCTION ABOUT TRUTH

Mr Srinivas Ranjan, Assistant Professor

School of Hotel Management & Catering Technology, Jaipur National University, Jaipur, India

Email Id: srinivas.ranjan@jnujaipur.ac.in

ABSTRACT:

Truth is a notion that permeates both human communication and thought. It speaks to the degree of agreement or congruence between assertions, notions, or ideas and the unchanging facts of the world. Philosophers, scientists, and academics have investigated the essence of truth throughout history in an effort to understand its intricacies and ramifications. This chapter explores the complex nature of truth, exploring its sociological, cognitive, and philosophical facets. The conflict between subjective and objective facts, the significance of perception and interpretation, and the difficulties created by prejudices and cultural influences are all topics covered in this study. Additionally, it emphasizes the importance of truth in a number of areas, including as science, ethics, and personal development. The chapter emphasizes the continual search for truth as a crucial and always changing feature of human cognition that directs our quest for knowledge, fairness, and a meaningful life.

KEYWORDS:

Coherence Theories, Knowledge, Truth, Theories.

INTRODUCTION

Truth has the quality of being true to reality or truth. In ordinary language, the concept of truth is often used to concepts like beliefs, propositions, and declarative statements that seek to describe reality or else conform to it. The traditional view is that untruth is the reverse of truth. Philosophy, art, religion, and science are just a few of the fields where the idea of truth is explored and contested. The majority of human activities, including most of the sciences, law, media, and daily life, rely on the notion, where its status as a concept is taken for granted rather than being a topic of debate. Some philosophers believe that the idea of truth is fundamental and cannot be described in terms that are more understandable than the idea of truth itself. Truth is most often understood as the congruence between language or cognition and an objective reality. The correspondence hypothesis of truth refers to this [1], [2].

Scholars, philosophers, and theologians continue to disagree on a variety of truth theories and perspectives. There are still numerous issues surrounding the nature of truth that are up for discussion in the modern day, such as how to define truth. If it is even feasible to define truth in a way that is instructive. Identifying things have the ability to be true or untrue since they are truth-bearers. If there are alternative truth values or if truth and untruth are bivalent. Defining the standards by which truth may be recognized and distinguished from untruth. The contribution that truth makes to the formation of knowledge. And if truth may vary depending on one's viewpoint or whether it is always objective.

The chapters that came before it examined some of the most significant issues and advancements of the day, from the undervalued danger of technology disruption to the overhyped menace of terrorism. You are entirely correct if you get the persistent impression that this is too much information for you to take in at one time.

Liberal philosophy has placed a great deal of faith in people's ability to reason during the previous several centuries. It converted individuals into autonomous, logical agents and turned them into the foundation of contemporary civilization. Liberal education encourages pupils to form their own opinions, whereas free-market capitalism and democracy are based on the notion that the voter has the greatest knowledge. However, putting too much faith in the logical person is a mistake. This "rational individual" may very well be a chauvinistic Western myth that exalts the autonomy and authority of upper-class white males, feminist and postcolonial scholars have noted. As previously mentioned, behavioral economists and evolutionary psychologists have shown that the majority of human decisions are made based on emotional reactions and heuristic shortcuts rather than on rational analysis. While our emotions and heuristics may have been useful for coping with life in the Stone Age, they are woefully insufficient in the Silicon Age [3], [4].

Individuality and reason are both myths. Rarely do people think for themselves. We instead think in groups. A tribe is required to create a tool, settle a dispute, or find a treatment for a sickness, just as it takes a tribe to raise a kid. No one person has all the knowledge necessary to construct a cathedral, an atom bomb, or an airplane. Not our individual reason, but our unrivaled capacity for communal thought gave *Homo sapiens* an advantage over all other species and made us the lords of the earth. Individual people are painfully ignorant about the world, and as time went on, they became much more so. A hunter-gatherer in the Stone Age was capable of making her own clothing, lighting a fire, going after bunnies, and avoiding lions. Today, we perceive ourselves to know far more than we really do. Nearly all of our wants are met by the knowledge of others. In one humiliating experiment, participants were asked to rate their comprehension of how a typical zip works. Since they often use zips, the majority of participants responded with confidence that they fully understood them.

Then, they were to list every step that went into operating the zip in as much detail as they could. Most were clueless. 'The knowing illusion' is what Steven Sloman and Philip Fernbach refer to as. We regard other people's information as if it were our own, so even when we ourselves know very little, we act as though we are tremendously knowledgeable. This is not always a terrible thing. We are in control of the world thanks to our dependence on groupthink, and the knowledge illusion frees us from being trapped in the futile pursuit of self-knowledge. From an evolutionary standpoint, *Homo sapiens* have done quite well by relying on the wisdom of others.

The knowing illusion does have a drawback, much like many other human characteristics that made sense in earlier times but are problematic today. People are oblivious to how uninformed they are of what is happening as the world becomes more complicated. Because of this, some people who know very little about biology or meteorology suggest ideas on climate change and genetically modified crops, while others have very strong opinions about what should be done in Iraq or Ukraine without knowing where these countries are on a map. Because they surround themselves with like-minded acquaintances and self-confirming newsfeeds, where their opinions are continuously reinforced and hardly questioned, people rarely recognize their stupidity.

It seems improbable that things would go better by giving individuals access to better and more knowledge. By improving scientific education, scientists want to remove false beliefs; by providing the public with factual information and expert reporting on topics like Obamacare or global warming, pundits try to influence public opinion. Such expectations are based on an incorrect understanding of how people really think. Most of our opinions are

influenced by collective groupthink rather than individual reason, and we adhere to these opinions out of devotion to the group. It's probably counterproductive to bombard individuals with information and point out their specific stupidity. Most individuals dislike feeling ignorant and excessive amounts of information. Don't assume that handing out statistical facts would persuade Tea Party followers of the reality of global warming.

Even though groupthink's opinions seem to be relatively random, its influence is so strong that it is challenging to escape from its grip. Because right-wing conservatives and left-wing progressives in the USA generally care significantly less about issues like pollution and endangered species than one another, Louisiana has far laxer environmental rules than Massachusetts. We take this condition for granted since we are used to it, yet it is really pretty unexpected. Conservatives should care far more about preserving the previous natural order and safeguarding their ancestral lands, woods, and rivers, one would think. Progressives, on the other hand, are likely to be far more amenable to drastic changes to the countryside, particularly if they are intended to hasten development and raise the quality of life for people. However, after the party line on these matters has been established by different historical oddities, conservatives have developed the habit of dismissing worries about polluted rivers and vanishing birds, while left-wing progressives have a propensity to worry about any change to the established ecological order.

DISCUSSION

Major theories

The five most common substantive theories of truth are mentioned below. They address the issue of what constitutes a valid foundation for determining how words, symbols, ideas, and beliefs may properly be regarded true, whether by a single individual or an entire community. Each of them offers viewpoints that are commonly held among academics who have been published. In addition to the most popular substantive theories, additional hypotheses are also included. According to a survey on professional philosophers' and others' philosophical views that was conducted in November 2009 (responses from 3226 participants, including 1803 philosophy faculty members and/or PhDs and 829 philosophy graduate students), 45% of participants accept or lean toward correspondence theories, 21% accept or lean toward deflationary theories, and 14% accept or lean toward epistemic theories [5]–[7].

1. Correspondence

The essential tenet of correspondence theories is that genuine statements and true beliefs reflect reality. This kind of theory emphasizes the connection between ideas or assertions on the one hand and things or objects on the other. It is a conventional paradigm that may be traced back to Socrates, Plato, and other classical Greek thinkers. According to this group of ideas, a representation's truth or falsehood is ultimately established by how it connects to other "things" and whether it properly depicts those "things." Thomas Aquinas, a philosopher and theologian, credited the phrase "Veritas est adaequatio rei et intellectus" "Truth is the adequation of things and intellect" to Isaac Israeli, a Neoplatonist from the ninth century, and it is a prime example of correspondence theory. The idea was rephrased by Aquinas as follows: "A judgment is said to be true when it conforms to the external reality."

According to correspondence theory, discovering the truth entails precisely reproducing what is sometimes referred to as "objective reality" and then properly reflecting it via ideas, words, and other symbols.[18] This ideal cannot be realized, according to many contemporary

thinkers, without considering other considerations. Language, for instance, has an impact since words exist in every language to describe ideas that are essentially undefinable in other languages. A good example of this is the German word *Zeitgeist*; although someone who speaks or understands the language may "know" what it means, no translation of the word seems to fully convey its full meaning (this is a problem with many abstract words, especially those derived from agglutinative languages). As a result, certain words add a further variable to the formulation of a precise truth predicate. Alfred Tarski, whose semantic theory is outlined later on, is one of the philosophers who wrestled with this issue. Some of the ideas below have even gone so far as to claim that the study must also take into account other concerns including power struggles within communities, community relationships, personal biases, and other aspects that influence what is seen as true.

2. Coherence

Truth implies that all the components of a system fit together properly for coherence theories in general. The requirement that the statements in a coherent system provide reciprocal inferential support to one another is quite common, nevertheless, and is typically understood to suggest something more than just logical consistency. As an example, the validity and utility of a coherent system are critically dependent on the completeness and comprehensiveness of the underlying set of ideas. The concept that truth is fundamentally a quality of complete systems of propositions and can only be given to individual propositions according to their coherence with the whole is a central premise of coherence theories. Theorists disagree on the issue of whether coherence implies several potential real systems of thinking or only one absolute system among the variety of viewpoints often characterized as coherence theory.

According to certain coherence theory variations, the fundamental and inherent characteristics of formal systems in logic and mathematics may be described. Formal reasoners, on the other hand, are happy to consider axiomatically distinct and sometimes incompatible systems side by side, such as the numerous alternative geometries. Coherence theories have generally been disregarded due to their lack of support when applied to other domains of truth, particularly when making claims about the natural world, general empirical data, and claims about the practical applications of psychology and society, especially when used independently of other major theories of truth.

The rationalist thinkers Baruch Spinoza, Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz, and Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel, as well as the British philosopher F. H. Bradley, are distinguished by coherence theories. They have also gained popularity among a number of logical positivists, including Otto Neurath and Carl Hempel.

3. Pragmatic

The three most important versions of the pragmatic theory of truth were first presented by Charles Sanders Peirce, William James, and John Dewey around the turn of the 20th century. These and other pragmatic theory proponents share the belief that truth is proven and validated by the outcomes of putting one's thoughts into practice, while having very divergent points of view. The definition of truth according to Peirce is as follows: "Truth is that concordance of an abstract statement with the ideal limit towards which endless investigation would tend to bring scientific belief, which concordance the abstract statement may possess by virtue of the confession of its inaccuracy and one-sidedness, and this confession is an essential ingredient of truth." According to Peirce, concepts of approximation, incompleteness, and partiality which he refers to elsewhere as fallibilism and "reference to the future" are fundamental to a correct notion of reality. This claim is emphasized by the

quotation. Peirce describes one aspect of the pragmatic sign relation using words like concordance and correspondence, but he is also very clear in stating that definitions of truth based solely on correspondence are nothing more than nominal definitions, which he accords a lower status than real definitions. Although it is a complicated concept, William James's interpretation of pragmatic theory is sometimes summed up by his remark that "the 'true' is only the expedient in our way of thinking, just as the 'right' is only the expedient in our way of behaving." James meant by saying that truth is a property whose worth is shown by its usefulness when ideas are put into practice.

John Dewey believed that inquiry, whether scientific, technical, sociological, philosophical, or cultural, is self-corrective over time if openly submitted for testing by a community of inquirers in order to clarify, justify, refine, and/or refute proposed truths. He held this belief less broadly than James but more broadly than Peirce. Despite being little known, a new variant of the pragmatic theory was developed and used with success starting in the 20th century. This kind is referred to as "negative pragmatism" and was defined and named by William Ernest Hocking. In essence, what succeeds could or might not be real, but what fails cannot be true since the truth always succeeds. "We never are definitely right, we can only be sure we are wrong," said Richard Feynman. This strategy integrates a lot of Peirce, James, and Dewey's theories. According to Peirce, "... endless investigation would tend to bring about scientific belief..." matches negative pragmatism since a negative pragmatist would never cease testing. An hypothesis or theory, according to Feynman, "...could never be proved right, because tomorrow's experiment might succeed in proving wrong what you thought was right." Similar to this, the theories of James and Dewey also attribute validity to frequent testing that becomes "self-corrective" over time [8]–[10].

The coherence theory of truth and pragmatism are closely related in that any testing should take into account information from all human pursuits and experiences rather than being separated from them. Testing should recognize and take into consideration the variety of the universe since it is a whole and interconnected system. According to Feynman, "... if it disagrees with experiment, it is wrong."

4. Constructivist

According to social constructivism, truth is created via social processes, is historically and culturally distinctive, and is somewhat determined by conflicts for power in a society. Constructivism holds that all of our knowledge is "constructed," since it does not correlate to any "transcendent" realities that exist outside of us (as a pure correspondence theory may suggest). Instead, it is believed that views of reality are dependent on tradition, individual perception, and social experience. Constructivists believe that social construction is responsible for how race, sexual orientation, and gender are represented in society.

One of the first to assert that history and culture were created by humans was Giambattista Vico. The axiom "truth itself is constructed" (*verum ipsum factum*) is the focal point of Vico's epistemological viewpoint, which draws together the widest spectrum of perspectives. Other early proponents of the idea that truth is or can be socially produced were Hegel and Marx. Marx, like many critical theorists who came after him, did not deny the existence of objective truth, but he did draw a distinction between information that is genuine and knowledge that has been tainted by ideology or the exercise of power. According to Marx, epiphenomenal knowledge is "an expression of the relation of material forces in a given economic arrangement" and scientific and accurate knowledge is "in accordance with the dialectical understanding of history."

5. Consensus

According to the consensus thesis, reality is whatever a particular group of people agrees upon, or in some versions, may come to agree upon. Any human beings, or a subset of humans made up of more than one person, might be included in such a group. The philosopher Jürgen Habermas is one of the contemporary proponents of consensus theory as a meaningful accounting of the notion of "truth." According to Habermas, in a perfect speaking scenario, everyone would agree on the definition of truth. The philosopher Nicholas Rescher is one of the consensus theory's most vocal opponents at the moment.

Formal theories

1. Logical truth

The focus of logic is on the patterns in reasoning that may be used to determine whether a statement is true or not. There is only truth under some interpretation or truth inside some logical system since logicians communicate the facts they are interested in using formal languages. A fact, also known as a synthetic claim or a contingency, is only true in this world as it has historically developed, in contrast to a logical truth, also known as an analytical truth or a necessary truth, which is a statement that is true in all conceivable worlds or under all possible interpretations. The meaning of the symbols and words in a statement like "If p and q, then p" is what makes it a logical truth rather than any fact about a specific universe. Since things are as they are, they cannot be false. Bivalent logic (also known as binary logic), three-valued logic, and other types of finite-valued logic allow for the representation of degrees of truth in logic using two or more discrete values. As with fuzzy logic and other types of infinite-valued logic, truth in logic may be expressed as a continuous range of integers, often between 0 and 1. Many-valued logic is the term used to describe the idea of describing truth using more than two values.

2. Mathematics

In mathematics, there are primarily two ways to find the truth. They are the truth model theory and the truth proof theory. Truth, often known as "T" or "1," has historically been treated as an arbitrary constant in mathematical models of logic since the creation of Boolean algebra in the nineteenth century. Another arbitrary constant that may be written as "F" or "0" is "falsity". These symbols may be used in propositional logic in accordance with a set of axioms and rules of inference, which are often presented in the form of truth tables.

Furthermore, true statements in mathematics were typically taken to be those that are defensible in a formal axiomatic system from at least the time of Hilbert's program at the turn of the 20th century until the proof of Gödel's incompleteness theorems and the development of the Church-Turing thesis in the early part of that century. This belief was challenged by the creation of claims that are true but cannot be supported by the system in the works of Kurt Gödel, Alan Turing, and others. The puzzles in Hilbert's book include two instances of the latter. The development of certain Diophantine equations for which it is unclear whether they have a solution or, even if they do, whether there are a finite or infinite number of solutions resulted from work on Hilbert's 10th problem in the latter half of the 20th century. Hilbert's first issue, which was more basic, was with the continuum hypothesis. The axioms of set theory's fundamental principles cannot be used to support or refute this claim, as shown by Gödel and Paul Cohen. The continuum hypothesis or its denial might therefore be taken as a new axiom, according to some.

Intuition, according to Gödel, is what determines whether a mathematical or logical proposition is true. He acknowledged that this intuition may ultimately lie outside the purview of formal theories of logic or mathematics and is perhaps best viewed in the context of human comprehension and communication, but he added: The more I consider language, the more amazed I am that anybody can ever comprehend anyone else. Even scientists may fall victim to groupthink's influence. Consequently, scientists who assume that facts may sway public opinion risk becoming the targets of scientific groupthink themselves. In spite of overwhelming factual evidence to the contrary, many who adhere to the scientific establishment still feel that they can win public discussions by presenting the appropriate facts.

3. Tarski's semantics

The following is the general case for a given language in the semantic theory of truth:

P is only true if and when P, where P is just the sentence itself, and 'P' stands for the sentence (also known as the sentence's name). For formal languages like formal logic, Alfred Tarski created the Tarski's theory of truth. Here, he limited it in the following way: No language could have its own truth predicate, meaning that the adverb is true could only be used in conjunction with sentences in other languages. The latter, the language being discussed, he referred to as an object language. It could furthermore possess a truth predicate that can be used with sentences in yet another language. His limitation was justified by the fact that paradoxical phrases like "This sentence is not true" would appear in languages with their own truth predicate. Tarski argued that since natural languages like English have their own truth predicates, the semantic theory cannot be applied to them. It served as the cornerstone of Donald Davidson's truth-conditional semantics, which he connected to radical interpretation in a coherentist manner.

Such paradoxes are reported to have been discovered even in the most advanced mathematical symbols of his day by Bertrand Russell, including the paradox that bears his name, Russell's paradox. In *Principia Mathematica*, Russell and Whitehead made an effort to address these issues by categorizing statements into a hierarchy of kinds, where a statement may only refer to other assertions that are lower on the hierarchy and not itself. This in turn caused additional levels of complexity that are still being worked out today with reference to the exact natures of types and the architecture of logically feasible type systems.

4. Kripke's semantics

According to Saul Kripke's theory of truth, a natural language may really include its own truth predicate without leading to contradiction. He demonstrated how to build one like follows:

starting with a subset of natural language phrases in which the words "is true" or "is false" are never used. Therefore, The Barn Is Big is Included in the Subset, but neither "The Barn Is Big Is True" nor problematic statements like "This sentence is False" limiting the definition of truth to the statements in that subset. Including sentences that determine whether a statement in the initial group of sentences is true or false as part of the definition of truth. This means that just "The barn is big is true" is now present, not "This sentence is false" or "'The barn is big is true' is true." Establishing the meaning of truth for all statements that state the truth or falsehood of a component of the second set. Imagine that this process goes on forever, defining truth for statements like "The barn is big" and "The barn is true" before moving on to "'The barn is true' is true" and so on. Truth is never defined for statements like these Because it was not included in the initial subset and does not imply the truth of any

other sentences in the original or any later set, this statement is false. These may be described as "ungrounded" by Kripke. Kripke's theory suggests that certain statements are neither true nor false because, even if the procedure is repeated endlessly, these phrases are never given either truth or falsity. This goes against the idea of bivalence, which states that every statement must either be true or untrue. Since the liar paradox is derived from this concept, the conundrum is resolved.

Similar to this, liberal groupthink may have contributed to the liberal belief in individual reason. One of the most dramatic scenes in Monty Python's *Life of Brian* involves a sizable throng of followers who mistake Brian for the Messiah. 'You don't need to follow me, you don't need to follow anybody,' Brian assures his followers. The jubilant audience then cries out in unison, "Yes! We are all unique people! Yes, everyone of us is unique. Although Monty Python was mocking 1960s counterculture dogma, their premise may apply to any believer in rational autonomy. Crowds yelling "Yes, the voter knows best!" in unison are common in contemporary democracies. The customer is really always right. Not only do regular voters and consumers suffer from the issue of groupthink and individual ignorance, but also presidents and CEOs. Although they may have a large number of experts and intelligence agencies at their disposal, this does not always mean that the situation will improve. When you are in charge of the world, it is very challenging to find the truth. Simply put, you're much too busy. Most political leaders and corporate titans are always on the go. However, if you want to go thoroughly into any topic, you'll need a lot of time and, more specifically, the right to waste time. You must experiment with fruitless avenues, investigate dead ends, create room for uncertainty and boredom, and for little seeds of understanding to gradually sprout and flourish. You will never learn the truth if you cannot afford to squander time.

And to make matters worse, truth is always distorted by immense power. Instead of seeing reality for what it is, power is all about altering it. Everything seems to be a nail when you have a hammer in your hand, and everything appears to be an open invitation to interfere when you hold immense authority. Even if you manage to resist this impulse, the others in your immediate vicinity will never forget the enormous hammer you are wielding. You can never have complete confidence in anything someone says since they all have agendas, whether conscious or not. No sultan can ever rely on his courtiers and aides to be honest with him.

Thus, great power behaves like a black hole that warps space itself. Everything gets more twisted the closer you approach. Every word that enters your circle becomes heavier than usual, and everyone you encounter wants to either flatter you, please you, or take advantage of you. They know you can only give them a minute or two, and since they don't want to say anything awkward or confusing, they wind up speaking either meaningless platitudes or the most overused clichés. I received a dinner invitation from Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu a few years back. My friends urged me not to attend, but I couldn't help myself. I hoped that I would finally learn some significant information that is only shared with select few behind closed doors. What a letdown it was! present were perhaps thirty individuals present, and everyone was trying to impress the Great Man, win his favor, or get something from him.

They performed a fantastic job of keeping whatever important secrets they may have known to themselves, if anybody present had any. Netanyahu was not at fault in the slightest, nor was it anybody else's. The gravitational attraction of power was to blame. Escape the black hole of power if you really seek truth, and give yourself permission to spend a lot of time aimlessly roaming the peripheral.

It is hard for revolutionary information to reach the center since the center is founded on preexisting knowledge. Who enters the centers of power is often decided by the keepers of the old system, and they frequently exclude those who have unsettlingly unusual views. Of course, they also remove a staggering quantity of trash. It's hardly a sign of wisdom to not be invited to the Davos World Economic Forum. You have to spend so much time on the perimeter because, although they sometimes contain amazing revolutionary discoveries, they are mostly filled with educated guesses, disproved models, fanatical dogmas, and absurd conspiracy theories. As a result, leaders are in a difficult situation. They will have a very warped view of the world if they remain at the center of power. They will squander too much of their valuable time if they go off the beaten path. Additionally, the issue will only worsen. The world will grow considerably more complicated than it is now during the next several decades. As a result, individual people - whether pawns or monarchs - will know even less about the technical innovations, economic trends, and political forces that determine the course of the globe. The most we can do under such circumstances, as Socrates noted more than 2,000 years ago, is to own our own unique stupidity. But what about justice and morality? How can we ever expect to distinguish between good and evil, fairness and injustice, if we do not comprehend the world?

CONCLUSION

As the cornerstone of knowledge, communication, and reasoned debate, the idea of truth is of utmost significance in human society. Even while truth is often thought of as an abstract, universal idea, how we see it might vary depending on our own viewpoints, prejudices, and cultural contexts. A thorough knowledge of truth requires critical reasoning, empirical support, and an open mind. It is essential for people to learn how to tell fact from fiction in a time of information overload and disinformation. Furthermore, understanding the subtleties and intricacies of reality might increase one's capacity for compassion, tolerance, and respect for opposing points of view. In the end, the search for truth is a continual process that propels intellectual advancement and shapes our perception of the universe.

REFERENCES

- [1] N. M. Brashier and E. J. Marsh, "Judging Truth," *Annual Review of Psychology*. 2020. doi: 10.1146/annurev-psych-010419-050807.
- [2] V. Bufacchi, "Truth, lies and tweets: A Consensus Theory of Post-Truth," *Philos. Soc. Crit.*, 2021, doi: 10.1177/0191453719896382.
- [3] A. Michailidou and H. J. Trenz, "Rethinking journalism standards in the era of post-truth politics: from truth keepers to truth mediators," *Media, Cult. Soc.*, 2021, doi: 10.1177/01634437211040669.
- [4] E. L. Henderson, D. J. Simons, and D. J. Barr, "The trajectory of truth: A longitudinal study of the illusory truth effect," *J. Cogn.*, 2021, doi: 10.5334/JOC.161.
- [5] S. Spoelstra, "The truths and falsehoods of post-truth leaders," *Leadership*, 2020, doi: 10.1177/1742715020937886.
- [6] A. Hassan and S. J. Barber, "The effects of repetition frequency on the illusory truth effect," *Cogn. Res. Princ. Implic.*, 2021, doi: 10.1186/s41235-021-00301-5.
- [7] P. Capilla, "Post-truth as a mutation of epistemology in journalism," *Media Commun.*, 2021, doi: 10.17645/MAC.V9I1.3529.

- [8] H. Enroth, "Crisis of Authority: The Truth of Post-Truth," *Int. J. Polit. Cult. Soc.*, 2021, doi: 10.1007/s10767-021-09415-6.
- [9] M. Schnuerch, L. Nadarevic, and J. N. Rouder, "The truth revisited: Bayesian analysis of individual differences in the truth effect," *Psychonomic Bulletin and Review*. 2021. doi: 10.3758/s13423-020-01814-8.
- [10] L. K. Fazio, D. G. Rand, and G. Pennycook, "Repetition increases perceived truth equally for plausible and implausible statements," *Psychon. Bull. Rev.*, 2019, doi: 10.3758/s13423-019-01651-4.

CHAPTER 17

A BRIEF DISCUSSION ON JUSTICE

Mr Sachin Pandey, Assistant Professor
School of Hotel Management & Catering Technology, Jaipur National University, Jaipur, India
Email Id: sachin.pandey@jnujaipur.ac.in

ABSTRACT:

A fundamental value, justice is essential to preserving fairness, equality, and order in society. It includes the idea of treating people and groups fairly, ensuring that their rights are upheld, and dealing with wrongdoing in the correct way. Justice also encompasses aspects of the social, economic, and environmental spheres in addition to legal ones. Recognizing past wrongs, advancing equality, and strengthening oppressed groups are all necessary to ensure justice. The notion of justice, its multiple facets, and its importance in legal, social, and moral situations are all explored in this chapter.

KEYWORDS:

Equality, Fairness Equality, Justice, Rights, Social.

INTRODUCTION

In its widest definition, justice refers to the idea that people should be treated fairly and equally. In order to attain justice, people should get what they deserve. However, what it means to "deserve" will depend on a variety of factors, including the domains of ethics, logic, law, religion, equity, and fairness. By running courts and applying their decisions, the state might be considered to be working toward justice. To help us grasp justice, several philosophical and moral ideas have been put forward. The Greek philosophers Plato and Aristotle developed the first philosophies of justice in their respective works, *The Republic* and *Nicomachean Ethics*. The command thesis, which maintains that justice comes from God, may be used to categorize religious interpretations of the judicial system. Later, several views on the origins of justice were put forward by Western philosophers. Justice, according to 17th-century thinkers like John Locke, is derived from natural law. According to the social contract idea, which was promoted by authors like Jean-Jacques Rousseau, justice results from a society's members' shared desire to be controlled by a political system. Utilitarian thinkers like John Stuart Mill said that justice is achieved by doing what produces the best results for the largest number of people in the 19th century.

Distributive justice, egalitarianism, retributive justice, and restorative justice are examples of contemporary frameworks. Using the criteria of what should be distributed, among whom it should be divided, and how it should be distributed, distributive justice examines what is right. Justice, according to egalitarians, can only exist within the parameters of equality. Retributive justice theories claim that punishment of criminals serves justice, but restorative justice sometimes referred to as "reparative justice" is a theory of justice that prioritizes the interests of both victims and offenders. Our sense of justice has deep evolutionary origins with all of our other senses [1], [2]. Through millions of years of evolution, human morality has evolved to address the social and ethical problems that have arisen in the lives of tiny hunter-gatherer tribes. Should I share my spoils with you if I went hunting with you and I killed a deer but you didn't catch anything? Does being stronger than you enable me to take

all these mushrooms for myself if you went mushroom hunting and returned with a full basket? Is it OK to cut your neck in the dead of night if I know you have plans to murder me?

Justice is a suitable, peaceful coexistence of the individual or city's opposing factions. Therefore, according to Plato, justice is owning and acting upon one's own property. A fair guy is one who is in the proper position, gives his utmost effort, and gives precisely what he has been given. Both on a personal and a societal level, this holds true. Reason, spirit, and desire are the three components of a person's soul. A city also includes three distinct sections. Socrates utilizes the chariot allegory to demonstrate his point: a chariot functions as a whole because the charioteer controls the force of the two horses. Only lovers of knowledge, or philosophers in one sense, can discern what is right, hence they should be in power. When one is unwell, one consults a doctor rather than a farmer since the doctor is an authority on health issues. Similar to this, one should put their city in the hands of a person who is knowledgeable about doing good rather than a politician who just seeks power by caving in to public opinion. The unjust city is like a ship in the open sea, crewed by a strong but inebriated captain (the common people), a group of dubious advisors who try to influence the captain into giving them control over the ship's course (the politicians), and a navigator (the philosopher) who is the only one who knows how to get the ship to port. Socrates uses the parable of the ship to illustrate this point. According to Socrates, the navigator must assume control in order for the ship to arrive at its destination the good.

We left the African savannah for the urban jungle, yet on the surface, not much has changed. One would believe that the issues we are now grappling with the civil war in Syria, global injustice, and climate change are merely expanded versions of earlier issues. But it's only a fantasy. From the perspective of justice, as from many other perspectives, size matters, and we are scarcely fitted to the environment in which we exist. No, values are not the issue. The people of the twenty-first century have a wide range of ideals, whether they are secular or religious. Implementing these ideals in a complicated, international environment is an issue. Numbers alone are to blame. The foragers' concept of justice was designed to deal with problems involving the lives of a few dozen individuals spread out across a few dozen square kilometers. Our moral sense is overpowered when we attempt to understand the interactions between millions of individuals spread over whole continents.

Justice calls for a comprehension of actual cause-and-effect relationships in addition to a set of abstract values. It would be unjust if I forcibly took the basket of mushrooms you had harvested for your children to eat, negating all of your labor and leaving them to sleep hungry. This is simple to understand since it is simple to observe the connections between causes and effects. The unfortunate fact is that the causal relationships in our contemporary, globalized environment are very ramified and complicated.

Left-wing activists claim that even though I live in peace at home and have never harmed anybody, I am entirely complicit in the wrongs committed by Israeli settlers and troops in the West Bank. The socialists claim that the foundation of my privileged existence is child labor performed in deplorable Third World sweatshops. Animal welfare activists often remind me that I am entangled in one of history's most heinous crimes: the ruthless abuse of billions of farm animals [3].

Is all of it truly my fault? It's difficult to say. I find it challenging to respond to even the most basic inquiries, like where my lunch comes from, who made the shoes I'm wearing, and what

my pension fund is doing with my money, because I depend for my existence on a mind-boggling network of economic and political ties.

DISCUSSION

A hunter-gatherer from the prehistoric era would have known exactly where her meal came from (she collected it herself), who produced her moccasins (he slept 20 meters away from her), and what her pension fund was doing it was playing in the mud. People back then only had access to one pension fund, known as "children." I know considerably more than the hunter-gatherer does. Years of investigation may reveal that the government I supported for is clandestinely supplying weaponry to a dubious leader halfway over the globe. But while I'm waiting to find out, I may be losing out on even more significant information, like what happened to the hens whose eggs I had for supper. The way the system is set up makes it possible for people who don't try to learn to live in blissful ignorance, and it makes it incredibly challenging for those who do want to learn the truth. When the global economic system is constantly committing theft on my behalf and without my awareness, how is it possible to refrain from doing the same? It makes no difference whether you believe in categorical responsibilities that should be upheld regardless of consequences (it is bad to steal because it makes the victims unhappy) or if you assess acts by their results (it is immoral to steal because it makes the victims unpleasant). The issue is that it is now very difficult to understand what we are really accomplishing [4]–[6].

When stealing meant physically taking something that wasn't yours with your own hands, the commandment to not steal was created. But now, the most crucial defenses against theft center on very different situations. Let's say I invest \$10,000 in shares of a major petrochemical company, earning a 5% yearly return on my investment. The company does not pay for externalities, which contributes to its great profitability. Without giving a thought to the harm to the local water supply, the general populace's health, or the surrounding animals, it dumps poisonous trash into a nearby river. It utilizes its resources to hire a large team of attorneys who defend it from any claims of financial wrongdoing. Additionally, it keeps lobbyists who oppose any effort to pass laws with stricter environmental standards. Can we claim that the company "stole a river"? What about me specifically? I never trespass into people's homes or steal cash from their purses. I'm unsure of the exact mechanism through which this company makes money. I hardly even recall that it's a part of my portfolio. So, am I a theft offender? When we have no possibility of knowing every essential piece of information, how can we behave morally?

Trying to escape the issue by embracing a "morality of intentions" is one option. What matters is what I aim to accomplish, not what I really do or how things turn out. In contrast, the greatest moral imperative changes to the urge to know in a linked world. Not only were hate and money to blame for the worst atrocities in contemporary history, but also ignorance and apathy. Charming English women who had never set foot in either Africa or the Caribbean bought stocks and bonds on the London stock market to fund the Atlantic slave trade. They subsequently used snow-white sugar cubes made in inhumane plantations, about which they knew nothing, to sweeten their tea at four o'clock. The local postmaster in Germany in the late 1930s could have been a kind neighbor who looked out for the wellbeing of his staff and personally assisted individuals in need to locate lost packages. He consistently arrived at work early and left last, making sure that the mail was delivered on schedule even during snowstorms. Unfortunately, his friendly and effective post service played a crucial role in the Nazi state's nervous system. Racist propaganda, Wehrmacht recruiting directives, and strict commands to the neighborhood SS section were all moving quickly. The motives of individuals who don't put out a real attempt to learn are suspect.

What, however, constitutes "a sincere effort to know"? Should postmasters across the world examine the mail they deliver and, if they find government propaganda, quit or revolt? Because we are aware of the origins and consequences of the Nazi Germany of the 1930s, it is simple to look back on it with complete moral clarity. But moral certainty may not be within our grasp without the advantage of hindsight. The sad fact is that our hunter-gatherer brains can no longer handle the complexity of the modern world. Our hunter-gatherer brains did not develop to be able to recognize structural biases, which is why the majority of injustices in the modern world are caused by widespread structural biases rather than by personal prejudices. We just don't have the time or energy to identify every one of these biases, but we are all involved in at least some of them. Writing this book helped me personally internalize the lesson. I constantly run the risk of favoring the position of the global elite above that of other disadvantaged populations while addressing global problems. It is hard to avoid the viewpoints of the global elite as they dominate the debate. Contrarily, marginalized groups often experience quiet, making it simple for others to overlook them not out of malice aforethought, but rather out of ignorance.

Divine command and Religious Theories of Justice

Justice, as well as overall morality, according to proponents of the divine mandate hypothesis, is God's authoritative command. For example, God states that murder is evil and ought to be punished. According to some theories, God must be followed due to the nature of God's connection with humans, while other theories contend that because God is goodness itself, obeying God's commands is beneficial for everyone. Plato's dialogue *Euthyphro* contains an early examination of the divine command idea. The *Euthyphro Dilemma* asks, "Is what is morally good commanded by the gods because it is morally good, or is it morally good because it is commanded by the gods?" The inference is that if the former is true, morality exists independently of the gods and is therefore susceptible to the judgment of mortals; if the latter is true, justice is beyond the comprehension of humans. A answer is that it is deductively true to state that the presence of an objective morality presupposes the existence of God and vice versa.

This argument was made famous in two situations by Immanuel Kant and C. S. Lewis. Along with compassion, justice is generally seen as a present, true, right, and particularly controlling notion among Jews, Christians, and Muslims. Justice is ultimately drawn from and held by God. The Bible claims that God established the Mosaic Law and other legal frameworks to compel the Israelites to uphold his moral principles. Abraham, the founder of the Judeo-Christian religion, is quoted in the Hebrew Bible as stating, "No, for I have chosen him, that he may charge his children and his household after him to keep the way of the Lord by doing righteousness and justice;" (NRSV, Genesis 18:19). According to the Psalmist, God is "Righteousness and justice [as] the foundation of his throne;" (NRSV, Psalm 89:14). The New Testament also speaks of God and Jesus Christ as having justice and showing it, often in contrast to God showing compassion and supporting it (Matthew 5:7).

Natural law

Justice is regarded by proponents of the view (like John Locke) that it is an element of natural law and is inherent in human nature.

Skepticism and despotism

Thrasymachus, a character in Plato's *Republic*, argues that justice is the interest of the powerful and is only a word for what a strong or crafty ruler has forced on the populace.

Mutual Agreement

According to proponents of the social compact, justice results from everyone agreeing on something; alternatively, in many variations, from what everyone would agree to given hypothetical circumstances such as equality and the lack of prejudice. This incident is discussed under the heading "Justice as Fairness" further down. The lack of prejudice refers to a level playing field for all parties to a dispute.

Subordinate Value

John Stuart Mill and other utilitarian philosophers contend that justice is not as essential as we sometimes believe. Instead, it derives from the simpler criterion of rightness known as consequentialism, which holds that the optimal course of action is one which produces the best results (often determined by the total or average welfare resulting). Therefore, the fair principles are those that have the best outcomes in general. These guidelines may end up being well-known ones, like adhering to contracts, but they may be not, depending on the reality of the repercussions. In any case, it's the results that matter, and justice only matters if it's based on this essential principle. Mill claims that two basic human tendencies our desire to exact revenge on those who have wronged us, or the feeling of self-defense, and our capacity to conceive of ourselves in another person's shoes, sympathy are the origins of justice, and that they help to explain why we are mistaken in thinking that it is overwhelmingly important. Therefore, when we see someone being hurt, we imagine ourselves in their shoes and become motivated to take revenge on their behalf. Our faith in justice should be shaken if this method is the cause of our sentiments about it.

Instrumental theories of justice

Auxiliary theories Justice examines the repercussions of punishing injustice, including issues like:

1. Why penalize?
2. Who needs to be disciplined?
3. What kind of punishment is appropriate?

In general, utilitarian theories focus on the effects of punishment in the future, retributive theories go back to specific instances of wrongdoing and try to match them with the proper punishment, and restorative theories focus on the needs of the victims and society as a whole and try to undo the harms caused by wrongdoing.

Utilitarianism

The utilitarian believes that in order to achieve justice, the average or overall wellbeing of all relevant persons must be maximized. Three approaches exist for punishment to combat crime:

1. **Deterrence:** People may change their behavior in response to a genuine threat of punishment, and responses to well-crafted threats may enhance welfare. This is in line with some very strong intuitions about justice. Punishment should, in general, be appropriate for the offence.
2. **Rehabilitation:** Punishment may transform "bad people" into "better" ones. According to the utilitarian, a "bad person" is just a person who is likely to bring about undesirable outcomes, such as misery. Therefore, utilitarianism could advocate for punishment that alters a person such that they become less prone to do wrong things.

3. **Security/Incapacitation:** Perhaps there are some who are unredeemable evildoers. If this is the case, locking people up could maximize welfare by reducing their potential for damage, therefore the advantage resides in safeguarding society.

The maximizing of welfare is the motivation for punishment, hence it should be applied to whomever, in whatever form, and to whatever degree is required to achieve that aim. When doing so would result in the greatest overall outcomes (for example, possibly murdering a few suspected shoplifters live on television would be an effective deterrence to stealing), this may sometimes justify punishing the innocent or imposing unduly harsh penalties. Additionally, it implies that depending on the circumstances surrounding the real effects of punishment, it may never prove to be the appropriate course of action.

Retributivism

The consequentialist will believe that retributivists are in error. Regardless of the results of punishment, if someone commits a crime, we must react by holding them accountable for the conduct. Because wrongdoing must be countered or atoned for in some manner, the offender deserves to be punished. It asserts that only those who are guilty and only those who are guilty deserve just punishment. This is consistent with several fundamental beliefs about what constitutes fair punishment, namely that it must be applied to all guilty parties and must be proportionate to the offense. However, it has been said on occasion that retributivism is only disguised vengeance. Retaliation and vengeance vary from one another in that the former is impartial and has a range of appropriateness while the latter is private and has the possibility for an infinite scope.

Restorative Justice

An approach to justice known as restorative justice (sometimes referred to as "reparative justice") puts the interests of victims and offenders first, rather than achieving imprecise legal requirements or punishing the perpetrator. While criminals are urged to accept responsibility for their crimes and "to repair the harm they've done - by apologizing, returning stolen money, or community service," victims play an active part in the process. It is founded on a conception of justice that views crime and wrongdoing as an offense against a person or a group, as opposed to the state. The best percentages of victim satisfaction and offender responsibility are seen in restorative justice systems that encourage communication between victims and offenders.

Mixed theories

According to some contemporary philosophers, utilitarian and retributive theories do not conflict. For instance, Andrew von Hirsch argued that we have a moral duty to punish serious crimes more severely than less serious ones in his 1976 book *Doing Justice*. However, if we stick to that restriction, utilitarian ideas would take a big backseat.

Theories

Introduction

'Systematic' or 'programmatically' political and moral philosophy in the West is considered to start with the inquiry, 'What is Justice?' in Plato's *Republic*. Most modern views of justice hold that justice is of utmost importance: According to John Rawls, "Justice is the first virtue of social institutions, just as truth is of systems of thought." The idea of "justice" is always conceived in logical or "etymological" contrast to the concept of "injustice" in classical methods, which are clear from Plato through Rawls. These methods list a variety of injustices

as obstacles that a philosophy of justice must overcome. However, a variety of post-World War II perspectives contest the apparent duality between those two ideas. Although benevolence, charity, prudence, mercy, generosity, and compassion are sometimes conceived of as being interconnected, justice may be viewed of as different from these qualities. The idea of justice is one of the cardinal virtues, which justice is. The idea of metaphysical justice is often linked to ideas like destiny, reincarnation, or Divine Providence, i.e., living according to a cosmic design. Justice and fairness have been historically and culturally established to be equivalent.

Equality before the Law

Important and difficult questions regarding justice, fairness, and equality are raised by the law. The adage "All are equal before the law" is an ancient one. Legal egalitarianism is the notion that everyone is treated equally under the law. The novelist Anatole France criticized this notion in 1894, writing, "In its majestic equality, the law forbids rich and poor alike to sleep under bridges, begging in the streets, and stealing loaves of bread." With this proverb, France demonstrated the basic flaw in a philosophy of legal equality that ignores social inequality; when the same rules are applied to everyone, the least powerful may be disproportionately hurt.

Relational Justice

In order to better understand how people are connected to one another and how they interact with one another in society, relational justice aims to investigate these connections. This emphasis includes knowledge of what these interactions ought to be, according to a normative viewpoint. This emphasis, from a political perspective, covers how people are organized in society. According to Rawls' theory of justice, the goal of justice is to equalize the distribution of basic social goods so that those in society who are least fortunate might gain. His distributional plan and other distributive theories of justice, however, do not explicitly address inter- and intra-personal power dynamics. They also don't discuss political issues like different decision-making systems like labor-culture divides or the creation of social meanings. Even Rawls' own fundamental principle of self-respect cannot be stated to be distributable.

Iris Marion Young contends that distributive accounts of justice fall short of offering an adequate conceptualization of political justice because they overlook many demands of daily life. Instead, she argues that a relational perspective on justice, which is based on an appreciation of the differences among social groups, provides a better framework and acknowledges unequal power relations between individuals, social groups, and institutional structures. Young Kim likewise approaches the issue of justice from a relational perspective, but he diverges from Iris Marion Young's political support for collective rights and instead places an emphasis on the personal and moral dimensions of justice. In terms of its moral components, he claimed that justice included responsible behaviors founded on logical and independent moral agency, with the person as the legitimate bearer of rights and obligations. Politically, he thinks that a kind of liberalism with the basic tenants of liberty and equality, as well as the ideas of variety and tolerance, is the ideal setting for justice.

Classical Liberalism

One of the fundamental ideas of classical liberalism is equality before the law. Equality before the law, not equality of result, is what classical liberalism advocates. The pursuit of collective rights at the cost of individual liberties is rejected by classical liberalism. Individual liberty is another fundamental principle of classical liberalism in addition to

equality. In "Two Concepts of Liberty," British social and political theorist, philosopher, and intellectual historian Isaiah Berlin distinguishes between positive and negative liberty, adhering to a concept of negative liberty, which takes the shape of independence from state intervention. In support of John Stuart Mills' harm principle, which embodies a classical liberal understanding of liberty, he further develops the idea of negative liberty by asserting that "the only end for which mankind are warranted, individually and collectively, in interfering with the liberty of action of any of their number is self-protection."

Equality

Liberalism in political philosophy contains the two enduring components of liberty and equality. The majority of modern views of justice, including Rawls' notion of justice as fairness, place a strong emphasis on the idea of equality. Ronald Dworkin views a nuanced understanding of equality as the supreme political value. Dworkin questions whether society has a moral obligation to assist people who caused them to need assistance. In his proposed transfer of resources, fairness for future generations and the distinction between factors of choice and matters of chance are complicated.

Evolutionary Perspectives

Evolutionary grounds for justice are suggested by evolutionary ethics and moral evolution. According to studies in biosocial criminology, human views of what constitutes proper criminal justice are founded on how people responded to crimes in the small-group context of their ancestors and may not necessarily be suitable for modern cultures.

Reactions to Fairness

Fairness is stimulating the same area of the brain that reacts to food in rats, according to studies conducted at UCLA in 2008. This is consistent with the idea that receiving fair treatment fulfills a fundamental need. This sensation is shared by other cooperative species, according to Emory University research from 2003, which suggested that "inequity aversion may not be uniquely human."

Justice and Institutions

Institutions are necessary to actualize justice goals in a world where people are linked yet differ. When compared to ideal standards, these institutions may be terribly unfair, as is the case with slavery, or they may be justified by their approximation to justice. Justice is a standard that the world struggles to uphold, often as a result of willful hostility to justice in the face of knowledge that doing so might be devastating. Legal theorists and philosophers of law have thought about the legitimacy, procedural, codification, and interpretation concerns that the concept of institutive justice poses. Strong institutions are essential to upholding justice, according to Sustainable Development Goal 16 of the UN [7], [8].

CONCLUSION

Any community that is capable of operating needs justice because it provides a framework for settling disputes, defending individual rights, and fostering social peace. The fundamental concepts of justice fairness, equality, and impartiality remain crucial, even if the perception and administration of justice might differ between cultures and legal systems. Establishing a strong legal system, impartial institutions, and procedures to remedy injustices are necessary for achieving justice. Additionally, it calls for inclusion promotion and systematic inequality to be addressed. In the end, the search for justice is a continuous process that requires group effort and a dedication to building a fairer and equal society.

REFERENCES

- [1] D. McCauley and R. Heffron, “Just transition: Integrating climate, energy and environmental justice,” *Energy Policy*, 2018, doi: 10.1016/j.enpol.2018.04.014.
- [2] S. Moroni, “The just city. Three background issues: Institutional justice and spatial justice, social justice and distributive justice, concept of justice and conceptions of justice,” *Plan. Theory*, 2020, doi: 10.1177/1473095219877670.
- [3] A. Završnik, “Algorithmic justice: Algorithms and big data in criminal justice settings,” *Eur. J. Criminol.*, 2021, doi: 10.1177/1477370819876762.
- [4] H. Coulson and P. Milbourne, “Food justice for all?: searching for the ‘justice multiple’ in UK food movements,” *Agric. Human Values*, 2021, doi: 10.1007/s10460-020-10142-5.
- [5] M. Kaljonen *et al.*, “Justice in transitions: Widening considerations of justice in dietary transition,” *Environ. Innov. Soc. Transitions*, 2021, doi: 10.1016/j.eist.2021.10.007.
- [6] M. Menton *et al.*, “Environmental justice and the SDGs: from synergies to gaps and contradictions,” *Sustain. Sci.*, 2020, doi: 10.1007/s11625-020-00789-8.
- [7] C. Hocking, “Occupational justice as social justice: The moral claim for inclusion,” *J. Occup. Sci.*, 2017, doi: 10.1080/14427591.2017.1294016.
- [8] D. Celermajer *et al.*, “Multispecies justice: theories, challenges, and a research agenda for environmental politics,” *Env. Polit.*, 2021, doi: 10.1080/09644016.2020.1827608.

CHAPTER 18

POST-TRUTH: SOME FAKE NEWS LASTS FOR EVER

Mr Pankaj Azad, Assistant Professor
School of Hotel Management & Catering Technology, Jaipur National University, Jaipur, India
Email Id: pankaj.azad@jnujaipur.ac.in

ABSTRACT:

The phrase "post-truth" describes the widespread 21st-century documenting of and concern about disagreements over assertions of public truth. The ideas and studies that explain the phenomenon's historically unique origins and consequences are referred to as the term's academic development. Some academics contend that the post-truth arguments are analogous to earlier moral, epistemological, and political discussions of relativism, postmodernism, and political dishonesty. Others assert that post-truth is primarily focused on cultural behaviors and communication technology of the twenty-first century. In this chapter, we will discuss about the post-truth merits and demerits also focus on the role of post-truth in academic circles.

KEYWORDS:

Politics, Post-Truth, Truth, History, Reality, Fake News.

INTRODUCTION

Although the phrase "post-truth politics" has been used in academic circles and the general public prior to 2016, Oxford Dictionaries gave a popular definition of it as "relating to and denoting circumstances in which objective facts are less influential in shaping public opinion than appeals to emotion and personal belief." Following its widespread use in the 2016 US presidential election and the UK's Brexit vote, the phrase was selected the Oxford Dictionaries Word of the Year in 2016. Oxford dictionaries also point out that the term "post-truth" was often used as an adjective to denote a certain kind of politics known as post-truth politics [1], [2].

These days, we are constantly informed that we are living in a brand-new, terrifying period of "post-truth," in which falsehoods and fictions are everywhere. There are many of examples available. As a result, in late February 2014, Russian Special Forces who were not wearing army insignia invaded Ukraine and took control of crucial facilities in Crimea. The Russian authorities and President Putin himself have frequently denied that they are Russian soldiers and have instead characterized them as self-defense organizations that may have picked up Russian-looking weapons from nearby stores. Putin and his allies were fully aware they were lying when they made this very absurd allegation.

This falsehood may be justified by Russian nationalists by claiming that it served a greater truth. Russia was fighting in a righteous war, therefore surely lying is acceptable if killing is acceptable for a noble cause? The protection of the revered Russian country was said to be the superior reason that justified the invasion of Ukraine. Russia is a holy entity that has survived for a thousand years despite several efforts by ruthless adversaries to conquer and sunder it, according to Russian national tales.

Following the Mongols, Poles, Swedes, Napoleon's Grande Armée, and Hitler's Wehrmacht, NATO, the USA, and the EU tried to destroy Russia in the 1990s by severing pieces of its

body and turning them into "fake countries," like Ukraine. For many Russian nationalists, the claim that Ukraine is a distinct country from Russia is a far larger lie than anything President Putin has said in the course of his fervent quest to reunify the Russian people. This explanation may upset Ukrainian civilians, foreign observers, and professional historians, who will likely see it as a kind of "atom-bomb lie" in the Russian deceitful arsenal. A large number of historical facts, such as the fact that Kyiv and Moscow were only a part of the same country for only 300 years throughout the thousand years of alleged Russian unity, are disregarded by those who assert that Ukraine does not exist as a nation or as an independent state. Additionally, it disobeys a number of international laws and treaties that Russia has already ratified and that have protected the independent Ukraine's sovereignty and frontiers. Most significantly, it disregards the self-perception of millions of Ukrainians. Do they not have any say over who they are?

Nationalists from Ukraine and Russia would undoubtedly agree that there are some fictitious nations out there. Ukraine, however, is not one of them. The 'Luhansk People's Republic' and the 'Donetsk People's Republic' are really fictitious nations that Russia created to hide its aggressive invasion of Ukraine. Regardless of which side you choose, it seems that we are in a dangerous post-truth period when not just specific military events but whole histories and entire countries might be made up. But if this is the post-truth period, when was the golden age of truth, exactly? About 1980? The 1950s? The 1930s? And was it the Internet that brought us into the post-truth era? On social media? Trump and Putin's ascent?

Even the practice of denying whole nations and inventing phantom countries has a long history, as seen by a brief examination of history. Propaganda and deception are nothing new, according to history. To support its invasion of China in 1931, the Japanese army staged fictitious assaults on itself. To further support its invasion, it subsequently established the fictitious Manchukuo. Tibet's status as a sovereign nation has long been contested by China. The legal principle of terra nullius, or "nobody's land," which essentially erased 50,000 years of Aboriginal history, was used to justify British colonization in Australia. A popular Zionist catchphrase from the early 20th century referred to the return of "a people without a land [the Jews] to a land without a people [Palestine]". Conveniently, the Arab community in the area was disregarded. Israeli Prime Minister Golda Meir is infamous for claiming that there has never been and will never be a Palestinian nation. Even now, after decades of military struggles against an impossibility, such views are quite widespread in Israel. For instance, Israeli MP AnatBerko cast doubt on the existence and history of the Palestinian people in a speech she delivered in the Israeli Parliament in February 2016. Her evidence? How can there be a Palestinian population since Arabic does not even have the letter "p"? The Arabic word for Palestine is Falastin (where 'f' stands for 'p').

The species of Post-Reality

In actuality, post-truth has always been a part of human existence. Humans are a post-truth species, and they get their power from fabricating and clinging to lies. Self-reinforcing myths have been used to bind human collectives together since the Stone Age. In fact, Homo sapiens' capacity to invent and disseminate fictions is what has allowed us to rule this planet. Because humans are the only animals capable of creating made-up tales, disseminating them, and persuading millions of others to believe in them, we are the only mammals that can work together with many strangers. We all follow the same rules and can work together efficiently as long as we all hold to the same fictions.

Therefore, if you blame Facebook, Trump, or Putin for bringing about a new and terrifying era of post-truth, consider that millions of Christians locked themselves inside a self-reinforcing mythological bubble hundreds of years ago, never daring to question the historical veracity of the Bible, while millions of Muslims placed their unwavering faith in the Quran. Stories of miracles, angels, devils, and witches predominated for millennia in what passed for "news" and "facts" on human social networks, with fearless reporters providing live coverage from the lowest depths of hell. Despite the fact that there is no scientific proof that Eve was enticed by the serpent, all unbelievers' souls burn in hell after death, or the universe's creator dislikes it when a Brahmin marries an Untouchable, billions of people have long held these beliefs. Some false information persists forever. I'm aware that comparing religion to false news may offend a lot of people, but that's precisely the idea. Fake news occurs when 1,000 individuals for a month accept a false report. We are warned against calling anything a religion after a billion people have believed it for a thousand years to avoid upsetting the devout (or drawing their wrath).

Please take note that I do not discount the usefulness or potential goodness of religion. The exact opposite. For better or worse, fiction is one of the most potent weapons in the human arsenal. Religious beliefs enable broad-scale human cooperation by uniting individuals. Along with armies and jails, they also encourage people to construct hospitals, schools, and bridges. Despite the fact that Adam and Eve never existed, Chartres Cathedral is still stunning. Even if a large portion of the Bible is fiction, it may nevertheless inspire people to be compassionate, brave, and creative, much like other great works of fiction like *Don Quixote*, *War and Peace*, and *Harry Potter*. Again, my comparison of the Bible to *Harry Potter* could anger some people. If you are a scientifically inclined Christian, you can claim that the Bible was never intended to be read as a literal record but rather as a metaphorical narrative containing profound insight in order to explain away all the mistakes, myths, and inconsistencies in it. But doesn't it also apply to *Harry Potter*?

You are more inclined to claim that the Bible is literally accurate if you are a fundamentalist Christian. Let's pretend for a second that you are correct that the Bible is the inerrant revelation of the one true God. What do you think of the Book of Mormon, the Vedas, the Avesta, the Quran, the Talmud, and the Avesta, as well as the Egyptian Book of the Dead? Don't you feel the need to claim that these writings are intricate fictions written by real people (or even by demons)? How do you feel about Roman rulers like Augustus and Claudius being deities? The Roman Senate demanded that the citizens of the empire worship the gods it had allegedly created by transforming them into human beings. That wasn't a lie, right? In fact, there is at least one instance in history of a false deity openly admitting that he was a fake. As previously said, obsessive faith in the deity of Emperor Hirohito was a foundational element of Japanese militarism in the 1930s and early 1940s. Hirohito officially declared that this was untrue and that he wasn't a deity after all after Japan's loss [3]–[5].

Therefore, even if we accept that the Bible is the inspired word of God, there are still billions of pious Hindus, Muslims, Jews, Egyptians, Romans, and Japanese who have relied on fiction for thousands of years. Again, this does not imply that the stories are inherently harmful or useless. They could still be admirable and motivating. Naturally, not all religious myths have been helpful. Hugh, a nine-year-old English child, was discovered dead in a well in the town of Lincoln on August 29, 1255. Even without Facebook and Twitter, the rumor that Hugh had been ritually killed by the local Jews spread swiftly. As the tale spread, Matthew Paris, one of

the most well-known English chroniclers of the time, presented a graphic account of how prominent Jews from all over England assembled in Lincoln to fatten, torment, and ultimately crucified the kidnapped infant. For the purported murder, 19 Jews were put to death after being tried. Similar blood libels spread to other English towns, sparking a string of pogroms that resulted in the killing of whole villages. Ultimately, the whole Jewish community of England was driven out in 1290.

There was more to the tale. Geoffrey Chaucer, the Father of English Literature, featured a blood libel based on Hugh of Lincoln's tale in the *Canterbury Tales* (also known as "The Prioress's Tale"), a century after the expulsion of Jews from England. The Jews are hanged at the story's climax. Subsequently, similar blood libels became a mainstay of every anti-Semitic campaign from late-medieval Spain to contemporary Russia. Even the 2016 "fake news" claim that Hillary Clinton oversaw a network of child traffickers who kept children as sex slaves in the basement of a well-known pizzeria can be heard in the background. One individual even showed up to the pizzeria with a rifle and demanding to see the basement (it turned out that the restaurant had no basement), which hampered Clinton's election campaign since enough Americans believed the claim.

Nobody is quite sure how Hugh of Lincoln died, although he was buried in Lincoln Cathedral and was regarded as a saint. Even centuries after the expulsion of all Jews from England, he was said to have performed a number of miracles, and his grave still draws visitors today. Lincoln Cathedral didn't denounce the blood libel until 1955, 10 years after the Holocaust, when they erected a plaque next to Hugh's grave that reads: During the Middle Ages and even much later, exaggerated tales of Jewish communities "ritually murdering" Christian youths were widespread in Europe. These fabrications claimed the lives of several innocent Jews. The purported victim was buried in the Cathedral in the year 1255, according to a tradition that originated in Lincoln. Such tales do not reflect well on Christendom. Some bogus news, however, only persists for 700 years.

DISCUSSION

Philosophical Precedents from the Past

The term "post-truth" refers to a historical issue with the use of truth in daily life, particularly in politics. Truth, however, has always been one of philosophy's main concerns. A lot of the research and public discussion around post-truth implies a specific theory of truth, or what philosophers refer to as a correspondence theory of truth. Truth is also one of the most difficult notions in the history of philosophy. Although it has its detractors, correspondence theory is the most popular explanation of truth because it approximately links words to realities that can be tested and validated. Coherence theory, which holds that truth is not simply one claim but rather a collection of assertions that are coherent about the world, is another important explanation of truth. The focus on philosophical arguments concerning truth, according to a number of academic specialists, has nothing to do with the idea of post-truth, which historically evolved in popular politics see post-truth politics, not in philosophy. As Julian Baggini, a philosopher, explains:

The academic community is largely interested in the merits of these opposing hypotheses. Contradictory conceptions of reality are not the reason why people differ when they discuss whether Saddam Hussain's Iraq has WMDs, whether global warming is real and caused by humans, or whether austerity is required. When asked to swear to speak the truth, the entire truth, and nothing but the truth, a witness doesn't have to ask the court which theory she is

thinking about. Why then has truth become such a difficult concept outside of the realm of academic philosophy? One reason is that there is much ambiguity and dispute on what constitutes a trustworthy source of truth. For the most of human history, people have placed some degree of steady faith in religious scriptures and authorities, educated professionals, and the time-tested common sense. Nowadays, it seems that almost nothing is accepted as authoritative. We are thus left with the choice of selecting our own experts or just going with our intuition [6], [7].

As a result, specialists who treat the idea of post-truth as something historically particular, as a current social event, contend that post-truth theory has nothing in common with long-standing philosophical discussions about the nature of truth. In other words, the question of "why don't we agree that this or that is true?" rather than "what is truth?" or "is X true?" is what post-truth as a current phenomena is all about. Numerous academic disciplines are arguing that the advent of new media and communication technologies, user-generated content, new media editing technologies (visual, audio-visual), and a saturating promotional culture has led to a breakdown in institutional authority for truth-telling (government, news media, especially), which has led to confusion and games of truth-telling, including truth markets. Not all authors, meanwhile, see post-truth as a historically particular phenomena covered by pragmatic, coherence, or implicit correspondence theories of truth. They talk about it within a philosophical tradition that explores the concept of truth. Some of these post-truth critics quote Friedrich Nietzsche.

Continental philosophy and critical theory

Some well-known philosophers are dubious about the distinction between values and facts. They contend that power dynamics in society generate scientific truths.

Bruno Latour

Bruno Latour, a philosopher from France, has drawn criticism for his role in developing the theoretical underpinnings of post-truth. 2018 saw the publication of a feature on Bruno Latour and post-truth politics in the New York Times. According to the article, contended that scientific facts should instead be understood as a result of scientific investigation in a series of contentious publications in the 1970s and 1980s. According to Latour's actor-network theory, facts were "networked"; their viability depended less on their intrinsic truth than on the institutions and practices that generated and understood them. However, the essay argues that it is incorrect to assert that Latour rejects reality or holds that truth is a matter of perspective:

Latour's detractors would have thought there was something strange about the scenario that day, with the longtime foe of those who worship science worshipping before the altar of science, if they had been there at our circus. They would have missed Latour's refusal to contest the reality of gravity, however, which is something they have always done. He has been attempting to redescribe the circumstances under which this information gets to be known, which is far more exceptional. Latour's contentious image as a "fact-denier" was cemented by an essay he published in the French monthly journal *La Recherche* in 1998. Here, Latour recounts how French anthropologists studying Ramses II's mummy in 1976 discovered that the pharaoh died of TB. How could he die from a bacillus that Robert Koch identified in 1882, wonders Latour? Ramses II being slain by machine guns or passing away from stress brought on by a stock market meltdown, according to Latour, would be anachronistic. Then then, Latour questions why tuberculosis-related deaths are not also considered anachronisms. He said, "The bacillus has no real existence before Koch." The idea

that Koch identified an already-existing bacillus is rejected by him as "having only the appearance of common sense".

In this approach, Latour or Michel Foucault as well draws attention to the institutional and practical conditions for knowledge production, which are always shifting in science at varying speeds.

Contemporary evaluation

In his book *The Demon-Haunted World: scientific as a Candle in the Dark*, renowned astronomer and scientific communicator Carl Sagan argued: Science is a style of thinking, not just a set of information. I worry about the United States in my children's or grandchildren's lifetimes: when it becomes a service and information economy; when nearly all of the important manufacturing sectors have left the country; when a small number of people control amazing technological advancements; when no one speaking for the public interest can even comprehend the issues; when the populace has lost the capacity to set their own goals or intelligently challenge those in power. People believe that Carl Sagan foresaw a future of "alternative facts" or "post-truth" in his statements. Recent political applications of post-truth include the 2016 and 2020 U.S. presidential elections, Brexit, the COVID-19 "infodemic," and the circumstances that led to the January 6, 2021, takeover of the US Capitol. When the US Capitol was stormed in 2021, historian Timothy Snyder wrote about post-truth:

Pre-fascism is post-truth... When we lose up on the truth, we hand over authority to those who can replace it with spectacle thanks to their riches and charm. Citizens cannot establish the civic society that would enable them to protect themselves without agreement on a few fundamental truths. We tend to wallow in alluring abstractions and fictions if we lose the institutions that create facts that are relevant to us. The post-truth era undermines the rule of law and ushers in a mythical dictatorship. The phrase "post-truth," according to writer George Gillett, confuses empirical and ethical judgments. He claims that the movement that calls itself "post-truth" is really a backlash against "expert economic opinion becoming a surrogate for values-based political judgements." Never again will the truth be a falsehood.

The use of fiction to promote harmony is not limited to ancient faiths. More recently, each country has developed its own national mythology, and ideologies like communism, fascism, and liberalism have developed complex self-reinforcing tenets. A lie said once stays a falsehood, but a lie spoken a thousand times becomes the truth, according to Joseph Goebbels, the master of Nazi propaganda and perhaps the most brilliant media whiz of the modern era. Hitler said in *Mein Kampf* that the most brilliant propagandist technique will yield no success unless one fundamental principle is borne in mind constantly it must confine itself to a few points and repeat them over and over. Can any modern-day purveyor of false information outdo that?

Equally nimble with the facts, the Soviet propaganda apparatus rewrote the history of anything from whole conflicts to specific images. The official newspaper *Pravda*, whose name translates to "truth," featured a picture of a beaming Joseph Stalin hugging a seven-year-old child on its main page on June 29, 1936. The photograph became a symbol of the Stalinist movement, elevating Stalin to the status of the nation's father and idealizing the "Happy Soviet Childhood." Millions of posters, sculptures, and mosaics depicting the event were produced nationwide by printing presses and factories and placed in public spaces from one end of the Soviet Union to the other. No Soviet school would be complete without an image of Joseph Stalin holding tiny Gelya, just as no Russian Orthodox church would be without an image of the Virgin Mary carrying baby Jesus.

Unfortunately, celebrity was frequently a recipe for tragedy in Stalin's empire. Within a year, Gelya's father was detained on the fictitious grounds that he was a Trotskyite terrorist and a Japanese agent. He was one of the many victims of the Stalinist terror who were put to death in 1938. The mother soon passed away in Kazakhstan under strange circumstances after Gelya and her mother were sent there. What should be done with all the symbols showing the Father of the Nation with the daughter of an infamous "enemy of the people"? No issue. Gelya Markizova disappeared at that point, and the 'Happy Soviet Child' in the well-known photograph was revealed to be Mamlakat Nakhangova, a Tajik girl who was thirteen years old and had earned the Order of Lenin by diligently picking lots of cotton in the fields (if anyone had thought the girl in the picture didn't look thirteen years old, they knew better than to voice such counter-revolutionary heresy).

The Soviet propaganda apparatus was so effective that it was able to conceal horrifying tragedies at home while presenting an idealistic image abroad. Ukrainians now argue that Putin has been effective in misrepresenting Russia's activities in the Crimea and Donbas to many Western media outlets. But he is far from equal to Stalin in the art of deceit. At a time when millions of Ukrainians and other Soviet residents were perishing from the man-made famine that Stalin engineered, left-wing Western journalists and intellectuals in the early 1930s praised the USSR as an ideal society. Even while it may be difficult to know which version of events to accept in the era of Facebook and Twitter, at least a dictatorship can no longer execute millions of people without the world being aware of it.

Commercial organizations also depend on fiction and false news, in addition to faiths and ideologies. Branding often entails repeatedly repeating a false tale to get others to believe it is true. What mental pictures spring to mind when you think about Coca-Cola? Do you see youthful, healthy individuals participating in sports and having a good time with one another? Or do you see diabetic individuals who are overweight and resting in a hospital bed? Drinking copious amounts of Coca-Cola will not keep you youthful, healthy, or athletic; on the contrary, it will raise your risk of developing diabetes and obesity. However, Coca-Cola has spent decades spending billions of dollars to associate itself with youth, fitness, and sports, and billions of people unconsciously hold this association to be true.

The reality is that human beings have never placed a great priority on the truth. Many people believe that if a certain religion or philosophy misrepresents reality, its followers will eventually figure it out because they will be unable to compete with more enlightened opponents. That's just another reassuring myth, I suppose. In reality, the effectiveness of human collaboration rests on a careful balancing act between reality and fantasy. If you oversimplify reality, it will weaken you by causing you to behave irrationally. For instance, Kinjikitile Ngwale of East Africa claimed to be the snake spirit Hongo's possession in 1905. To the inhabitants of the German colony in East Africa, the new prophet delivered a revolutionary message: band together and expel the Germans. Ngwale gave his followers magic medication, known as maji in Swahili, that he said could change German bullets into water in order to make his message more acceptable. Thus, the Maji Maji Rebellion got underway. It fell flat. German weapons on the battlefield did not turn into water.

Instead, they savagely tore into the corpses of the unarmed insurgents. Similar fervent faith that God would battle for the Jews and aid them in overthrowing the imperious Roman Empire fueled the Jewish Great Revolt against the Romans two thousand years ago. Likewise, it was a failure, and as a result, Jerusalem was destroyed and the Jews were exiled. On the other hand, you need some mythology to efficiently organize large groups of people. Few will follow you if you remain true to truth. Without myths, it would have been difficult to plan not just the unsuccessful Maji Maji and Jewish revolts, but also the far more

successful Maccabean and Mahdi revolts. In fact, when it comes to bringing people together, lies have a natural edge over the truth. Asking individuals to believe in an absurdity rather than the truth is a far better way to test for group loyalty. Loyalty to the leader is not necessary in order to praise him if he says, "The sun rises in the east and sets in the west." Only real believers will raise their hands if the chief declares that "the sun rises in the west and sets in the east." Similar to how you can rely on your neighbors to come together in times of need if they all hold to the same absurd rumor. What does it show if they just want to accept verified facts?

You may argue that, at least in certain circumstances, agreements reached by consent are a more effective means of organizing people than myths and fictions. Thus, even though everyone is aware that money and companies are only human conventions, in the economic world, they have a far greater ability to unite people than any deity or sacred book. A real believer would simply say, "I believe that other people believe that the dollar is valuable," in the instance of the currency, as opposed to saying, "I believe that the book is sacred" in the case of a holy text. People appreciate the dollar despite the fact that it was clearly only created by humans. If so, why can't humanity give up all myths and fictions and organize themselves according to mutually agreed-upon rules like the dollar?

The distinction between "knowing that something is just a human convention" and "believing that something is inherently valuable" is not always clear in reality. People often lack clarity or are unaware of this distinction. To use another example, practically everyone would agree that corporations are fictitious tales made up by people if you sat down and had a thorough philosophical conversation about it. Microsoft is a complex legal fiction constructed by legislators and attorneys, not the properties it owns, the people it employs, or the stockholders it serves. But 99 percent of the time, we aren't having in-depth philosophical debates; instead, we treat businesses like tigers or people real, living things in the world.

There are various reasons to blur the lines between fiction and reality, from "having fun" to "survival," among others. You must be able to suspend your disbelief in order to enjoy games and books. For at least 90 minutes, you must forget that the laws of the game are essentially human constructions in order to really appreciate football. If you don't, you'll find it completely absurd that 22 people are rushing after a ball. Football may start out as a game for enjoyment, but as any English hooligan or Argentinian patriot can confirm, it has the potential to develop into far more serious material. Football may be used to create individual identities, to bind vast groups, and even to justify violent behavior. Nations and faiths are like super-powered football teams.

Humans are unique in their capacity to both know and not know. Or, to put it more accurately, they can know something if they really think about it, but most of the time they don't, so they don't. If you pay close attention, you'll see that money is a myth. But typically you are not focused. You are aware that football was created by humans if you are questioned about it. But nobody questions you about it at the match's tense moments. You can learn that countries are complex yarns if you put the time and effort into it. You don't have the time or energy, however, while a conflict is in progress. The tale of Adam and Eve becomes clear if you want the absolute truth. But how often do you ask for the absolute truth?

Power and truth can only go so far together. They eventually go their own ways. You will eventually have to propagate lies if you seek power. You will eventually have to give up power if you want to discover the reality of the world. You will have to make admissions that may enrage friends, demoralize supporters, or jeopardize societal peace, such as concerning the roots of your own authority. Throughout history, academics have grappled with the

question of whether to serve truth or power. Should they try to ensure that everyone believes the same tale in order to bring about unity, or should they tell the truth even at the cost of causing division? The most influential academic institutions, whether they were run by Christian priests, Confucian mandarins, or communist ideologues, prioritized unity above truth. They were so effective because of this.

Humans are a species that values power above truth. Even when we make an attempt to comprehend the world, it is often done in the belief that doing so would make controlling the world simpler. We spend considerably more time and energy trying to control the world than we do trying to understand it. Therefore, you shouldn't expect much from *Homo sapiens* if you envision a society where the truth is valued above all else and myths are disregarded. Try your luck with chimpanzees instead. All of this is not to say that fake news is not a major issue or that politicians and clergy are allowed to tell outright lies. It would also be completely incorrect to draw the conclusion that all news is phony, that there is no difference at all between genuine journalism and propaganda, and that any effort to learn the truth is destined to failure. Real truths and genuine sorrow may be found behind all the false information. For instance, Russian troops are really engaged in combat in Ukraine, thousands have actually killed, and hundreds of thousands have actually lost their homes. Although the belief in fiction is often the source of human pain, the suffering itself is nevertheless real.

Therefore, rather than accepting false news as the norm, we should acknowledge that it is a far more complex issue than we often imagine and work much harder to tell fact from fiction. Don't anticipate excellence. Denying the complexity of the universe and thinking in absolutes of perfect purity against demonic wickedness is one of the worst lies of all. Although no politician ever speaks the full truth and nothing but the truth, some are nonetheless far more effective than others. Even if the British Prime Minister was not above exaggerating the facts when it suited him, I would have far more faith in Churchill than Stalin. In a similar vein, although every newspaper has biases and errors, some really try to uncover the truth, while others only serve as propaganda vehicles. I wish I had the foresight to trust the *New York Times* over *Pravda* and *Der Sturmer* if I had lived in the 1930s.

We must all take the time and make the effort to identify our prejudices and to double-check the information we get. As mentioned in prior chapters, we are unable to do exhaustive research on our own. But because of that, we must at least thoroughly research our preferred information sources, whether they are a newspaper, a website, a TV network, or an individual. Science undoubtedly has its limits and has made several errors in the past. But for generations, the scientific community has been our most trustworthy source of information. Even if you believe that a scientific theory is incorrect, at the very least, you should be aware of the scientific ideas you are rejecting and present some empirical evidence to back up your position.

For their part, scientists must participate far more actively in contemporary political discussions. They shouldn't be hesitant to speak out when the conversation veers into their area of knowledge, whether it be history or medicine. Silence is supporting the current quo, not neutrality. Of course, it is crucial to continue doing academic research and publishing the findings in specialized publications that are read only by professionals. However, it is equally crucial to inform the general people about the most recent scientific hypotheses via popular science literature and even through the skillful use of fiction and art. Actually, it is not a terrible concept at all. Science fiction is likely the most significant genre of all in the twenty-first century because it influences how most people interpret concepts like artificial intelligence, biotechnology, and climate change. Art has a significant part in influencing how people see the world. We need solid research, no doubt, but from a political standpoint, a

good science fiction film is much more valuable than a piece in research or Nature [5], [8], [9].

CONCLUSION

Although "post-truth" has become a popular word recently, the phenomena itself is not wholly new. People have always been prone to prejudice and arbitrary information interpretation. Technology developments and the emergence of social media, however, have accelerated the transmission of misleading information and made it simpler for people and organizations to sway public opinion. The decline in faith in established authorities and information sources is one of the main causes of the post-truth phenomena. Due in part to instances of inaccurate reporting or apparent bias, there is a growing sense of skepticism regarding well-established organizations like the government and the media. Living in a post-truth culture has important repercussions. Misinformation may have a negative impact on social cohesiveness, public policy, and democracy. It has the potential to erode the consensus on reality required for fruitful discussion and decision-making. Additionally, if individuals withdraw into their own echo chambers and reject alternative perspectives, it may lead to the polarization of society.

Post-truth concerns need for a multifaceted strategy to be addressed. By encouraging critical thinking and discernment, fact-checking groups and media literacy initiatives play an important part in the fight against disinformation. Through algorithmic transparency and content control, technology businesses have a duty to stop the spread of incorrect information on their platforms. Additionally, promoting a climate of respectful involvement, open communication, and empathy may aid in bridging gaps and promote the interchange of differing viewpoints.

REFERENCES

- [1] Naomi Oreskes, "Merchants of doubt: how a handful of scientists obscured the truth on issues from tobacco smoke to global warming," *Choice Rev. Online*, 2011, doi: 10.5860/choice.48-6243.
- [2] D. Gooblar, "How to Teach Information Literacy in an Era of Lies - The Chronicle of Higher Education," *Chron. High. Educ.*, 2018.
- [3] P. Armitage, "Why Blogging Is More Important Than Ever," *Act-On*, 2015.
- [4] D. A. Disparte, "Why Blockchain, Why Now?," *Forbes*, 2018.
- [5] W. Koh, "'Gently Caress Me, I Love Chris Jericho': Pro Wrestling Fans 'Marking Out,'" *M/C J.*, 2009, doi: 10.5204/mcj.143.
- [6] F. López-Cantos, "The impact on public trust of image manipulation in science," *Informing Sci.*, 2019, doi: 10.28945/4407.
- [7] L. Malita and G. Grosseck, "Tackling Fake News In A Digital Literacy Curriculum," in *14th International Conference eLearning and Software for Education*, 2018. doi: 10.12753/2066-026x-18-262.
- [8] P. Attallah, "Too Much Memory," *M/C J.*, 1998, doi: 10.5204/mcj.1704.
- [9] W. Hill, "Harmony Korine's Trash Humpers: From Alternative to Hipster," *M/C J.*, 2017, doi: 10.5204/mcj.1192.

CHAPTER 19

A STUDY ON SCIENCE FICTION: THE FUTURE MOVIES

Mr Shivam Sharma, Assistant Professor

School of Hotel Management & Catering Technology, Jaipur National University, Jaipur, India

Email Id: Shivam.sharma@jnujaipur.ac.in

ABSTRACT:

Science fiction is a literary, cinematic, and artistic genre that explores inventive and speculative ideas, often based on potential future developments in science or technology. It offers stories that go beyond the bounds of reality, bringing viewers to fresh settings, distinct cultures, and ground-breaking concepts. Science fiction continues to challenge us to imagine both utopian and dystopian futures, from classics like H.G. Wells' "The War of the Worlds" to more recent works like Margaret Atwood's "The Handmaid's Tale." This chapter gives a general overview of science fiction, stressing its distinctive elements, well-liked topics, and substantial influence on culture and society.

KEYWORDS:

Future, Science Fiction, Society, Television, Technology.

INTRODUCTION

Science fiction is a subgenre of speculative fiction that often explores innovative and future ideas including cutting-edge technology, space travel, time travel, parallel worlds, and alien life. Science fiction is also occasionally abbreviated as sf or sci-fi. Science fiction has origins in prehistoric mythology. It has several subgenres and is connected to fantasy, horror, and superhero fiction. Authors, critics, researchers, and readers have long disagreed on its precise description. Science fiction has gained popularity and influence across much of the globe through literature, cinema, television, and other forms of media. It often examines the prospective effects of scientific, social, and technological advancements and has been referred to as the "literature of ideas." It sometimes acts as a conduit for future scientific and technical advancements. It may amuse while simultaneously exploring alternatives and criticizing contemporary society. It is often credited with igniting a "sense of wonder."

Because they can collaborate more effectively than any other species and because they believe in fiction, humans are in charge of the planet. Thus, artists such as poets, painters, and playwrights are at least as significant as soldiers and engineers. People construct cathedrals and engage in armed conflict because they believe in God, and they hold this belief because they have read poetry about God, seen images of God, and been mesmerized by theatrical productions about God. In a similar vein, Hollywood and the pop industry's creative productions serve as the foundation for our trust in the current mythology of capitalism. We think that increasing our material possessions would make us happier since we seen the capitalist paradise firsthand on television.

Science fiction is perhaps the most significant creative genre in the early twenty-first century. The most recent works in the disciplines of genetic engineering and machine learning are seldom read. Instead, television shows like Westworld and Black Mirror and movies like The Matrix and she influence how people see the most significant social, economic, and technical

advancements of our day. This implies that science fiction has to portray scientific truths much more responsibly in order to avoid giving readers the incorrect impressions or directing their attention to the wrong issues [1], [2].

The biggest fault of contemporary science fiction, as mentioned in a previous chapter, may be its propensity to conflate intellect with awareness. Therefore, it overreacts to the threat of a battle between humans and machines when our real cause for worry should be one between a few superhuman elite and a sizable underclass of weak *Homo sapiens*. Karl Marx is still a better example to follow when contemplating the future of AI than Steven Spielberg. In fact, a lot of artificial intelligence-related films are so far off from scientific truth that one wonders whether they aren't merely allegories for entirely other issues. Thus, it seems that the 2015 film *Ex Machine* is about an AI specialist who falls in love with a female robot only to be tricked and used by her. However, in actuality, this is not a film about people's apprehension about sentient robots. It is a film about men's aversion to smart women, particularly their worry that female liberty would result in female dominance. When an AI appears in a film when the scientist is male and the AI is female, the film is likely about feminism rather than cybernetics. Because why on earth would an AI have a gender or sexual orientation? An attribute of biological multicellular creatures is sex. What might it possible entail for a cybernetic, non-organic being?

The risk of technology being used to influence and control humans is one issue that science fiction has examined with significantly better depth. In the world of *The Matrix*, almost all people are imprisoned in cyberspace, and every aspect of their lives is determined by a powerful algorithm. The central character of *The Truman Show* is one person who unknowingly stars in a reality television program. All of his friends and acquaintances, including his mother, wife, and closest friend, are actors; everything that occurs to him follows a well written script; and everything he says and does is captured by hidden cameras and closely watched by millions of followers. He is completely unaware of this.

Despite their brilliance, both films ultimately shudder at the true ramifications of their events. They believe that the people stuck in the matrix have a true self that is unaffected by all the technical tricks, and that the heroes may reach the genuine reality that lies outside the matrix if they work hard enough. The matrix is only a constructed wall that divides your inner real self from the outside authentic world. Both heroes Neo in *The Matrix* and Truman in *The Truman Show*—overcome great obstacles to transcend and escape the web of deceptions, find their true identities, and arrive in the real promised land.

Strangely enough, the real Promised Land is exactly like the fake matrix in every significant way. When Truman escapes the TV set, he sets out to find his high school girlfriend, who the show's director had fired. However, if Truman were to realize his love desire, his life would resemble the flawless Hollywood illusion that *The Truman Show* sold to millions of people around the world, plus trips to Fiji. What type of alternate life Truman would find in the real world is not even hinted at in the film. Similar to this, Neo finds that the outside world is identical to the inner world after he escapes the matrix by taking the infamous red pill.

Violent confrontations and individuals motivated by desire, love, enmity, and terror exist both within and outside. The film ought to have concluded with Neo being informed that the reality he has entered is really a larger matrix and that, in order to leave it and enter "the true real world," he must once again decide between taking the blue or red pill. The contemporary

technology and scientific revolution suggests that authenticity is an illusion rather than that actual people and genuine realities may be influenced by algorithms and TV cameras. People are terrified of being boxed in, but they are unaware that they are already in one their brain which is imprisoned inside a larger box human civilization with its plethora of fictions. The only thing you find once you leave the matrix is another, larger matrix. When the peasants and workers rose up against the tsar in 1917, Stalin was the result. And when you start to examine all the ways the environment can mislead you, you eventually realize that your fundamental identity is a sophisticated delusion produced by brain networks [3], [4].

People worry that they will lose out on the world's marvels if they are confined to a box. Truman and Neo will never go to Fiji, Paris, or Machu Picchu as long as they are trapped within the TV studio and the matrix, respectively. But in reality, your body and mind are where you will find every event you will ever have. Nothing will change whether you leave the matrix or go to Fiji. It's not as if, when you finally get to the South Pacific, you get to open a chest made of iron with the warning sign "Open only in Fiji!" painted on it, and all sorts of unique sensations and experiences that you can only experience in Fiji pour out. And if you never go to Fiji in your life, you will never experience these unique emotions. No. Anywhere in the world even within the matrix you can experience anything you can feel in Fiji.

Maybe we're all trapped within a huge computer simulation, as in *The Matrix*. All of our national, religious, and ideological myths would be in conflict with that. Our mental experiences would still be genuine, however. It would be humiliating for Karl Marx and the Islamic State if it turned out that human history was a complex simulation played on a supercomputer by rodent scientists from the planet Zircon. However, these rat scientists would still be held accountable for Auschwitz and the Armenian genocide. How did they get that one past the ethics board at Zircon University? The feelings of anguish, dread, and despair were just as agonizing even if the gas chambers were nothing more than electronic impulses in silicon chips.

Even in the matrix, love is love, fear is fear, and suffering is pain. No matter if the atoms in the outer world or computer-manipulated electrical impulses are the source of your dread. The terror still exists. So both within and outside of the matrix, you may investigate the world that exists in your mind. The triumph of intellect over matter is a tale that is told in the majority of science fiction films. The legend goes as follows 30,000 years ago: "Mind imagines a stone knife, hand creates a knife, human kills mammoth." However, the fact is that humankind's ability to govern the planet came more from mind control than from the invention of blades and the slaughter of mammoths. The mind is an object that is being fashioned by history and biology, not a subject that freely alters biological facts and historical events. Even the values we hold dearest freedom, love, and creativity are like a mammoth-killing stone knife that someone else fashioned. The mind is always subject to manipulation, according to the most cutting-edge scientific theories and technology innovations. There is no genuine self-trapped within the deceptive shell waiting to be released. Do you realize how many books, movies, and poems you've read over the years, and how these works of art have shaped and honed your concept of love? As porn is to sex, and Rambo is to battle, romantic comedies are to love. You are deluding yourself if you believe that you can hit a delete button and remove all traces of Hollywood from your limbic system and mind.

Although we appreciate the concept of creating stone knives, we don't like the concept of becoming stone knives. Accordingly, the matrix adaptation of the traditional tale of the woolly mammoth goes something like this: "Mind imagines a robot; hand creates a robot; robot kills terrorists; robot also attempts to control the mind; mind kills robot." However, this tale is untrue. Not being able to kill the robot with the mind is the issue. The issue is that the mind that first conjured up the robot was already the result of much earlier manipulations. Therefore, destroying the robot won't set us free.

DISCUSSION

Disney Loses Faith in Free Will

A far more somber and unsettling animated narrative about the human condition was published by Pixar Studios and Walt Disney Pictures in 2015, and it soon became a hit with both kids and adults. Riley Andersen, an eleven-year-old girl, travels with her parents from Minnesota to San Francisco in the tale *Inside Out*. She struggles to adapt to her new life since she misses her friends and her birthplace, and she makes an attempt to flee back to Minnesota. Riley is unaware that there is a far bigger story unfolding. Riley isn't shackled in the matrix or the unknowing star of a reality TV program. Instead, Riley is the matrix, and something is imprisoned inside of her.

Disney's empire was created by repeatedly presenting the same tale. In several Disney films, the protagonists encounter challenges and perils but ultimately succeed by discovering their true selves and making their own decisions. This misconception is mercilessly shattered by *Inside Out*. It utilizes the most recent neurobiological theory of human nature and puts viewers into Riley's brain where they learn that she lacks a real self and never exercises free will. Riley is really a massive robot controlled by a variety of antagonistic biological systems, which the film personifies as adorable cartoon characters, such as the red, irritable Anger, the blue, depressing Sadness, and the yellow, upbeat Joy. These people have complete influence over Riley's emotions, choices, and actions by operating a series of buttons and levers at Headquarters while seeing Riley's every move on a big TV screen [5]–[7].

A mishap at Headquarters threatens to throw Riley's brain entirely out of balance, which is the cause of Riley's inability to adapt to her new life in San Francisco. Joy and Sadness go on an epic adventure through Riley's brain to right the wrongs. Along the way, they ride on the train of thought, explore the subconscious jail, and stop by the inner studio, where a group of creative neurons are hard at work creating dreams. Riley's brain is explored by these anthropomorphic biological machinery, but we never come to a soul, a true self, or free choice.

In fact, the pivotal point in the plot the one when Riley realizes she has one true self occurs when it becomes clear that she cannot be associated with any one core and that her survival relies on the coordination of many separate systems. Viewers are first encouraged to associate Riley with the main character, the sunny yellow Joy. However, it turns out that this was the crucial error that endangered Riley's life. By believing that she alone embodies Riley's true soul, Joy bullies Riley's other inner personas, upsetting Riley's brain's delicate balance. Joy has catharsis when she realizes her error and learns, along with the audience, that Riley isn't Joy, Sadness, or any of the other characters. Riley is a complicated tale that was created by the interactions and disagreements of all the biological characters at once. The fact that Disney dared to release a film with such a radical message and that it went on to become a global smash is simply astonishing. Given that *Inside Out* is a comedy with a joyful conclusion, it's possible that most viewers missed both its neurological significance and its

dark undertones. The greatest prescient science-fiction novel of the 20th century cannot be considered to be the same. Its ominous aspect is impossible to ignore. Even though it was written about a century ago, it still holds true today. In 1931, when Aldous Huxley was writing *Brave New World*, communism and fascism were well-established in Russia and Italy, Nazism was on the rise in Germany, militaristic Japan was waging war of conquest in China, and the Great Depression was engulfing the whole globe. Huxley, however, was able to look beyond all of these ominous clouds and imagine a society without wars, famines, or plagues, one that continuously enjoys peace, wealth, and health. It is a consumerist society where enjoyment is the most important value and where sex, drugs, and rock 'n' roll are entirely legal. The fundamental premise of the book is that people are biochemical algorithms that can be hacked by science and subsequently manipulated by technology.

The World Government in this bright future world employs cutting-edge biotechnology and social engineering to ensure that everyone is constantly satisfied and has no cause to revolt. It seems as if Riley's brain's representations of Joy, Sadness, and the others have been transformed into devoted government operatives. Therefore, there is no need for a Ministry of Love à la 1984 by George Orwell, a secret police, or concentration camps. Huxley's brilliance is in demonstrating that love and pleasure can be used to subdue people considerably more effectively than fear and violence. The only question left unanswered while reading *Nineteen Eighty-Four* is, "How do we avoid reaching such a terrible state?" It is evident that Orwell is presenting a terrifying nightmare scenario in this book. Reading *Brave New World* is a much more unsettling and difficult experience since it is difficult to pinpoint precisely what makes it a dystopian novel. Everyone is always very happy in this peaceful, rich planet. What could be wrong with it, exactly?

In the book's pivotal scene, Mustapha Mond, the World Controller for western Europe, speaks with John the Savage, a Native American who has spent his entire life on a reservation in New Mexico and is the only other man in London who still knows anything about Shakespeare or God. Science fiction, in the words of Isaac Asimov, is a genre of writing that explores how people respond to advancements in science and technology. A concise definition of nearly all science fiction, according to Robert A. Heinlein, could be this: "Realistic speculation about possible future events, based firmly on adequate knowledge of the real world, past and present, and on a thorough understanding of the nature and significance of the scientific method."

According to American science fiction writer and editor Lester del Rey, "Even the devoted aficionado or fan—has a hard time trying to explain what science fiction is," and the reason there isn't a "full satisfactory definition" of science fiction is because "there are no easily delineated limits to science fiction." Because science fiction fans often serve as their own arbiters in determining what precisely qualifies as science fiction, it is challenging to come up with a consensus definition of the genre. The challenge was best put up by Damon Knight, who said, "Science fiction is what we point to when we say it." According to David Seed, it could be more helpful to discuss science fiction as the nexus of other, more specific genres and subgenres.

Alternative Terms

The word "sci-fi" (similar to the then-popular "hi-fi") is ascribed to Forrest J. Ackerman for coining it in about 1954; the first recorded usage in print was a description of *Donovan's Brain* by film reviewer Jesse Zinser in January 1954. As science fiction became more widely accepted, authors and readers who were involved in the field began to connect the phrase with low-tech, low-budget "B-movies" and with pulp science fiction of poor caliber. By the

1970s, critics in the field, such as Terry Carr and Damon Knight, started adopting the term "sci fi" to separate shoddy science fiction from legitimate scientific fiction. "SF" (or "sf") is, according to Peter Nicholls, "the preferred abbreviation within the community of sf writers and readers." Robert Heinlein recommended that the term "speculative fiction" be used in place of "science fiction" for those works in this genre that are more "serious" or "thoughtful."

Some academics believe that science fiction has its roots in the past, when there was a blurring of the lines between myth and reality. A True Story, a work of satire by the Roman satirist Lucian from the second century CE, features several themes and clichés seen in contemporary science fiction, such as alien life, space travel, interplanetary conflict, and artificial life. Some people think of it as the first science fiction book. Science fiction is also included in a few of The Arabian Nights tales, as well as the 10th-century The Tale of the Bamboo Cutter and the 13th-century Theologus Autodidactus by Ibn al-Nafis.

In the Age of Enlightenment and the Scientific Revolution, works such as Johannes Kepler's Somnium (1634), Francis Bacon's New Atlantis (1627), Athanasius Kircher's Itinerarium extaticum (1656), Cyrano de Bergerac's Comical History of the States and Empires of the Moon (1657), The States and Empires of the Sun (1662), Margaret Cavendish's "The Blazing World" (1666), Jonathan Swift's The earliest science-fiction narrative, according to Isaac Asimov and Carl Sagan, is Somnium, which describes a trip to the Moon and how the Earth's motion is perceived from there.

Mary Shelley's Frankenstein (1818) and The Last Man (1826), which came after the novel's literary growth in the 17th century, contributed to the definition of the science-fiction novel's form. According to Brian Aldiss, Frankenstein was the first piece of science fiction. A travel to the Moon was portrayed in "The Unparalleled Adventure of One Hans Pfaall" (1835), one of Edgar Allan Poe's science fiction works. Particularly in Twenty Thousand Leagues under the Sea (1870), Jules Verne was praised for his meticulous attention to detail and scientific correctness. The first time machine was depicted in Enrique Gaspar y Rimbau's work El anacronópete from 1887. J.-H. Rosny aîné (1856–1940), a pioneer of French/Belgian science fiction, wrote in this genre. Les Navigateurs de l'Infini (The Navigators of Infinity), Rosny's masterwork from 1925, is where the phrase "astronautique" (or "space travel") first appears.

H. G. Wells is regarded by many commentators as one of science fiction's most significant writers, or perhaps "the Shakespeare of science fiction." The Time Machine (1895), The Island of Doctor Moreau (1896), The Invisible Man (1897), and The War of the Worlds (1898) are some of his well-known science fiction masterpieces. His science fiction included time travel, biological engineering, extraterrestrial invasion, and invisibility. He foresaw the development of aircraft, military tanks, nuclear weapons, satellite television, space travel, and anything approximating the World Wide Web in his non-fiction futurologist books. A Princess of Mars by Edgar Rice Burroughs, first of his three-decade-long Barsoom planetary romance series with John Carter as the protagonist, was published in 1912. These books, which were YA's forerunners, borrowed their ideas from American Westerns and European science fiction.

We, a first dystopian book by Russian author Yevgeny Zamyatin, was released in 1924. Within a single totalitarian society, it depicts a world of peace and uniformity. It had an impact on how the literary genre of dystopia emerged. The first American science-fiction magazine, Amazing Stories, was published by Hugo Gernsback in 1926. He wrote in its first article: I refer to 'scientifiction' as stories like those written by Jules Verne, H. G. Wells, and Edgar Allan Poe, which combine a sweet romance with scientific truth and foretelling. These

incredible stories not only make for really fascinating reading, but they are also always instructional. They provide information in a highly appealing way. The new experiences that science has predicted for us today might very well come true tomorrow. There are still a lot of amazing scientific tales that will go down in history to be written. They will be remembered by history for having broken new ground in advancement as well as in writing and fiction.

The *Skylark of Space*, authored by E. E. "Doc" Smith and Lee Hawkins Garby, was originally published in 1928's *Amazing Stories*. The first major space opera is a common description of it. The first Armageddon 2419 tale by Philip Francis Nowlan also appeared in *Amazing Stories* that same year. The first genuine science-fiction comic strip, *Buck Rogers*, was published after that. Some people believe that the hiring of John W. Campbell as editor of *Astounding Science Fiction* in 1937 marked the start of the Golden Age of Science Fiction, which was typified by works that celebrated advancement and accomplishment in science. The Foundation trilogy by Isaac Asimov, which charts the development and fall of galactic empires and introduces psychohistory, was first published in 1942. Later, the series received a single Hugo Award for "Best All-Time Series." It's common knowledge that the "Golden Age" ended in 1946, although sometimes the late 1940s and the 1950s are also included.

In his 1953 book *More Than Human*, Theodore Sturgeon examined the potential course of human development. One of the most significant Soviet science fiction works, *Andromeda: A Space-Age Tale* by the Russian author and paleontologist Ivan Yefremov was published in 1957 and offered a glimpse of an intergalactic communist civilisation. Robert A. Heinlein's 1959 book *Starship Troopers* represented a change from his prior works for young readers. It introduced the idea of powered armor exoskeletons and is considered one of the earliest and most significant works of military science fiction. The first episode of the multi-author German space opera series *Perry Rhodan*, which began in 1961 with a description of the first Moon landing, has since been stretched in time and space by billions of years. It has grown to be the most read science fiction book series ever.

In the 1960s and 1970s, new wave science fiction gained a reputation for embracing a high level of experimentation in both form and substance as well as a sophisticated and overtly "literary" or "artistic" perspective. The Polish edition of Stanislaw Lem's *Solaris* was released in 1961. As the protagonists tried to learn more about a supposedly sentient ocean on a recently found planet, the book's central issue of human limits was explored. The projected future civilization in Frank Herbert's 1965 novel *Dune* was much more intricate and well-developed than in earlier science fiction. Science-fiction novel series *Dragonriders of Pern* by Anne McCaffrey debuted in 1967. McCaffrey became the first woman to win a Hugo or Nebula Award thanks to two of the novellas that were a part of her first book, *Dragonflight*. [86] *Do Androids Dream of Electric Sheep?* By Philip K. Dick was released in 1968. It serves as the inspiration for the *Blade Runner* film series. Ursula K. Le Guin's 1969 novel *The Left Hand of Darkness* was set on a world with no established gender. It is perhaps one of the most significant works of anthropological, feminist, and social science fiction.

Science Fiction World started appearing in the People's Republic of China in 1979. It was formerly the most widely read science fiction magazine in the world, with a circulation of 300,000 copies every issue and an estimated 3-5 readers per copy (for a total readership of at least 1 million). It now dominates the Chinese science fiction magazine market. William Gibson's debut book, *Neuromancer*, published in 1984, contributed to the rise of cyberpunk and the term "cyberspace," which he first used in his short tale *Burning Chrome* from 1982. *Shards of Honor*, the first novel in Lois McMaster Bujold's *Vorkosigan Saga*, was out in

1986. Neal Stephenson foresaw significant societal upheaval as a result of the information revolution in his 1992 novel *Snow Crash*.

The Three-Body Problem, a book by Liu Cixin, was released in China in 2007. It was released by Tor Books in 2014 after being translated into English by Ken Liu, and in 2015 it won the Hugo Award for Best Novel, becoming Liu the first Asian author to do so. Environmental concerns, the effects of the Internet and the increasing information universe, concerns about biotechnology and nanotechnology, and post-scarcity societies are some of the new topics in science fiction from the late 20th and early 21st centuries. Subgenres and recent trends in science fiction include biopunk, steampunk, and generic science fiction.

Television

Television and science fiction have always had a tight association. Before television itself became widely accessible in the late 1940s and early 1950s, science fiction regularly included television or devices that resembled it. The earliest known science fiction television show was a live broadcast from the BBC's Alexandra Palace studios on February 11, 1938, including a 35-minute adaptation of the play *RUR* by Czech writer Karel apek. The kid-friendly adventure series *Captain Video and His Video Rangers*, which aired from June 1949 to April 1955, was the first widely watched science fiction show on American television.

Rod Serling created, narrated, and produced *The Twilight Zone* (the original series), which aired from 1959 to 1964. Rod Serling also authored or co-wrote the majority of the episodes. In addition to science fiction, it also included fantasy, suspense, and horror, with each episode telling a whole tale. It is among the top TV shows of any genre, according to critics. Despite being a comedy and only airing for one season (1962–1963), *The Jetsons* accurately anticipated numerous modern developments, including flat-screen TVs, newspapers shown on computer-like screens, computer viruses, video chat, tanning beds, and home treadmills. The first episode of the time-travel-themed *Doctor Who* aired on BBC Television in 1963. The original series was renewed in 2005 after running till 1989. It has received widespread acclaim and had a significant impact on subsequent science fiction on television. *The Outer Limits* (1963–1965), *Lost in Space* (1965–68), and *The Prisoner* (1967) were some of the other shows that aired in the 1960s.

Gene Roddenberry's *Star Trek* (the original series) debuted on NBC Television in 1966 and lasted for three seasons. Space Western and space opera elements were blended. At initially only marginally successful, the series rose to prominence thanks to syndication and exceptional audience engagement. With a large number of movies, TV episodes, books, and other works and items, it became a highly well-known and significant franchise. Six further live action *Star Trek* television series have since been produced as a result of *Star Trek: The Next Generation* (1987–1994), including *Deep Space 9* (1993–1999), *Voyager* (1995–2001), *Enterprise* (2001–2005), *Discovery* (2017–present), *Picard* (2020–2021), and *Strange New Worlds* (2021–present), with others in various stages of production.

On NBC, the miniseries *V* made its debut in 1983. It showed reptilian aliens attempting to take over Earth. Between 1988 until 1999, *Red Dwarf*, a comedic science fiction programme, broadcast on BBC Two. Since 2009, it has been available on Dave. Chris Carter produced *The X-Files*, a television series that focused on UFOs and conspiracy theories, which Fox Broadcasting Company aired from 1993 to 2002 and again from 2016 to 2018. In 1994, the movie *Stargate*, which is about intergalactic teleportation and ancient astronauts, came out. The 10-season run of *Stargate SG-1* began in 1997 and lasted until 2007. *Stargate Infinity* (2002–2003), *Stargate Atlantis* (2004–2009), and *Stargate Universe* (2009–2011) were three

spin-off shows. Other 1990s television programs included *Babylon 5* (1994–1999) and *Quantum Leap* (1989–1993).

The Sci-Fi Channel's successor, SyFy, first aired science fiction, fantasy, and supernatural horror in 1992. *Firefly*, a space Western television series, debuted on Fox in 2002. It is set in the year 2517, following the escapades of the rebel crew of *Serenity*, a "Firefly-class" starship, after humanity have settled in a new star system. A woman who adopts the identity of one of her many genetically identical human clones is the subject of the five-season television series *Orphan Black*, which debuted in 2013. An American TV show about the colonization of the Solar System, *The Expanse*, debuted on SyFy in late 2015 to rave reviews. The subsequent seasons would subsequently appear on Amazon Prime Video [8].

CONCLUSION

For many years, science fiction has captivated viewers with its visions of future societies, cutting-edge technology, and thought-provoking ideas. Science fiction has provided a forum for investigating the potential outcomes of technological advancement as well as the sociological and cultural ramifications that follow from it via its creative storylines. As a genre, it entertains while simultaneously providing social criticism, fostering critical thought, and igniting discussions on the moral and ethical implications of technological breakthroughs. Because it makes us think about our role in the cosmos and the effects of our actions in a continually changing environment, science fiction has been popular for a long time.

REFERENCES

- [1] M. Burnam-Fink, "Creating narrative scenarios: Science fiction prototyping at Emerge," *Futures*, 2015, doi: 10.1016/j.futures.2014.12.005.
- [2] P. G. Raven, "Telling tomorrows: Science fiction as an energy futures research tool," *Energy Res. Soc. Sci.*, 2017, doi: 10.1016/j.erss.2017.05.034.
- [3] H. A. Wiltsche, "The Forever War: understanding, science fiction, and thought experiments," *Synthese*, 2021, doi: 10.1007/s11229-019-02306-6.
- [4] C. B. Menadue, K. Giselsson, and D. Guez, "An Empirical Revision of the Definition of Science Fiction: It Is All in the Techne.," *SAGE Open*, 2020, doi: 10.1177/2158244020963057.
- [5] N. Selwyn, L. Pangrazio, S. Nemorin, and C. Perrotta, "What might the school of 2030 be like? An exercise in social science fiction," *Learn. Media Technol.*, 2020, doi: 10.1080/17439884.2020.1694944.
- [6] L. Zaidi, "Worldbuilding in science fiction, foresight and design," *J. Futur. Stud.*, 2019, doi: 10.6531/JFS.201906_23(4).0003.
- [7] G. Morgan, "New ways: The pandemics of science fiction," *Interface Focus*, 2021, doi: 10.1098/rsfs.2021.0027.
- [8] O. Mubin, K. Wadibhasme, P. Jordan, and M. Obaid, "Reflecting on the Presence of Science Fiction Robots in Computing Literature," *ACM Trans. Human-Robot Interact.*, 2019, doi: 10.1145/3303706.

CHAPTER 20

A BRIEF DISCUSSION EDUCATION: CHANGE IS THE ONLY CONSTANT

Subhranshu Panda, Professor
School of Pharmaceutical Sciences, Jaipur National University, Jaipur, India
Email Id: drsubhram@gmail.com

ABSTRACT:

In order for people and civilizations to thrive and advance, education is essential. It provides people with the information, abilities, and competences needed to live successful and satisfying lives. There are several arguments over its specific description, such as the objectives it seeks to fulfill. Another question is whether the improvement in the student as a result of education contributes to education's significance. To differentiate between education and indoctrination, several scholars emphasize the need of critical thinking. This chapter examines the many facets of education, including its goals, difficulties, and capacity to change people's lives. Additionally, it highlights the significance of inclusive, egalitarian educational institutions that meet the various needs of students. The aim is to add existing conversations and initiatives focused at improving education globally by exploring different educational models and methods.

KEYWORDS:

Education, Formal Education, Information, Knowledge, School.

INTRODUCTION

Education is the dissemination of information, abilities, and moral qualities. These differences have an impact on how to categorize, evaluate, and enhance educational formats. The phrase may also be used to describe the traits and mental states of educated individuals. It may also refer to the academic area that studies education. Different forms of schooling exist. Public schools are one example of a complicated institutional setting where formal education takes place. Even though it takes place outside of the regular educational system, non-formal education is organized. Informal education consists of unstructured learning through everyday activities. The levels of formal and informal schooling are separated. They cover preschool, elementary school, high school, and post-secondary school. Other categories, such as teacher-centered and student-centered education, concentrate on the teaching methodology. Subject-specific forms of education, such as those in science, language, and physical education, may also be differentiated [1], [2].

Children are socialized into society via education through learning cultural values and customs. It gives them the tools they need to contribute positively to society. This promotes economic progress and increases public knowledge of both domestic and international issues. Several facets of education are impacted by organized institutions. Governments, for instance, determine education policy. They decide who may or must attend lessons, when they take place, and what is taught. Primary education for all children has been promoted by international organizations like UNESCO.

Success in schooling is influenced by a variety of things. Intelligence, personality, and motivation are examples of psychological elements. Discrimination is often connected to

social characteristics including socioeconomic class, race, and gender. Technology in education, the caliber of the instructor, and parental participation are further considerations. Education studies is the name of the primary field that examines education. It looks at the definition of education and its objectives. It also investigates the causes, consequences, and potential improvements. There are several subfields within it, including comparative education, sociology of education, psychology of education, and economics of education. It also talks about the evolution of schooling. In the prehistoric era, informal learning took place via oral communication and imitation. Writing was created together with the growth of ancient civilizations, and knowledge expanded. As a result, informal education gave way to official schooling. Formal education was once primarily accessible to aristocrats and religious organizations. The printing press was created in the 15th century, which increased the accessibility of literature. This raised overall literacy levels. Public education gained importance starting in the 18th and 19th centuries. It sparked the global movement to make elementary education accessible to everyone, free of charge, and required until a particular age.

Our old narrative are disintegrating under the weight of massive upheavals confronting humanity, and no new story has yet to take their place. How can we get ourselves and our kids ready for a future with such drastic changes and extraordinary transformations? In 2050, a baby born today will be in their 30s. If all goes according to plan, the infant will still be alive in 2100 and may even be a contributing member of society. What should we educate that child to enable him or her to thrive in the twenty-first or twenty-fifth century? What sort of abilities will he or she need to get employment, comprehend what is going on around them, and go through the labyrinth of life?

We unfortunately don't know the answers to these concerns since no one can predict how the world will appear in 2050, much alone in 2100. Of course, no one could ever accurately foretell the future. Today, however, it is more challenging than ever before since we can no longer be confident about anything, even things that formerly appeared permanent and eternal, because technology allows us to construct bodies, brains, and minds. People in 1018 believed that the fundamental aspects of human civilization would not alter despite the fact that many facts about the future were unknown to them at the time. By 1050, the Song Empire would fall, the Khitans might come from the north, and diseases might kill millions of people, according to someone who lived in China in 1018.

However, it was obvious to you that even in 1050, the majority of people would continue to work as farmers and weavers, governments would continue to depend on people to man their armies and administrative structures, males would continue to control women, the average life expectancy would remain at approximately forty, and the human body would remain unchanged. Thus, in 1018, wealthy Chinese parents educated their males how to study the Confucian classics, write calligraphy, or engage in horse-mounted combat, while impoverished Chinese parents taught their daughters how to be humble and submissive housewives. It was clear that these abilities will be necessary in 1050.

Today, however, we are unsure of what China or the rest of the globe will look like in 2050. We are unsure of what individuals will do for a job, how bureaucracies and militaries will operate, and how gender relations will be. Some individuals will likely live longer than they do now, and owing to bioengineering and direct brain-computer interfacing, the human body may see an extraordinary change. By 2050, a large portion of what children learn now will

likely be obsolete. There are now too many schools that emphasize cramming information. This made sense in the past when knowledge was scarce and censorship often prevented even the gradual flow of information that was already available. It was impossible to know much about the outside world in 1800, example, if you lived in a tiny provincial town in Mexico. There was no public library, radio, television, or daily newspaper.

Apart from books and religious pamphlets, there wasn't much to read even if you were literate and had access to a private library. The Spanish Empire severely restricted the importation of just a few number of carefully reviewed books and tightly regulated all locally produced works. Much the same applied whether you lived in a small town in China, Turkey, Russia, India, or another country. Modern schools, which taught every kid to read and write as well as the fundamentals of geography, history, and biology, were a significant advance.

The twenty-first century, however, is characterized by a huge informational flow that even the censors are unable to control. Instead, they are busy disseminating false information or diverting our attention with unimportant issues. If you have a smartphone and reside in a small town in Mexico, you might easily spend several lives reading Wikipedia, watching TED presentations, and enrolling in free online courses. No government can possibly expect to keep all the information secret that it dislikes. However, it is disturbingly simple to confuse the public with false information and red herrings. The most recent reports of the bombing of Aleppo or the melting ice caps in the Arctic are just a click away for anybody in the globe, yet there are so many conflicting reports that it is difficult to know which ones to trust. Additionally, it is challenging to concentrate since so many other topics are accessible with just a click, and it is alluring to switch to humorous cat videos, celebrity gossip, or porn when politics or science seem too complex [3]–[5].

The last thing a teacher has to do in such a society is provide her students with additional knowledge. They have way too much of it already. Instead, individuals need to be able to interpret data, distinguish between what is significant and what is not, and, most importantly, put together a variety of data into a comprehensive understanding of the world. In reality, despite the fact that it has been the goal of Western liberal education for centuries, many Western institutions have lagged behind in achieving it. Teachers were permitted to concentrate on pushing facts while urging students to "think for themselves." Liberal schools have a special aversion to big narratives because of their distrust of authoritarianism. They reasoned that if we give students a lot of information and some degree of freedom, they will develop their own understanding of the world. Even if this generation is unable to combine all the information into a comprehensive account of the world, there will be plenty of time to do so in the future. Time is rapidly running out. The choices we make over the next several decades will determine how life itself will develop, and we can only make these choices based on our current worldview. If this generation doesn't have a thorough understanding of the universe, life's future will be selected at random.

DISCUSSION

To define education, theorists from a variety of disciplines have attempted. Many people agree that education is an intentional endeavor attempting to accomplish particular goals. These objectives include imparting information, abilities, and moral qualities. Beyond these fundamental characteristics, there are significant controversies over its precise nature. Some theories contend that it is largely a process that takes place during activities like education,

teaching, and learning. Others see it as a result of this process rather than a process itself. This implies that education is what those who are educated possess. It also contains the mental attitudes and behaviors that define them. The phrase might also be used to describe a certain academic discipline. This field of study examines the procedures and activities involved in instruction and learning. The social institutions involved in these processes are examined. The Latin word *educare* is where the word "education" comes from. In terms of the mind, it means "bring up, rear, educate." Additionally, the Latin word *educere* is related to it. It pertains to the physiological level and meaning "bring out, lead forth".

Some theories provide specific definitions by outlining the particular traits that are exclusive to them and shared by all systems of education. For instance, R. S. Peters claims that education must have these three characteristics:

1. It is concerned with the dissemination of information and comprehension.
2. This broadcast is valuable.
3. It is carried out in a way that is ethically just and in line with the student's interests.

The most prevalent types of schooling are typically successfully described using such exact descriptions. However, there exist counterexamples, therefore they are questioned. Some theorists have created less precise notions as a result of these challenges. On familial resemblance, some of them are founded. This implies that all educational methods are comparable to one another. However, they are not required to have a set of fundamental characteristics that they all possess. According to some scholars, the word "education" depends on its context. This means that it has several meanings depending on the context. To accurately identify educational forms, it's essential to have a comprehensive understanding of the term's definition. Additionally, it matters while attempting to gauge or enhance them.

The academic literature is divided on the issue of whether education is an evaluative term. This implies that being decent in some way is a component of what constitutes education. This is supported by so-called thick definitions. They can assert, for instance, that education must lead to the learner's progress. There may still be disagreements among many different definitions as to what type of improvement is required. On the other hand, thin definitions make an effort to provide an impartial description of education. The contrast between descriptive and prescriptive ideas is one that is closely connected. Describe how the phrase is really used by native speakers is the goal of descriptive concepts. Prescriptive notions make an effort to define excellent education or how it ought to be carried out [6].

Numerous dense and prescriptive concepts use the goals of education to support their point of view. This indicates that they see education as a practice intended to pursue certain objectives. These objectives may be divided into many groups. Epistemic commodities, such as knowledge and understanding, fall under one category. The talents area includes things like logic and critical thinking. Characteristics like compassion and honesty are also present. Some thinkers emphasize a single overall goal for education and see the more granular objectives as ways to achieve this goal. They can assert, for instance, that socialization is what education is all about. This indicates that the practice of passing on acquired knowledge from one generation to the next is how education is seen. The student may now participate in society as a normal citizen thanks to this procedure. Instead, definitions that are more person-centered put the student's welfare first. For them, education is a process that enables them to live the life they want or a decent one. To differentiate between education and indoctrination, some researchers emphasize critical thinking. They believe that ordinary indoctrination just seeks to ingrain in students certain views, regardless of how sensible those opinions may be. On the other hand, education ought to encourage the capacity for reasoned reflection and

skepticism of such ideas. However, other thinkers assert that early in the educational process, certain types of indoctrination may be required. It can be necessary until the child's thinking is fully formed.

Either the teacher's or the student's viewpoint may be used to describe education. Definitions that are teacher-centered emphasize the teacher's viewpoint and position. They could assert, for instance, that education is the ethically acceptable transfer of information and skills. On the other hand, student-centered definitions view education from the perspective of the student's experience throughout the learning process. They may characterize it, for instance, as a process that enhances and alters their experience thereafter. Definitions that consider both points of view are likewise feasible. This may be done by referring to the procedure as the shared experience of a single reality. This collaborative experience incorporates both problem-posing and problem-solving as well as discovery.

History of Education

The techniques, institutions, and procedures used in teaching and learning are examined in the history of education. It makes an attempt to explain how these interactions have influenced educational practice up to the current day. Education started in prehistory when adults taught children the information and abilities that were judged essential for their community. There weren't many specialist instructors, and most people taught the young informally while engaging in daily activities. Oral communication and imitation were the main methods of education. To transmit information, values, and talents from one generation to the next, storytelling and song may be used. The oldest ancient civilizations emerged in Egypt, Mesopotamia, and North China between 3000 and 1500 BCE. The advent of writing and the growth of formal education were characteristics of ancient education. The history of education as a whole was significantly impacted by the creation of writing. Information might be saved, preserved, and made more widely available via writing. This paved the way for a number of later developments, including the establishment of educational institutions and resources like textbooks.

The introduction of formal schooling was another important component of ancient education. Since the body of knowledge increased as civilizations advanced and informal education proved inadequate to pass on all information from one generation to the next, this became required. Education grew increasingly abstract and distant from ordinary life as teachers acted as subject-matter experts to transmit information. Ancient cultures still lacked widespread access to formal education and only the intellectual elite had access to it. In addition to reading and writing, it also included instruction in the humanities, physics, medicine, mathematics, law, and astrology. This took place in the form of scribe and priest training. One of the notable successes of ancient education is often cited as being Plato's Academy in ancient Greece. It is usually referred to be the first higher education institution. The construction of the Great Library of Alexandria in ancient Egypt is another accomplishment. Many consider it to be the most distinguished library in antiquity.

Religious authority had a significant impact on formal education throughout the medieval era. This was relevant to the Catholic Church's function in Europe especially. But it's also prevalent in Muslim countries. The Quran and its interpretations were the main subjects of study there, although students also learned about the sciences and the arts. Universities as concentrated centers of higher education and research were also established during this time. The University of Bologna, the University of Paris, and the University of Oxford were the earliest academic institutions. Guilds were founded, which was another significant development. In order to govern the practice of their occupations, experienced artisans and

merchants formed guilds. They were in charge of providing vocational training, and new members had to go through a number of levels before becoming masters. General education was significantly impacted by Johann Gutenberg's development of the printing press and subsequent popularization of it in the middle of the 15th century. It greatly decreased the cost of creating books, which were previously written by hand, and as a result increased the distribution of written works, including novel formats like newspapers and pamphlets. The overall level of literacy in the population was significantly impacted by the growing accessibility of written media.

The development of public education in the 18th and 19th centuries was facilitated by these improvements. Publicly sponsored schools were started during this time period with the intention of educating everyone. This differs from former times, when private institutions, religious organizations, and private tutors tended to be the main providers of formal education. The Aztec civilisation was an outlier in that formal education was required for all adolescents beginning in the 14th century, regardless of social level. Related improvements included making schooling for all kids up to a certain age obligatory and free of charge. In the 20th and 21st centuries, efforts to advance public education and universal access to education achieved great strides and were supported by international organizations like the UN. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the Convention on the Rights of the Child, the drive to provide education to all people, the Millennium Development Goals, and the Sustainable Development Goals are a few examples. All types of education saw a steady increase as a consequence of these initiatives, but elementary education was most impacted. For instance, in 1970, 28% of all primary-age children globally were not enrolled in school; by 2015, this percentage has decreased to 9%.

The implementation of uniform curriculum for public schools and standardized examinations to gauge the pupils' development were both unintended consequences of the foundation of public education. Through putting institutions and standards in place to direct and regulate teacher training, such as through creating certification requirements for instructors in public schools, it also had an impact on teachers. The introduction of new instructional technology has an additional impact on modern education. For instance, the widespread use of computers and the internet has significantly improved access to educational materials and opened the door to new forms of education, including online learning. Particularly during the COVID-19 epidemic, this was important. Schools had to be closed for protracted periods of time all throughout the globe. To continue teaching, many provided remote learning options including pre-recorded video classes or video conferencing. The rising internationalization and globalization of education are further modern factors.

Heat is Present

In addition to teaching students facts, most schools place an undue emphasis on teaching them a set of specified abilities, such as how to solve differential equations, write C++ computer code, recognize substances in a test tube, or communicate in Chinese. But we don't really know what specific skills individuals will need since we don't know how the globe or the labor market will look in 2050. By 2050, AI will be able to code software much better than humans, and a new Google Translate app will allow you to carry on a conversation in almost flawless Mandarin, Cantonese, or Hakka even if you only know how to say "Ni hao." We may spend a lot of time and money teaching children how to write in C++ or how to speak Chinese.

What therefore ought to we be instructing? The four Cs: critical thinking, communication, cooperation, and creativity are the subject of much educational debate. In general, schools

should place more emphasis on general life skills and less emphasis on technical abilities. The capacity to adapt to change, learn new things, and maintain your mental equilibrium in strange settings will be the most crucial of all. In order to survive in the world of 2050, you will need to constantly reinvent yourself. This is more important than just coming up with new ideas and goods. Because of the likelihood that the definition of "being human" itself may shift as change accelerates, this trend extends beyond the economy. The Communist Manifesto said that "all that is solid melts into air" as early as 1848. But social and economic systems were primarily on Marx and Engels' minds. Physical and mental structures will both dissolve into air or a cloud of data by the year 2048.

Millions of people left their employment working on country farms in 1848 and relocated to the large cities to work in industries. However, it seemed improbable that they would change their gender or acquire a sixth sense once they arrived in the large metropolis. Additionally, if they were able to get a position in a textile plant, they may anticipate remaining there for the remainder of their working lives. People may have to adapt to cyberspace migrations, fluid gender identities, and novel sensory experiences brought on by computer implants by 2048. If people find fulfillment in creating the newest looks for a 3-D virtual reality game, AI may replace all vocations requiring this degree of creative production over the next ten years, not just this one.

So, at the age of 25, you identify yourself as "a twenty-five-year-old heterosexual woman who lives in London and works in a fashion shop" on a dating website. Your life's purpose, according to you, is to "go where no fashion designer has gone before" at the age of 35. You describe yourself as "a gender-non-specific person undergoing age-adjustment, whose neocortical activity takes place primarily in the NewCosmos virtual world." Dating and self-definition are so dated at age 45. You only have to wait for an algorithm to identify or generate your ideal mate. Regarding deriving significance from the art of fashion design, you are so far outclassed by the algorithms that contemplating your greatest successes from the preceding decade makes you feel ashamed rather than proud. Furthermore, you still have several decades of significant transformation ahead of you at the age of 45.

Please don't read too much into this circumstance. Nobody can actually foresee the precise alterations that will take place. Any specific situation is probably not true at all. It's probably incorrect if someone tells you about the world in the middle of the twenty-first century and it sounds like science fiction. However, if someone attempts to depict the world in the middle of the twenty-first century and it doesn't sound science fiction, it is undoubtedly incorrect. The only thing we can be certain of is change itself, but we cannot be confident of the details.

Such significant change may possibly alter the fundamental makeup of life, making discontinuity its most prominent characteristic. Life has always been split into two complimentary phases: a learning phase and a working phase. During the first stage of life, you learned things, acquired skills, created a worldview, and solidified your identity. The most crucial thing you were doing at fifteen was learning how to cultivate rice, how to negotiate with rapacious rice merchants from the big city, and how to resolve disputes over land and water with the other villagers. This was true even if you spent the majority of your day working in the family's rice field rather than attending a formal school. You depended on your acquired knowledge and abilities to get by in the second half of life, make a livelihood, and give back to society. Of fact, even at fifty, you were still picking up new knowledge about rice, traders, and battles, but these were really minor adjustments to already well-honed skills [7].

Categories For Education

There are several categories for education. Whether education is formal, non-formal, or informal relies on the institutional context. Based on elements including the student's age and the difficulty of the subject matter, several educational levels are identified. Some categories concentrate on the student or the subject. Others depend on the manner of instruction, the platform, or the financing.

1. Formal, Non-Formal and Informal

Types of education are often separated. The three categories of official, non-formal, and informal education are the most typical ones. Some theories, however, merely make the distinction between formal and informal schooling. Formal schooling takes place inside a complicated institutional setting. These frameworks are arranged both chronologically and hierarchically. For instance, the current educational system places students in courses according to their age and academic standing from elementary school through university. The government often oversees and directs formal education. Typically, it is required until a particular age.

Outside of the conventional educational system, there is informal and non-formal education. An intermediate option is non-formal education. It is structured, methodical, and carried out with a specific goal in mind, much like formal education. Examples include the scouting movement, fitness programs, and tutoring. On the other hand, informal education is acquired haphazardly via everyday interactions and exposure to the environment. There is often no defined authority person assigned the responsibility of teaching, unlike formal and non-formal education. Numerous contexts include informal schooling. It occurs often and spontaneously throughout one's lifetime. In the same way that individuals learn to create a food by cooking together, children learn their mother language from their parents.

Some theories divide the three categories depending on where people learn. In schools, formal education is provided. Informal education takes place where daily activities take place. Infrequently frequented locations are where non-formal education takes occur. There are variations in the motivational factors as well. Formal education is mostly motivated by extrinsic incentive for benefits from outside sources. Since learning is enjoyable, non-formal and informal education are intimately related to intrinsic motivation. For the common circumstances, the difference between the three categories is often obvious. However, certain types of education are difficult to categorize.

Modern society is fundamentally dependent on formal education. The majority of education, however, took place at the informal level in prehistoric civilizations. This often indicates that there is no separation between educational activities and other pursuits. Instead, everyone in the environment functions as a teacher while the majority of adults serve as students. However, informal education often isn't effective enough to disseminate a significant amount of information. It often takes a structured environment and qualified instructors to do this. This was one of the factors that contributed to the increasing significance of formal education throughout history. Through this approach, school experience became more impersonal and detached from everyday life. Instead of studying and modeling behavior, there was a greater focus on understanding broad patterns.

2. Levels

Education is often broken down into levels or stages. The International Standard Classification of Education is the most important framework. The United Nations

Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) looks after it. Both official and informal schooling are included. It makes distinctions between levels depending on the age of the pupil, how long they have been studying, and how difficult the subject matter is. Additional criteria include prerequisites for enrollment, teaching credentials, and the desired result of successful completion. Early childhood education (level 0), primary education (level 1), secondary education (levels 2-3), post-secondary non-tertiary education (level 4), and tertiary education (levels 5-8) are the several levels that are combined together.

Preschool education or nursery education are other names for early childhood education. This level of schooling lasts from the time a child is born until the commencement of elementary school. It pursues the all-encompassing objective of promoting early childhood development on the levels of the physical, mental, and social. In terms of socialization and personality development, it is crucial. It covers a variety of fundamental abilities in the fields of learning, communication, and problem-solving. In this manner, it gets kids ready for the start of elementary school.

Primary (or elementary) education typically lasts four to seven years and begins between the ages of five and seven. There are no further qualifications for admittance. Its major objective is to impart the fundamentals of reading, writing, and arithmetic. But it also teaches the fundamentals of other disciplines, like music, art, history, geography, and the sciences. The promotion of personal growth is another goal. In practically all nations today, elementary schooling is required. Around the globe, more than 90% of all students in elementary school attend. The educational level that comes after basic school is secondary education. The typical age range is from 12 to 18.

Lower secondary education, also known as middle school or junior high school, and upper secondary education, sometimes known as high school, senior high school, or college, depending on the nation, are the two main categories. Primary school graduation is often required for admittance into lower secondary education. It seeks to broaden and enhance the learning objectives. It has a stronger emphasis on subject-specific curriculum and instructors who are experts in only one or two areas. The familiarization of pupils with the fundamental theoretical ideas in these domains is one of its objectives. This contributes to laying the groundwork for lifelong learning. It sometimes also consists of vocational training. It is the last phase of obligatory schooling in many nations.

The goal of upper secondary education is to provide students with the abilities and information required for either the workforce or postsecondary study. Typically, completion of lower secondary school is a prerequisite. Its topics are more sophisticated and diversified. The pupils often have a selection of many disciplines. A high school diploma or another official certification is often required for it to be successfully completed. After secondary school, there are several forms of education that are not considered to be tertiary. They often resemble secondary schooling in complexity. However, they often put more of an emphasis on vocational training to get students ready for the workforce. Higher education is another name for tertiary education. It builds on the principles of secondary education but focuses more intently and narrowly on a single area or topic. A degree is awarded upon completion. Short-cycle tertiary, Bachelor's, Master's, and doctorate level education are the four categories that best describe it. They often take the shape of a hierarchy, with subsequent levels dependent on the success of earlier ones.

Practical topics are emphasized in short-cycle tertiary education. To prepare students for the labor market in specialized professions, it involves advanced vocational and professional training. Undergraduate education is another name for education up to the bachelor's degree.

Compared to short-cycle tertiary education, it often lasts longer. It is often provided by colleges and leads to a Bachelor's degree, which serves as an introductory academic credential. Education at the master's level is more specialized than at the undergraduate level. For successful completion, many programs need independent study in the form of a Master's thesis. A doctorate is the advanced research certification that results from doctoral level education. A dissertation or other major scholarly work is often required for submission.

Societal Role

In society, education may play a variety of functions in the social, economic, and personal spheres. Education enables the creation and maintenance of a stable social order. It aids individuals in developing the fundamental abilities required to engage with their surroundings and satisfy their wants and goals. This requires a variety of abilities in today's culture, including the ability to talk, read, and write as well as to solve problems and carry out simple mathematical operations. Using information and communications technology is also a part of it. Developing these talents helps socialize kids into society. Understanding social and cultural norms and expectations is a crucial component of socialization since it teaches people how to interact with one another and live in social groupings. Understanding the conduct that is deemed suitable in various situations is necessary for this. In this manner, the culture, standards, and values that are prevalent in their community are conveyed to new members. Although socialization occurs throughout life, it has a particular bearing on early childhood schooling. It promotes the kind of social cohesiveness, stability, and serenity necessary for individuals to successfully conduct their everyday lives. In democracies, education is crucial because it boosts civic engagement via organizing and voting as well as by its propensity to advance equitable opportunity for everyone.

Another concern is teaching individuals how to participate in society and become useful members of it. People get the technical and analytical abilities necessary to pursue their professions, manufacture commodities, and provide services to others via education. Early cultures lacked specialization, and children often learned the majority of the jobs necessary to support their community. Modern cultures are becoming more complicated, and only a small number of individuals who acquire specialized training in addition to a broad education can master various occupations. The value of certain socially adaptive traits and abilities depends on the situation in which they are used since they may compete with one another. For instance, encouraging a questioning mindset is essential to the development of the capacity for critical thought, yet in other circumstances, deferring to an authoritative figure is vital to maintain societal order.

Education may promote economic development and lessen poverty by assisting individuals in becoming useful members of society. It promotes worker skill development, which raises the quality of products and services produced and, in turn, promotes wealth and greater competitiveness. In this sense, public education is often seen as a long-term investment for the good of society. Particularly for investments in basic education, the rate of return is significant. Along with boosting economic prosperity, it may also result in scientific and technical advancements, reduce unemployment, and enhance social fairness.

Education can equip a nation to effectively adjust to changes and take on new problems. For instance, it may promote awareness of current world issues and assist find solutions. Examples include sustainability and climate change, as well as the growing disparities between the affluent and the poor. It may motivate some students to strive toward the realization of a more sustainable and just society by making them aware of how their lives and activities influence others. In this approach, education may be a tool for growth through

implementing social change to enhance society rather than only serving the aim of replicating society as it is. This also holds true for shifting economic conditions. For instance, many professions might disappear in the next decades as a result of technology advancements and more automation. This might devalue presently taught skills and knowledge while elevating alternative areas of study. By changing the curriculum, education may be utilized to help individuals become ready for these changes. This will help to promote courses that teach digital literacy and how to use new technology. Massive open online courses in the field of education are another example.

Education encourages human growth on a more intimate basis. This might include things like picking up new skills, honing talents, encouraging creativity, expanding one's self-awareness, and sharpening one's problem-solving and decision-making skills. Additionally, it benefits health and wellbeing. Although education is very important in infancy, it continues throughout maturity and throughout life. Lifelong learning is this phenomena. Due to the various ways in which society is changing quickly and the need that individuals adapt to those changes, it is particularly important in today's society. The annual International Day of Education, which is observed on January 24, honors the value of education in society. The year 1970 was designated as the International Year of Education.

Role of Institutions

Organized institutions are important in many facets of education. The education sector is made up of organizations like schools, universities, teacher preparation programs, and ministries of education. They engage with one another as well as with other key players including parents, local communities, and religious organizations. NGOs, healthcare experts, law enforcement, media outlets, and political figures are additional stakeholders. The education industry directly employs a large number of people. Along with teachers, administrators, and students, they also include school nurses and curriculum designers.

Governmental institutions' policies control a number of facets of formal education. They decide when lessons are conducted, what age children must be in school, and details about the school environment, such as infrastructure. Regulations also specify the qualifications needed for instructors and their preparation. The curriculum utilized in classroom instruction in colleges, universities, and other educational institutions is a crucial component of education policy. A curriculum is a set of instructions or a program of study that is intended to direct students' experiences so that they may fulfill the objectives of education. Typically, themes are chosen for schools based on their significance and relevance. The objectives of public school curriculum, for instance, are often to provide a thorough and well-rounded education, but the emphasis of vocational training is primarily on specialized practical abilities within a sector. In addition to the material to be covered, the curricula also address a number of other topics, such as the teaching approach, the goals to be accomplished, and the criteria for judging progress. Governmental organizations strongly influence what information and skills are taught to students by setting the curriculum.

Additionally important to education are international organizations. One international agency that actively supports education is UNESCO. Its advocacy of educational policy is one of its activities. The UNCRC pact is one such. It claims that every kid and young person has the right to an education. The campaign "Education for All" is another. By 2015, it hoped to provide elementary education to all kids, teenagers, and adults. Goal 4 of the initiative Sustainable Development Goals subsequently took its place. The Futures of Education project and the Convention against Discrimination in Education are two related pieces of legislation. There are several significant non-governmental groups that are not intergovernmental. For

instance, the International Association of Universities encourages international collaboration between colleges and universities. International diploma programs are offered by the International Baccalaureate. International student exchanges are facilitated by several organizations, such as the Erasmus Program.

Education Studies

Education studies, often known as education sciences, is the primary field of study for education. It makes an effort to understand how information is transmitted and acquired by examining the delivery systems and educational platforms. Along with the cultural, sociological, political, and historical factors that influence education, it is concerned in the goals, outcomes, and value of education. Different research techniques are used to investigate educational issues. They may be loosely categorized into mixed-methods, qualitative, and quantitative techniques. By collecting data from many observations using exact numerical measures and then analyzing it using statistical tools, quantitative research mimics the techniques used in the natural sciences. It seeks to reach a detached, impersonal understanding. A significantly smaller sample size is often used in qualitative research, which aims to get a thorough understanding of highly individualized and subjective issues like how various actors perceive the educational process. The goal of mixed-methods research is to blend the information obtained from the two methodologies in order to get to a fair and complete understanding. There are several methods to collect data, including via direct observation, test results, interviews, and surveys. Research may be used to explore particular applications, seek for answers to real-world issues, and assess the success of initiatives, in addition to studying fundamental aspects impacting all types of education.

Subfields

Philosophy of education, pedagogy, psychology of education, sociology of education, economics of education, comparative education, and history of education are only a few of the subfields that make up education studies. The discipline of applied philosophy known as "educational philosophy" looks at many of the fundamental presumptions that underlie educational theory and practice. In an effort to provide precise descriptions of its nature and how it varies from other phenomena, it investigates education both as a process and as a discipline. It explores the nature of education, its goals, and the best ways to think about students, instructors, and their interactions. It also covers educational ethics, which looks at many moral questions pertaining to education, such as what moral principles underpin it and how educators should apply them in certain situations. Education philosophy has a long history and was covered in classical Greek philosophy.

Though it is sometimes used as a synonym for education studies, the word "pedagogy" really refers to the discipline that is concerned in teaching techniques. It investigates how educational objectives, such as information dissemination or the development of skills and character characteristics, might be achieved. Some academics limit their study in this area to the techniques and procedures employed in normal schools. But in a broader sense, it includes all kinds of teaching, even those that take place outside of schools. In this broad sense, it investigates how instructors might facilitate experiences for students to deepen their comprehension of the subject being studied as well as the process of learning itself.

Concerned with how social variables affect education and how it contributes to socialization, sociology of education studies these topics. Social variables, which include things like financial class, race, and gender, are distinct from mental elements researched by psychology. The sociology of education investigates how these elements, together with the prevailing ideology in society, influence the kind of education that is accessible to a person and their

level of achievement. How education influences various social groupings and how educational experiences might shape a person's identity are two concerns that are closely connected. The sociology of education is concerned with factors that contribute to inequality and is pertinent to education policy, for instance, when attempting to pinpoint the root causes of inequality and provide solutions for reducing it. Conflict theory and consensus theory are two significant schools of thought. According to consensus theorists, education helps society as a whole by preparing individuals for their duties. Conflict theories see education as a tool used by the ruling class to further their own agenda and have a more pessimistic perspective on the ensuing inequities. The area of research that looks at how education is created, disseminated, and consumed is called education economics. It aims to decide how resources need to be allocated in order to enhance education. As an example, consider the topic of how much paying instructors more improves their quality. The impact of decreasing class sizes on academic achievement and the best ways to fund innovative educational technology are other concerns. In this way, it aids in determining how to allocate scarce resources most effectively for the good of society as a whole. It also aims to comprehend the long-term benefits that education confers on a nation's economy by boosting its competitiveness and supplying a highly trained work force. The benefits and drawbacks of various educational systems from an economic perspective are a closely linked topic.

The field of study known as comparative education analyzes and compares various educational systems. Comparisons may take place from a broad standpoint or may concentrate on particular elements, such as social, political, or economic considerations. It is often used to compare and contrast the educational systems and practices of other nations as well as to analyze the effects of the various strategies. It may be utilized to discover from other nations which educational policies are effective and how one's own educational system could be enhanced. Policy borrowing is the term for this activity. It has several challenges since kids' and instructors' social and cultural contexts may have a significant impact on how well policies work. The issue of whether the educational systems of industrialized nations are better and should be transmitted to less developed nations is a closely linked and contentious subject. The importance of education in transferring from an authoritarian system to a democracy, as well as the globalization of education, are additional important themes.

Objectives and Beliefs

Education studies place a strong emphasis on issues like why individuals should be taught and what objectives should direct this process. There have been many proposed goals for education. On the most fundamental level, education is about acquiring information and skills, but it may also entail personal growth and the development of character qualities. Common recommendations include the propensity to think, feel, and act ethically as well as traits like curiosity, creativity, reason, and critical thinking. Some academics concentrate on liberal principles related to liberty, self-determination, and open-mindedness. Others, however, place more value on traits like deference to authority, intellectual rigor, devotion, and religious belief. The subject of critical thinking's involvement is crucial in this context. It queries whether indoctrination is a component of education. It is often emphasized that education should socialize individuals on a social level. In this manner, it fosters responsible citizenship and protects cultural values while transforming people into useful members of society. Who gains most from education the educated individual, society at large, or powerful organizations within society is a contentious question in this context.

Systems of fundamental philosophical presumptions and concepts make up educational philosophies. In addition to discussing the objectives of education, they also discuss a number of other matters, such as the subjects covered and the organization of the learning process.

The role of the instructor and how the outcomes are to be evaluated are further considerations. They also make assertions about the institutional architecture and policies' structure. Ideologies are many, and they often cross over in different ways. For instance, teacher-centered philosophies emphasize the teacher's function as a conduit for students' learning. Student-centered beliefs encourage students to participate more actively in the process. Product-based philosophies approach the topic of education from the standpoint of the intended outcome. These philosophies stand in contrast to those that are process-based and concentrate on the teaching and learning processes themselves. A different categorization compares progressive beliefs to more conventional and conservative ones. Humanism, romanticism, essentialism, encyclopaedism, and pragmatism are other subcategories. Both authoritarian and democratic philosophies have certain forms.

Theories Of Learning And Instruction

Theories of learning attempt to explain how learning occurs. Behaviorism, cognitivism, and constructivism are influential philosophies. According to behaviorism, learning is the modification of behavior in response to environmental cues. To do this, a stimulus is given to the learner, who then associates it with the desired reaction and solidifies the stimulus-response combination. Cognitivism emphasizes the mental processes involved in storing, retrieving, and processing information and views learning as a change in cognitive structures. Constructivism holds that each person's own experiences serve as the foundation for their learning. More focus is placed on social interactions and how the learner interprets them. These notions have significant effects on how we instruct. For instance, behaviorists often emphasize drills, cognitivists may encourage the use of mnemonic devices, and constructivists frequently utilize cooperative learning techniques.

The teaching approach refers to how the instructor presents the material, such as if group work is done instead of placing a strong emphasis on individual learning. There are several possible instructional strategies. Which one is most effective in a given situation depends on a number of variables, including the subject matter and the age and skill level of the learner. In order to promote a fruitful learning experience, pupils are divided into classes according to age, proficiency, speciality, and native language in contemporary educational systems. Very varied techniques are routinely used for various topics. For instance, verbal learning is often emphasized in language instruction. On the other hand, deductive reasoning and abstract and symbolic thinking are key components of mathematical education. Making ensuring that the student stays motivated, for instance via interest and curiosity or by external incentives, is a fundamental prerequisite for teaching approaches.

The instructional materials employed, such as books, workbooks, and audio-visual recordings, as well as having some kind of exam or evaluation to gauge the learning progress, are further parts of teaching techniques. Each lesson is a component of a wider educational venture that is guided by a syllabus, which is an essential pedagogical feature in many kinds of contemporary education. It often spans a number of months or years. The stages of instruction are defined by Herbartianism. The first stage is getting the pupil mentally ready for new knowledge. The student is then given new concepts, which are subsequently connected to those they are previously acquainted with. Later stages see a change in knowledge to a more basic level behind the particular cases, and the concepts are then applied in practical ways [8], [9].

CONCLUSION

One of society's core pillars, education has the ability to influence how people live and how communities and countries are shaped. It gives people the resources and chances they need to

learn new things, hone vital skills, and get used to a world that is changing quickly. However, there are many problems that education systems must deal with, including uneven access, a lack of funding, and outmoded teaching methods. Prioritizing inclusive and equitable education that acknowledges the variety of learner needs and supports equal opportunities for all will be critical in overcoming these obstacles. Education may genuinely be a transforming force by adopting cutting-edge ideas and methods, enabling people to realize their full potential and promoting long-term social and economic growth. In order to build a future where education is affordable, efficient, and empowering for everyone, efforts to enhance education must be continual and collaborative, engaging stakeholders from all sectors.

REFERENCES

- [1] J. Miranda *et al.*, “The core components of education 4.0 in higher education: Three case studies in engineering education,” *Comput. Electr. Eng.*, 2021, doi: 10.1016/j.compeleceng.2021.107278.
- [2] L. Guo, J. Huang, and Y. Zhang, “Education development in China: Education return, quality, and equity,” *Sustainability (Switzerland)*. 2019. doi: 10.3390/su11133750.
- [3] L. Chen, P. Chen, and Z. Lin, “Artificial Intelligence in Education: A Review,” *IEEE Access*, 2020, doi: 10.1109/ACCESS.2020.2988510.
- [4] M. Teräs, J. Suoranta, H. Teräs, and M. Curcher, “Post-Covid-19 Education and Education Technology ‘Solutionism’: a Seller’s Market,” *Postdigital Sci. Educ.*, 2020, doi: 10.1007/s42438-020-00164-x.
- [5] G. Boldureanu, A. M. Ionescu, A. M. Bercu, M. V. Bedrule-Grigoruță, and D. Boldureanu, “Entrepreneurship education through successful entrepreneurial models in higher education institutions,” *Sustain.*, 2020, doi: 10.3390/su12031267.
- [6] J. S. G. Venegas, “Education and democracy,” *Bajo Palabra*. 2021. doi: 10.15366/BP2020.25.003.
- [7] H. Mei, C. H. Lee, and Y. Xiang, “Entrepreneurship education and students’ entrepreneurial intention in higher education,” *Educ. Sci.*, 2020, doi: 10.3390/educsci10090257.
- [8] L. V. Shukshina, L. A. Gegel, M. A. Erofeeva, I. D. Levina, U. Y. Chugaeva, and O. D. Nikitin, “STEM and STEAM Education in Russian Education: Conceptual Framework,” *Eurasia J. Math. Sci. Technol. Educ.*, 2021, doi: 10.29333/ejmste/11184.
- [9] R. Alda, H. Boholano, and F. Dayagbil, “Teacher education institutions in the philippines towards education 4.0,” *Int. J. Learn. Teach. Educ. Res.*, 2020, doi: 10.26803/ijlter.19.8.8.

CHAPTER 21

A BRIEF DISCUSSION ON MEANING OF LIFE

Mr. Rajkumar Bargujar, Associate Professor

School of Hotel Management & Catering Technology, Jaipur National University, Jaipur, India

Email Id: rajkumar.bargujar@jnujaipur.ac.in

ABSTRACT:

The important question of "what is the meaning of life?" is examined in this chapter. Philosophers, theologians, and intellectuals have pondered the idea of life's purpose throughout history. The presence of a higher power or divine design is a common theme in religious and spiritual frameworks that provide meaning. Existentialist philosophy emphasizes freedom and responsibility while arguing that people construct their own meaning via their own experiences and decisions. There have been many different ideas and points of view put out, ranging from existentialist and nihilistic views to religious and spiritual convictions. This chapter explores different viewpoints in an effort to provide readers a thorough grasp of life's purpose.

KEYWORDS:

Life, Purpose, Philosophy, Spirituality.

INTRODUCTION

Who am I? How should I live my life? What purpose does life serve? These inquiries have been made by people from the beginning of time. Each generation must come up with a fresh solution since our knowledge and ignorance are always evolving. What is the best response we can provide at this time, given what we know and don't know about science, God, politics, and religion? What kind of response do they anticipate? Almost often, when someone asks what life is all about, they anticipate hearing a tale. Humans are storytellers who think in narratives rather than numerical or graphical representations. They also believe that the cosmos is a series of interconnected narratives with protagonists and antagonists, conflicts and resolutions, climaxes, and joyful endings. When searching for the meaning of life, we seek a narrative that will reveal the nature of reality and my special place in the grand scheme of things. All of my experiences and decisions are explained by this job, which also defines who I am [1]–[3].

We are all a part of an endless cycle that includes and unites all creatures, according to one well-known narrative that has been recounted to nervous humans for thousands of years to countless numbers of people. Every being has a certain role to play in the cycle. Knowing the purpose of your life requires knowing your special purpose, and living a happy life entails fulfilling that purpose. In the middle of a bloody civil conflict, the great warrior prince Arjuna becomes overcome with doubts, according to the Hindu epic the Bhagavad-Gita. He hesitates to battle and murder them after seeing his friends and relatives among the enemy force. He starts to wonder about the origins of good and evil, who made those decisions, and the meaning of existence. The deity Krishna then explains to Arjuna that each individual has a distinct "dharma" within the vast cosmic cycle, which is the route you must take and the obligations you must fulfill. No matter how difficult the journey may be, when you realize your dharma, you experience inner tranquility and are freed from any uncertainties. You will upset the cosmic equilibrium and never be able to experience either serenity or joy if you choose not to pursue your dharma and instead attempt to follow someone else's route or

wander about with no path at all. Whatever road you choose, as long as you pursue it, it doesn't matter. A washerwoman who faithfully adheres to the washerwoman's path is considerably preferable than a prince who veers from the prince's path. After coming to terms with life's purpose, Arjuna obeys his dharma and becomes a warrior. He murders his friends and family, commands his army to victory, and goes on to become one of Hinduism's most revered and adored heroes.

This old tale was updated for contemporary viewers in the 1994 Disney classic *The Lion King*, with the young lion Simba filling in for Arjuna. Simba's father, the lion king Mufasa, explains the vast Circle of Life to him when he asks what life is all about. The lions kill the antelopes, the antelopes are eaten by the lions, and the lions' decayed bodies nourish the grass once they die, according to Mufasa. If every animal participates in the drama, this is how life passes along from one generation to the next. Since everything is interconnected and everyone is dependent upon one another, the Circle of Life might come to an end if even one blade of grass fails to fulfill its purpose. Mufasa claims that Simba's purpose in life is to lead the lion kingdom once he passes away and maintain order among the other animals.

Young Simba, however, feels responsible for Mufasa's untimely death and flees the lion kingdom, shunning his regal destiny, and wandering out into the woods. He is so overcome with remorse that he never returns. He meets a meerkat and a warthog there, along with two other misfits, and the three of them enjoy a few blissful years away from civilization. They respond to any issue by repeating the antisocial phrase "Hakuna matata," which means "no worries." Simba, though, is bound by his dharma. He grows older and gets more disturbed as a result of not knowing who he is or what he should do with his life. The ghost of Mufasa appears to Simba in a vision at the movie's turning point and reminds him of the Circle of Life and his status as a king. Simba also finds out that during his absence, the wicked Scar ascended to the throne and mismanaged the kingdom, which is now severely plagued by discord and starvation. Simba has finally come to terms with who he is and what he ought to do. He murders his uncle upon his return to the lion kingdom, ascends to the throne, and restores peace and prosperity. The great Circle of Life is ensured by a proud Simba presenting his newborn heir to the gathered animals as the film comes to a close.

The cosmic drama is told as a cyclical tale in *The Circle of Life*. As far as Simba and Arjuna are aware, lions have consumed antelope for millennia and will continue to do so in the future. The myth is given weight by the perpetual repeating, which implies that this is the way things must be and that Arjuna avoiding battle or Simba rejecting the throne would be against nature's own rules. If I accept the Circle of Life tale in whatever form, it implies that I have a genuine identity that is fixed and defines my responsibilities in life. For many years, I may be unsure or unaware of my identity, but one day, at a moment of tremendous drama, it will be revealed. At that time, I will comprehend my place in the cosmic drama, and even though I may go through many hardships and tribulations in the future, I will be free from uncertainty and hopelessness.

Other philosophies and faiths believe that the universe is a sequential story with a clear beginning, a brief middle, and a conclusive conclusion. For instance, according to the Muslim narrative, Allah created the cosmos and established its rules from the beginning. He subsequently made these rules known to people in the Qur'an. Unfortunately, ignorant and evil individuals revolted against Allah and attempted to violate or conceal these regulations; it is now the responsibility of righteous and obedient Muslims to defend these laws and disseminate information about them. Allah will eventually assess each and every person's behavior on the Day of Judgment. He will cast the wicked into the fiery depths of hell while rewarding the good with eternal joy in paradise. This big tale suggests that my little but

significant contribution to life is to obey Allah's directives, disseminate awareness of His rules, and assure adherence to His will. If I accept the Muslim narrative, I will find significance in doing five times a day of prayer, giving money to construct a new mosque, and battling apostates and unbelievers. Even the most commonplace actions like hand washing, drinking wine, and having sex have deeper spiritual significance [4]–[6].

Nationalism supports a linear narrative as well. Thus, the Zionist narrative starts with the exploits and triumphs of the Jewish people in the Bible, follows them through 2,000 years of exile and persecution, culminates in the Holocaust and the creation of the state of Israel, and then anticipates the day when Israel will experience peace and prosperity and turn into a moral and spiritual beacon for the entire world. If the Zionist narrative is true, I come to the conclusion that my life's work is to serve the interests of the Jewish people by defending the Hebrew language's integrity, battling to retake lost Jewish land, or even by having and raising a new generation of devoted Israeli children. In this instance as well, even mundane tasks have significance. Israeli kids often join in on a well-known Hebrew hymn celebrating any deed carried out for the benefit of the nation on Independence Day. A group of children eventually joins together to sing, "So we have a house, and a tree, and a poem [and whatever else you would like to add] in the land of Israel," after one child sings, "I've built a house in the land of Israel," another, "I've planted a tree in the land of Israel," a third, "I've written a poem in the land of Israel," and so on.

Communist ideology presents a similar tale, but it emphasizes class over race. The Communist Manifesto states in its first paragraph that: Class conflicts have shaped every culture that has existed thus far. Freeman and slave, aristocrat and peasant, lord and serf, guild master and journeyman in other words, oppressor and oppressed were in constant conflict with one another. This conflict continued unabatedly, now in secret, now in the open, and it always resulted in either a revolution that rebuilt society as a whole or the mutual ruin of the contending classes. The manifesto continues by stating that society as a whole is increasingly dividing into two vastly opposed camps, or two vast groups that are directly opposed to one another: the bourgeoisie and the proletariat. The proletariat will triumph in their battle, marking the end of history and the beginning of the communist paradise on earth, where nobody will own anything and everyone will be totally free and content. If I accept this communist narrative, I come to the conclusion that my life's work is to hasten the world revolution by penning ferocious pamphlets, planning strikes and protests, possibly assassinating rapacious capitalists, and engaging in combat with their lackeys. The narrative offers context to even the tiniest actions, such as boycotting a company that takes advantage of Bangladeshi textile workers or sparring with my capitalist-pig father-in-law at Christmas dinner.

It is startling to realize that size means relatively little when considering the whole spectrum of narratives that aim to uncover my actual identity and explain why I behaved the way I did. Some narratives, like Simba's Circle of Life, seem to go on forever. I can only understand who I am in the context of the whole cosmos. In contrast, other tales, like the majority of nationalist and tribal myths, are insignificant. Zionism reveres the exploits of 0.2 percent of humanity and 0.005 percent of the earth's surface during a very little period of time. The Zionist narrative is unable to assign any significance to the Chinese dynasties, the tribes of New Guinea, the Andromeda galaxy, or the innumerable ages that came before Moses, Abraham, and the apes' development. Such myopia may have detrimental effects. An important barrier to any peace agreement between Israelis and Palestinians, for instance, is

Israel's refusal to split Jerusalem. They contend that this city is "the eternal capital of the Jewish people," and you can't possibly make concessions when dealing with something enduring. What do a few mortals mean in the grand scheme of things? Of course, this is just rubbish. The cosmos has been around for at least 13.8 billion years, which is the length of eternity. Humans have been around for at least 2 million years, while the planet Earth created roughly 4.5 billion years ago. In contrast, Jerusalem was founded just 5,000 years ago, and the Jewish people have a maximum age of 3,000 years. This scarcely counts as an eon.

DISCUSSION

In terms of the future, science predicts that Earth will be swallowed up by an expanding solar in roughly 7.5 billion years and that our cosmos will last for at least another 13 billion years. Is there really anybody out there who thinks the Jewish people, the state of Israel, or the city of Jerusalem will still be there in 13,000 years, much alone 13 billion? Zionism's perspective for the future, although just a few millennia, is sufficient to zap the imagination of the majority of Israelis and somehow qualify as "eternity." Additionally, individuals are prepared to make sacrifices for "the eternal city," but they would undoubtedly decline to do so for a fleeting collection of dwellings.

I was originally drawn in by the nationalist promise of being a part of something greater than myself as an Israeli kid. I wanted to think that if I sacrificed my life for the country, I would dwell there forever. However, I was unable to understand what it meant "to live for ever in the nation." What did the sentence truly imply, despite how deep it sounded? When I was about thirteen or fourteen, I can very clearly recall one specific Memorial Day celebration. While Memorial Day in the United States is mostly celebrated with sales, it is a very somber and significant day in Israel. Schools around Israel organize programs on this day to honor the dead troops from the country's several conflicts. The children wear all-white clothing, read poetry, perform songs, lay wreaths, and wave flags. So there I was at our school's ceremony wearing all white, thinking to myself naturally that I too would want to be a fallen soldier when I grew up in between flag-waving and poetry recitations. After all, if I were a brave fallen soldier who gave his life in defense of Israel, all of these children would be reading poetry and raising flags in my honor [7], [8].

But then I said to myself, "Wait a second. How would I know that these children were indeed performing poetry in my honor if I were dead? I so made an effort to visualize my death. And when I listened to the poetry coming from above the earth, I envisioned myself laying behind a white headstone in a tidy military cemetery. Then I reasoned, "If I am dead, then I cannot hear any poems, for I have no ears, no brain, and I cannot hear or feel anything." What's the purpose then? And to make matters worse, by the time I was thirteen, I was aware that the cosmos is a few billion years old and would likely continue to exist for many more billions of years. Was it possible for me to believe that Israel would last for so long? Will white-clad Homo sapiens children still chant poetry in my honor 200 million years from now? The entire scheme of things seemed suspicious. Don't be arrogant if you happen to be Palestinian. Equally implausible is the existence of any Palestinians in 200 million years. In fact, it's quite likely that there won't be any animals left by then. Other national movements are as obtuse. While Korean nationalists think that a little peninsula on Asia's east coast is the only region of the universe that really counts in the big scheme of things, Serbian nationalism is unconcerned with events from the Jurassic period.

Of all, even Simba, who is so devoted to the Circle of Life's eternal nature, never stops to consider the possibility that grass, antelopes, and lions aren't actually forever. Simba does not examine the state of the universe prior to the development of mammals or what would

happen to the beautiful African savannah if all the lions were killed and the meadows were covered with asphalt and concrete. Would this completely negate the purpose of Simba's life?

All tales are unfinished. But I don't actually need a comprehensive tale free of flaws and internal inconsistencies to create a workable identity for myself and give my life purpose. Just two requirements must be met for a tale to give my life purpose: first, it must assign me some kind of part to perform. A tribesman from New Guinea is unlikely to hold Zionism or Serbian nationalism in high regard since both ideologies have zero regard for New Guinea and its inhabitants. Humans like only those storylines that give them a prominent position, much like movie stars. Second, although a good tale need not continue on forever, it must go beyond my limitations. The tale gives me a sense of identity and gives my life purpose by integrating me into something greater than myself. But there's always a chance that I'll start to question what that "something bigger" means. If helping the proletariat or the Polish country is the purpose of my existence, what precisely gives the proletariat or the Polish nation purpose? A guy once allegedly said that the globe is stabilized by sitting on the back of a massive elephant. He said that the elephant is on the back of a big turtle when asked what it is standing on. the turtle, too? on the shell of a much larger turtle. Also, the larger turtle? Don't worry about it, the guy snapped. It's turtles all the way down from there.

The best tales are still unfinished. They are so skilled at grabbing people's attention and holding it there that they never need to explain where meaning ultimately derives from. As a result, while discussing how the planet is supported by a large elephant, you should go into great detail on how the elephant's enormous ears generate storms and earthquakes when it is angry. This will help you avoid any awkward inquiries. Nobody will wonder what the elephant is standing on if your yarn is nice enough. Similar to this, nationalism charms us with stories of bravery, brings us to tears by remembering previous tragedies, and enflames our rage by focusing on the injustices our country has endured. We get so engrossed in this national saga that we stop questioning why our country is so important in the first place and begin judging everything that occurs in the outside world according to how it will affect us.

When you believe a certain tale, it piques your attention in even the smallest details while keeping you oblivious to everything outside of its purview. Devout communists may spend countless hours debating whether it is acceptable to form a coalition with social democrats in the early stages of revolution, but they rarely take the time to reflect on the role of the proletariat in the development of mammalian life on Earth or the spread of organic life in the universe. Such meaningless chatter is seen as a counterrevolutionary waste of time. While some tales take the bother to cover all of space and time, the ability to hold the audience's attention enables many other effective stories to maintain a far more constrained scope. One of the most important rules of storytelling is that once a narrative succeeds in going beyond the horizon of the audience, its final scope becomes less important. For the sake of a billion-year-old deity as well as a country with a thousand-year history, people may act with the same homicidal fanaticism.

Simply said, most people struggle with huge numbers. Most of the time, it takes remarkably little to push our imagination to its limit. Given what we know about the world, it would seem absolutely illogical for any rational person to think that the history of nationalism in general, as well as nationalism in Israel, Germany, or Russia, is the ultimate truth about the cosmos and human life. A tale that overlooks practically all of space, time, the Big Bang, quantum physics, and life's development is, at best, just partially accurate. Yet people manage to ignore it in some way. In fact, throughout history, billions of individuals have held the view that in order for their lives to be meaningful, they don't even need to be assimilated into a country or a major ideological movement. It suffices if they just "leave something behind,"

guaranteeing that their life's work lives on after they pass away. My ideal "something" to leave behind is my soul or my unique spirit. Death is not the end if I am reincarnated in a new body when my current body expires. The story that started in one chapter will continue in the next one; there is just a pause between them. Even if they do not base it on any particular religion, many individuals at least have a hazy belief in such an idea. They just need the soothing knowledge that their tale continues when they pass away, not a complex ideology. This widely held and immensely enticing worldview that views life as a never-ending epic has two fundamental flaws. First off, I don't actually make my personal narrative more important by making it longer. I just lengthen it. In fact, Hinduism and Buddhism, the two major faiths that accept the notion of an endless cycle of births and deaths, share a loathing of the futility of it all. Over and over again, I am born, I grow up, I argue with my mother-in-law, I become sick, I pass away, and then I repeat the process all over again. What is the purpose? The Pacific Ocean would be filled with all the tears I've wept during my past lifetimes, and the Himalayas would be taller than the height of all the teeth and hair I've lost combined. And what do I have to show for it all? It makes sense that Hindu and Buddhist sages have both concentrated much of their efforts on figuring out how to exit this cycle rather than continue it.

The lack of evidence supporting this idea is the second issue. What evidence do I have that I was a medieval peasant, a Neanderthal hunter, a Tyrannosaurus rex, or an amoeba in a previous life? If I had really lived millions of lifetimes, I would have been both a dinosaur and an amoeba at some point. Who guarantees that I won't come back as a frog, a cyborg, or perhaps an interstellar explorer? It would be like to selling my home for a post-dated check drawn on a bank above the clouds if I based my life on this promise. People who question whether a soul or spirit really survives death try to leave behind something a little more concrete. It is possible for such "something tangible" to be biological or cultural. For example, I may leave behind a poem or a few of my priceless genes. Because my poetry will still be read 100 years from now or because my children and grandkids will still be alive, my existence has value. And what purpose do their lives serve? That's their issue, not mine, I suppose. Thus, trying to figure out the purpose of life is a little like handling a live hand grenade. You are protected once you transfer it to someone else. Unfortunately, this simple wish to just "leave something behind" is seldom realized.

The majority of species that have ever lived died away and left no genetic legacy. For instance, almost all of the dinosaurs. Or a Neanderthal family that perished when Sapiens seized over. or the Polish family of my grandma. My grandmother Fanny moved to Jerusalem in 1934 together with her parents, two sisters, and a large number of relatives who remained in the Polish cities of Chmielnik and Czstochowa. A few years later, the Nazis arrived and exterminated them down to the last kid. Few cultural legacies are ever attempted with greater success. Only a few fading faces from my grandmother's Polish kin remain in the family book, and even at age 96, she is unable to put names to the faces. To the best of my knowledge, they haven't produced any works of culture, not even a shopping list or a journal. You may say that they are a part of the Jewish people's or the Zionist movement's communal legacy, but that hardly provides value to each person's life. Furthermore, how can you be certain that everyone embraced their Jewish heritage or supported the Zionist movement? Perhaps one of them was a fervent communist who gave his life to spy for the Soviets? Perhaps another, who served as an officer in the Polish army and wanted nothing more than to fit in, was murdered by the Soviets during the Katyn massacre?

Perhaps a third of them rejected all conventional nationalist and religious identities and identified as a radical feminist? Since they left nothing behind, it is much too simple to

recruit them after their deaths to this or that cause, and they are unable to object. If we are unable to leave a gene or a poem behind, maybe it will be sufficient if we can just slightly improve the world. You may have a positive impact on the world by helping someone who will then go on to assist someone else. You so become a modest link in the long chain of good deeds. Maybe you act as a role model for a challenging but bright youngster who grows up to become a doctor and saves the lives of hundreds of people? Perhaps you can make an elderly woman's hour of life better by assisting her in crossing the street? The great chain of kindness has many advantages, but unlike the great chain of turtles, it is not immediately obvious what it means. The question of the purpose of life was put to a wise elderly man. Well, I've discovered that my purpose for being on planet is to assist others, he said. Why the other folks are here is something that I still don't understand.

Perhaps the most secure and frugal narrative for people who don't trust any big chains, future legacies, or communal epics is romance. It doesn't try to see beyond the present. As several love poems attest, when you are in love, your beloved's earlobe, eyelash, or nipple becomes your whole world. Romeo says, "O, that I were a glove upon that hand, That I might touch that cheek," as he looks at Juliet who is resting her face on her hand. You feel linked to the whole universe by focusing on a single body in the here and now at reality, the person you love is simply another person, not fundamentally different from the many others you pass by every day on the train and at the grocery store. However, he or she seems limitless to you, and you are content to lose yourself in that limitlessness. All types of mystic poets have often confused cosmic unity with romantic love by describing God as a lover. Romantic writers have returned the favor by describing their loves as gods in their works. You never question the purpose of life when you are really in love.

If you're not in love, what then? Well, if you buy into the love tale Though you are not in a relationship, at least you are aware of your life's purpose, which is to discover genuine love. You have read about it in many novels and seen it in countless movies. You know that one day you'll find that special someone, that you'll see infinity in two sparkling eyes, that everything in your life will suddenly make sense, and that all the questions you've ever had will be answered by repeating one name over and over again, just like Tony in West Side Story or Romeo when he sees Juliet standing on the balcony looking down at him.

The weight of the Roof

While a good narrative must cast me in a certain position and go beyond my current understanding, it need not be real. Even if a tale is entirely made up, it may give me a sense of identity and give my life purpose. To the best of our scientific knowledge, none of the many tales that various societies, religions, and tribes have concocted throughout the course of history are real. They are all only creations of humans. Know that a tale is the incorrect response if you ask someone what life's actual purpose is. The specifics aren't that important. Simply because it is a narrative, every single one is false. Simply said, the cosmos doesn't function like a tale.

Why then do people accept these myths as fact? One explanation is that the tale is the foundation of their own identity. From an early age, people are trained to trust the tale. They learn it through their parents, teachers, neighbors, and the community at large long before they have the mental and emotional maturity required to challenge and validate such tales. When their intelligence develops, they are already so emotionally engaged in the narrative that they are far more likely to utilize their intellect to support the narrative than to cast doubt on it. Most individuals who go on identity searches behave like little children who are looking for treasure. They only discover things that their parents have pre-hidden for them.

Second, the tale serves as the foundation for both our individual and societal identities. It is thus quite unsettling to have any doubts about the account. Anyone who attempts to achieve this is marginalized or punished in many civilizations. Even if not, it takes guts to challenge society's foundation. Because if the tale is in fact wrong, then everything in the world as we know it is absurd. State regulations, societal customs, and financial institutions might all fail.

Instead of the strength of their foundations, most stories are kept together by the weight of their roof. Think about the biblical tale. It is built on the thinnest of foundations. What proof do we have that the universe's creator's son was born some 2,000 years ago as a carbon-based living form somewhere in the Milky Way? What proof do we have that it took place in Galilee and that His mother was a virgin? However, substantial international institutions have been erected on top of that narrative, and their immense weight pushes down so forcefully that it maintains the narrative. A single word in the narrative has become the subject of whole conflicts. The one phrase "filioque" (Latin for "and from the son") caused the thousand-year divide between Western and Eastern Orthodox Christians, which lately expressed itself in the reciprocal butchery of Croats by Serbs and Serbs by Croats. The Eastern Christians strenuously opposed to the Western Christians' desire to include this phrase into the Christian statement of faith. It is impossible to question a tale after personal identities and whole social institutions have been constructed around it, not because the evidence is conclusive, but rather because to do so would result in a personal and societal devastation. In the past, the roof has sometimes been more significant than the base.

The Identity Portfolio

Greeks, Canaanites, and ancient Egyptians all hedged their offerings. They believed in a variety of gods, and they thought that if one did not provide, another would. They offered sacrifices to the earth goddess at midday, the sun god in the morning, and a group of fairies and demons in the evening. That hasn't altered much either. Today's population believes in a variety of incomplete, contradictory tales and deities, including Yahweh, Mammon, the Nation, and the Revolution. As a result, individuals seldom place all of their confidence in a single narrative. Instead, they maintain a portfolio of many narratives and personas, moving between them as necessary. Most civilizations and movements have some kind of cognitive dissonance.

Think about the average Tea Party member who manages to reconcile their fervent faith in Jesus Christ with their steadfast opposition to government assistance programs and their enthusiastic allegiance to the National Rifle Association. Jesus didn't seem to be as interested in arming oneself to the teeth as he was in aiding the poor. The human brain contains many drawers and compartments, and although it may seem incompatible, certain neurons just cannot communicate with one another. Similar to this, many Bernie Sanders followers believe in some unspecified future revolution while still emphasizing the need of making prudent financial decisions. They may easily go from talking about the unfair distribution of wealth in the globe to talking about how their Wall Street assets are doing. Almost nobody just has one identity. Nobody is just a capitalist, just an Italian, just a Muslim, etc. However, every now and again a fanatical religion emerges and demands that individuals adhere to a single narrative and identity. Fascism was the most extreme of these ideologies in recent decades.

Fascism maintained that individuals should only have their national identity and should not have any other beliefs than the nationalist narrative. Fascists are not all nationalists. The majority of nationalists have tremendous trust in their country's history, emphasize the special qualities of their country and the special duties they have to it, but they also recognize that

there is more to the world than simply their country. I may have different identities while still being a devoted Italian with particular responsibilities to the Italian people. I can also identify as a socialist, a Catholic, a scientist, a vegetarian, a spouse, and a parent, all of which come with extra responsibilities. Sometimes I feel like I'm being pulled in various ways by a number of different identities, and some of my responsibilities contradict with one another. But who said life was simple?

When nationalism tries to make life too simple for itself by ignoring all other identities and duties, fascism results. The definition of fascism has recently been the subject of much debate. Almost anybody who offends others is referred to be a fascist. The phrase runs the risk of becoming an all-purpose insult. What does that really imply then? In short, nationalism teaches me that my country is exceptional and that I have unique responsibilities to it, but fascist teaches me that my nation is supreme and that I have unique obligations to it. No of the situation, I should never put the interests of any group or person ahead of those of my country since it is the only thing that matters in the world. I should have no qualms about backing my country, even if it stands to earn a pitiful profit off of inflicting great suffering on millions of strangers in a distant location. In every other case, I am a vile traitor.

I should slaughter millions of people if my country requires it of me. I should sacrifice my family if my country requires me to do so. If my country asks that I violate truth and beauty, then I should do so. How does a fascist assess works of art? How does a fascist determine if a film is excellent or bad? It's quite easy. There is just one metric to use. A good movie is one that promotes the interests of the country. A terrible movie is one that does not advance the interests of the country. And how can a fascist choose what to instruct children in? He applies the same standard. Whatever promotes the interests of the country should be taught to the children; the truth is irrelevant.

This worship of the country is very alluring, not only because it makes many complex problems simpler, but also because it makes individuals believe that they are a part of the most significant and stunning entity in the world their nation. The Holocaust and the Second World War's atrocities serve as examples of the devastating results of this way of thinking. Unfortunately, when individuals discuss the negative aspects of fascism, they often do a bad job of it because they prefer to paint it as a monstrous monster without explaining what is so alluring about it. Because of this, some individuals today unknowingly acquire fascist ideologies.

Many people believe that they cannot be fascists because they were taught that it is ugly and that when they look in the mirror, they see something really lovely. It is similar to the error made by Hollywood movies when they portray the villains as ugly and cruel, such as Voldemort, Lord Sauron, and Darth Vader. Even when dealing with their most devoted fans, they are often unpleasant and vicious. When I see such films, I never understand why someone would be persuaded to follow a repulsive freak like Voldemort. The issue with evil is that it isn't always distasteful in the actual world. It may seem to be quite lovely. Hollywood recognized this better than Christianity, which is why early Christian art often portrayed Satan as a hottie. Because of this, it may be quite challenging to reject Satan's temptations. Fascism is tough to combat in part because of this. The image that appears when you look in the fascist mirror is not at all unpleasant. Germany was seen as the most beautiful thing in the world by Germans in the fascist mirror of the 1930s. Russia would seem to be the most beautiful thing in the world if Russians now looked in the fascist mirror. Israel will seem to Israelis to be the most beautiful thing in the world if they gaze in the fascist mirror. Then they'll want to disappear within that lovely communal.

The Latin word "fascis," which means "a bundle of rods," is where the term "fascism" originates. That seems like a fairly unattractive representation of one of the most vicious and lethal philosophies in human history. But it has a profound and evil significance. A single rod is very frail and can readily split in half. However, it becomes very hard to break them once you bundle many rods together into a fascis. This suggests that although the individual is unimportant, the group is very potent as long as it remains united. Fascists require that no single rod ever dares to sever the integrity of the bundle because they think that the interests of the collective should take precedence over those of any individual. Naturally, it is never really evident where one human 'bundle of rods' ends and another one starts. What makes me think of Italy as the collection of rods to which I belong? Why not my family, Florence, Tuscany, the whole of Europe, the entire human race, or any of those places? The more moderate types of nationalism will inform me that I may have responsibilities to my family, Florence, Europe, and all of humanity in addition to having unique responsibilities to Italy. Italian fascists, on the other hand, will demand complete devotion to Italy alone.

Despite Mussolini's and his fascist party's best efforts, the majority of Italians remained relatively ambivalent about placing Italy above their families. Although the Nazi propaganda machine in Germany performed a far better job than it did elsewhere, even Hitler was unable to make the public forget about all the competing narratives. People always preserved a couple of alternative narratives in addition to the official one, even throughout the worst moments of the Nazi regime. In 1945, this was made very evident. You would have expected that many Germans would be completely unable to make sense of their post-war existence following twelve years of Nazi indoctrination. What to do when a fantastic narrative that they had all of their confidence in blew up? But the majority of Germans recovered quite quickly. As soon as Hitler was shot in the head, people in Berlin, Hamburg, and Munich formed new identities and discovered new meanings for their lives. This is because they were holding onto some other versions of the world in the back of their brains.

It is accurate to say that 10% of generals and around 20% of Nazi gauleiters—regional party leaders—committed suicide. However, this indicates that 90% of generals and 80% of gauleiters were content with their living conditions. The great majority of Nazis who carried identification cards and even members of the SS rank and file did not commit themselves or become mad. They later succeeded as successful farmers, teachers, physicians, and insurance brokers. Even committing suicide shows that one is not completely committed to a particular narrative. The Islamic State planned numerous suicide bombings that took place in Paris on November 13, 2015, leaving 130 people dead. The terrorist organization said that it did so in retaliation for French airstrikes that targeted Islamic State members in Syria and Iraq, and in the hope that France would be discouraged from launching such attacks in the future.

The Islamic State also claimed that all Muslims killed by the French air force were martyrs who now experience everlasting pleasure in paradise in the same sentence. Something about this is illogical. Why would anybody want retaliation if the victims murdered by the French air force are indeed already in heaven? What precisely is there to avenge? For conveying individuals to heaven? Would you start detonating lottery booths in retaliation if you had just learned that your dear brother had won a million dollars in the lottery? So why, simply because the French air force provided a couple of your brothers a one-way ticket to heaven, go on the rampage in Paris? If you were to succeed in stopping the French from attacking Syria further, it would be much worse. Because fewer Muslims would enter paradise in such scenario.

We could be tempted to draw the conclusion that supporters of the Islamic State do not really think martyrs go to paradise. They are upset when they are bombed and murdered because of

this. If that's the case, then why do some of them put on explosive belts and voluntarily blow themselves to pieces? The most likely explanation is that people continue to believe two conflicting tales without giving the contradictions any thought. As was previously said, certain neurons are merely unable to communicate with one another.

Eight centuries ago, a different French army entered the Middle East in what would come to be known as "the Seventh Crusade," eight centuries before the French air force blasted Islamic State positions in Syria and Iraq. The crusaders, led by the saintly King Louis IX, sought to take the Nile Valley and convert Egypt into a stronghold for Christianity. At the Battle of Mansoura, they were thwarted, and the majority of the crusaders were captured. The crusader knight Jean de Joinville subsequently recalled in his memoirs that one of his soldiers objected to the decision to surrender after the fight was lost. What I suggest is that we all let ourselves die because then we would all enter heaven. Joinville says sarcastically, "None of us heeded his advice."

Joinville has not said why they objected. After all, it was the promise of everlasting salvation that led these men to abandon their cozy chateaux in France for a protracted and dangerous journey in the Middle East. Why then would they choose Muslim enslavement when they were only seconds away from the unending joy of paradise? Even though the crusaders strongly believed in redemption and heaven, it seems that they decided to take a safe bet when the going got tough.

The Reality Check

There is no need to give up hope, despite the fact that all of these major tales are fictional creations of our own thoughts. Reality still exists. But why would you want to do that in the first place? You cannot take part in any fictional drama. Humans' main concern isn't "what is the meaning of life," but rather "how do we escape pain?" When you stop believing in all the lies, you can see reality much more clearly than before, and if you really understand the truth about yourself and the world, nothing can bring you misery. Of course, it is much easier said than done. Because we can make up and believe in tales, humans have ruled the planet. As a result, humans have an especially hard time telling fact from fiction. For us, ignoring this distinction has been essential to our survival. Suffering is a good place to start if you still want to understand the differences. Because pain is the most genuine thing in the world.

One of the most important questions to address when determining if a fantastic narrative is fictional or genuine is whether the main character in the story may experience pain. Consider if Poland may suffer, for instance, if someone recounts the history of that country. The renowned Romantic poet and founder of contemporary Polish nationalism, Adam Mickiewicz, is credited as referring to Poland as "the Christ of nations." Writing in 1832, after Poland had been divided among Russia, Prussia, and Austria and soon after the brutal Russian suppression of the Polish uprising of 1830, Mickiewicz explained that Poland's horrific suffering was a sacrifice on behalf of all of humanity, comparable to Christ's sacrifice, and that Poland will rise from the dead just like Christ did.

In a well-known line, Mickiewicz stated:

Poland said, "Whoever comes to me shall be free and equal because I am FREEDOM," to the people of Europe. However, the monarchs were so terrified by what they heard that they crucified and buried the Polish people while yelling, "We have slain and buried Freedom." But they stupidly screamed out. Because the Polish Nation survived. The soul will return to the body on the third day, at which point the nation will rise up and liberate all of Europe's people from slavery.

Can a country really suffer? Having eyes, hands, senses, emotions, and passions as a nation? Can it bleed if you puncture it? Of course not. Even if it loses a battle, a province, or even its independence, it won't be able to feel any form of suffering since it lacks a body, a mind, or any kind of emotion at all. It's only a metaphor, in actuality. Poland is not a genuine country capable of suffering; it only exists in the imagination of certain people. These people provide Poland the physical support it needs to survive, embodying the nation's pleasures and sorrows in addition to serving as soldiers in the army. When word of the Polish loss at the battle of Ostroka reached Warsaw in May 1831, people's stomachs twisted in agony, their chests hurt, and their eyes welled up with tears.

Of course, none of these excuses the Russian invasion or takes away from Poles' right to found a nation and develop their own laws and customs. However, it does imply that in the end, reality cannot be the tale of the Polish people since Poland rests on the ideas that people have in their heads. Contrarily, think about what happened to the Warsaw lady who was robbed and raped by the Russian invaders. The agony of the lady was extremely genuine, as opposed to the figurative sorrow of the Polish country. Many of the Russian policymakers and soldiers were motivated by human beliefs in different fictions, including Russian nationalism, Orthodox Christianity, and macho heroics, which may have contributed to the conflict. The ensuing anguish was, nevertheless, nonetheless quite genuine.

Beware of politicians who begin using mystical language. By encasing it in complex, illegible language, they may be attempting to hide and rationalize genuine agony. Take extra caution while using the following four words: redemption, purity, eternity, and sacrifice. Set off the alert if you hear any of these. Additionally, you are in serious peril if you reside in a nation whose leader often uses phrases like "Their sacrifice will redeem the purity of our eternal nation." Always attempt to put such nonsense into concrete words, such as a soldier sobbing in pain, a lady being beaten and maltreated, or a youngster trembling in terror. Therefore, the greatest place to start when learning the truth about the world, life's purpose, and your own identity is by watching pain and delving into what it is. A tale is not the solution [9]–[11].

CONCLUSION

Human curiosity has always been piqued by the age-old desire to understand the meaning of existence. The assessment of many viewpoints reveals that the purpose of life is a profoundly individualized and subjective idea. On the other side, nihilistic viewpoints contend that existence has no intrinsic purpose and that people must face their own absurdity in order to find meaning in a meaningless world. In the end, each person's perception of the purpose of life may vary depending on their views, values, and experiences. It is difficult to describe or come to a consensus on since it is a complicated and multidimensional idea. However, investigating and considering the query might result in personal development, self-discovery, and a better comprehension of our own beliefs and purposes. People might attempt to discover their own unique meaning and lead a satisfying and worthwhile lifestyle via this reflection and engagement with life's existential problems.

REFERENCES

- [1] O. Golias, "What Is the Meaning of Life?," in *Take a Stand!: Classroom Activities that Explore Philosophical Arguments That Matter to Teens*, 2021. doi: 10.4324/9781003238393-8.
- [2] S. M. Kaye and P. Thomson, "What Is the Meaning of Life?," in *More Philosophy for Teens*, 2021. doi: 10.4324/9781003236757-19.

- [3] T. Kiymaz, “On the meaning of ‘the meaning of life,’” *Filos. Unisinos*, 2019, doi: 10.4013/fsu.2019.202.04.
- [4] F. Lorca, S. Pérez, F. Giner, and J. H. Marco, “What Dimension of Meaning in Life is the Stronger Predictor of Borderline Personality Disorder Symptom?,” *J. Constr. Psychol.*, 2021, doi: 10.1080/10720537.2019.1697912.
- [5] G. Lawton, “What is the meaning of life?,” *New Sci.*, 2016, doi: 10.1016/S0262-4079(16)31609-8.
- [6] L. Miller-Lewis, J. Tieman, D. Rawlings, C. Sanderson, and D. Parker, “Correlates of perceived death competence: What role does meaning-in-life and quality-of-life play?,” *Palliat. Support. Care*, 2019, doi: 10.1017/S1478951518000937.
- [7] S. M. Kaye, P. Thomson, and J. Compton, “What Is the Meaning of Life?,” in *Philosophy for Teens Questioning Life’s Big Ideas*, 2021. doi: 10.4324/9781003237167-21.
- [8] J. Colmer, “What is the meaning of (statistical) life? Benefit-cost analysis in the time of COVID-19,” *Oxford Rev. Econ. Policy*, 2020, doi: 10.1093/oxrep/graa022.
- [9] C. Woodard, “What Good is Meaning in Life?,” *De Ethica*, 2017, doi: 10.3384/de-ethica.2001-8819.17467.
- [10] T. Hoswell, “The Wildman’s Dilemma: Is the Question ‘What is the Meaning of Life?’ Harmful?,” *Heythrop J. - Q. Rev. Philos. Theol.*, 2020, doi: 10.1111/heyj.13321.
- [11] H. F. Pedersen *et al.*, “What brings meaning to life in a highly secular society? A study on sources of meaning among Danes,” *Scand. J. Psychol.*, 2018, doi: 10.1111/sjop.12495.

CHAPTER 22

A BRIEF DISCUSSION ON MEDITATION: JUST OBSERVE

Mr Vikrant Meshram, Assistant Professor

School of Hotel Management & Catering Technology, Jaipur National University, Jaipur, India

Email Id: Vikrant.meshram@jnujaipur.ac.in

ABSTRACT:

Many civilizations and faiths have used meditation as a discipline for thousands of years. To create a condition of mental clarity and tranquility, it entails concentrating attention and stopping the stream of ideas. This chapter examines the idea of meditation, its many practices, and its potential advantages for both physical and mental health. Regular meditation practice has been linked to improved immunological function, improved cognitive performance, improved emotional management, and improved brain function, according to scientific research. Additionally, it covers the scientific studies on meditation and emphasizes how effective it is in enhancing general wellbeing. This research seeks to provide a thorough knowledge of meditation and its possible effects on people by examining the current literature.

KEYWORDS:

Meditation, Mind, Mental Health, Physical Health.

INTRODUCTION

Meditation is a practice in which someone utilizes a method to train their attention and awareness, reach a cognitively clear and emotionally tranquil and stable state, such as mindfulness or concentrating their minds on a certain object, idea, or activity. Many different religious systems practice meditation. The Upanishads include the first descriptions of meditation (dhyana), and Hinduism, Jainism, and Buddhism all emphasize the practice in their contemplative traditions. Asian meditation practices have been adopted by various civilizations since the 19th century, where they are now used in fields other than spirituality, such business and health [1], [2]. Meditation may improve calmness, perception, self-concept, and wellbeing while also considerably reducing stress, anxiety, sadness, and pain. The impacts of meditation on health, including psychological, neurological, and cardiovascular health, are still being studied.

Etymology

The word "meditation" comes from the Latin term *meditatio*, which in turn comes from the Old French verb *meditacioun*, which means "to think, contemplate, devise, or ponder." Before the 12th century monk Guigo II, the Greek word *Theoria* was employed for the same reason in the Catholic tradition. Meditative practice is described as a structured, step-by-step method. The word meditation was first used to translate Eastern spiritual practices known as *dhyana* in Hinduism and Buddhism. *Dhyana* is derived from the Sanskrit root *dhyai*, which means to think or meditate. The word "meditation" in English may also apply to practices from various religions, including Jewish and Christian Hesychasm and Islamic Sufism.

After critiquing so many myths, ideologies, and religions, it is only right that I defend myself by describing how someone who is so skeptical can yet manage to wake up happy every morning. I'm hesitant to do this for a variety of reasons, including my fear of self-indulgence and my desire to avoid creating the false impression that what works for me will work for

everyone. I am very aware that not everyone has the peculiarities of my DNA, neurons, past experiences, and sense of dharma. However, it could be advantageous for readers to at least be aware of the colors that tint my spectacles, which cloud my eyesight and affect how I write.

I used to be agitated and restless when I was a teenager. I have no understanding of the world and no satisfactory solutions to my fundamental concerns about existence. I was particularly confused about the causes of the suffering in the world and in my own life, as well as what might be done to alleviate it. All I received from those around me and the books I read were elaborate fictions, whether they were myths about gods and heavens from religion, myths about the motherland and its historical purpose from nationalism, myths about love and adventure from romance, or myths about economic growth and how stuff will make me happy from capitalism. Although I had the intelligence to see that these were probably all fabrications, I was unsure of how to discover the truth.

I felt the university would be the best location to get answers when I started my studies there. But I was let down. The academic environment gave me the ability to dispel every myth that people have ever invented, but it didn't give satisfactory solutions to the great life's concerns. Instead, it pushed me to pay attention to ever-narrower questions. I finally ended up writing a doctoral dissertation at the University of Oxford on the memoirs of medieval warriors. I continued to read a lot of philosophy books and engage in a lot of philosophical discussions as a side pastime, but although this provided unending intellectual fun, it barely offered any genuine insight. It was quite annoying. Eventually, my dear friend Ron Merom advised that I try taking a Vipassana meditation course instead of reading any more books or participating in any more philosophical debates for a few days. The Pali language of ancient India has the word "Vipassana," which means "introspection". I dismissed it as some New Age quackery since I had no interest in learning yet another mythology. But in April 2000, after a year of persistent prodding, he convinced me to attend a ten-day Vipassana retreat [3], [4].

Prior to this, I had very little knowledge about meditation and had assumed it would require a variety of intricate mystical beliefs. Therefore, I was astounded by how applicable the instruction ended up being. S. N. Goenka, the course's instructor, told the students to shut their eyes, sit with their legs crossed, and concentrate only on their inhalations and exhalations. He kept urging, "Don't do anything." "Don't attempt to regulate your breathing or breathe in a certain manner. Just be aware of whatever the truth of the current moment may be. You just become aware that the breath is entering when it does. You only become conscious that the breath is leaving when it does. And you just become aware that "now my mind has wandered away from the breath" when you lose concentration and your mind begins to stray into dreams and recollections. The most significant thing someone has ever told me was that.

When individuals ponder the major concerns in life, they often have no interest whatsoever in knowing when their air enters and leaves their noses. They are more interested in knowing topics like what happens when you pass away. However, what occurs before you die is the great mystery of life, not what happens after you pass away. Understanding life is necessary if you wish to comprehend death. Will I simply entirely disappear when I die? Is a common question. What about heaven?

Will I reincarnate in a different body? These inquiries are predicated on the notion that there is an 'I' who exists from conception to death, and the query is, 'What will this I become at death?' But what is there that lasts from conception to passing away? The intellect, the brain, and the body are all constantly evolving. It becomes more evident that nothing lasts even from one instant to the next when you look at yourself more closely. What then maintains a whole life? If the answer to that question escapes you, you have no prospect of comprehending either life or death. The solution to the grand issue of death will likewise be clear if and when you figure out what keeps life together. People often claim that "The soul endures from birth to death and thereby holds life together," yet it is really a myth. Ever get a glimpse of a soul? Not just at the point of death, but at any time, you may investigate this. You will be able to grasp what will happen to you at the time of death if you can comprehend what occurs to you when one instant ends and another one starts. You will fully comprehend everything if you can really study yourself for the period of one breath.

The first thing I discovered by paying attention to my breath was that, despite all the books I had read and the lectures I had taken in college, I understood very little about and had very little control over my thoughts. Despite my best attempts, I was unable to focus on the actual sensation of my breath entering and exiting my nostrils for more than 10 seconds before my thoughts began to wander. I had the false belief that I was in control of my life and the CEO of my own brand for many years. But after only a few hours of meditation, I realized I scarcely had any self-control. I was only the gatekeeper; I was not the CEO. I was instructed to wait at the entrance to my body, which are my nostrils, and only watch everything that enters or exits. But after a short while, I became distracted and left my position. It was an encounter that opened my eyes.

Students learned to pay attention to their whole body's feelings as the training went on, not just their breath. Not unique blissful and ecstatic feelings, but rather the most commonplace and everyday sensations, such as heat, pressure, pain, and so on. The Vipassana method is founded on the understanding that bodily sensations and mental processes are intimately related. Body feelings are constantly there, between me and the outside world. I never respond to things that happen in the outer world; instead, I always respond to how my body feels. I have an aversion response when the experience is unpleasant. When the experience is enjoyable, I respond by wanting more of it.

The fact is that we constantly respond to our current physiological sensations, regardless of whether we believe we are reacting to anything that another person has done, President Trump's most recent tweet, or a distant childhood memory. The searing feelings in the pit of our stomach and the band of sorrow around our heart, when someone insults our country or our deity, are what make the insult intolerable. Our country is emotionless, while our bodies are in terrible pain. You're curious about what fury is. Simply pay attention to the bodily feelings that appear and disappear when you're upset. When I attended this retreat, I was twenty-four years old and had certainly experienced rage 10,000 times before, but I had never thought to pay attention to how anger truly felt. When I was upset, I never concentrated on the sensory truth of the anger; instead, I focused on the source of my anger something someone did or said.

By paying attention to my senses for 10 days, I believe I learnt more about myself and about people in general than I had previously known during my whole life. I didn't have to believe

any myth, theory, or tale in order to do this. I had no choice except to accept reality as it is. The most significant realization I had was that my own thought patterns are the root cause of my pain. My mind produces sorrow in response to my desires not being fulfilled. There is no measurable state of suffering in the outer world. It is a thought response produced by my own mind. The first step towards stopping to cause further misery is realizing this.

I started meditating for two hours every day after taking my first course in 2000, and I now attend a month-long or longer meditation retreat every year. Reality cannot be escaped via it. It is becoming more grounded in reality. I try to observe reality as it is for at least two hours a day, but for the other twenty-two I'm just thinking about it. Emails, tweets, and videos of lovely puppies overwhelm me. I could not have written *Sapiens* or *Homo Deus* without the concentration and clarity that this practice allowed me to achieve. For me, at least, there was never a contradiction between science and meditation. Instead, it has been a useful tool in the scientific toolbox, particularly when attempting to comprehend the human mind [5].

DISCUSSION

Meditation Traditions

Origins

The religious setting in which meditation was first practiced had a profound impact on its history. Rossano has proposed that the most recent stages of human biological development may have been influenced by the creation of the ability for concentrated concentration, a component of many meditation techniques. The Indian Upanishads include some of the first mentions of meditation as well as proto-Samkhya. The Mahabharata (containing the Bhagavad Gita) and the middle Upanishads contain the first definite references to meditation. Gavin Flood claims that the older Brihadaranyaka Upanishad, which declares that "having become calm and concentrated, one perceives the self (tman) within oneself," is referring to meditation.

Indian Religions

Jainism

Salvation-path is the name given to the Jain method of meditation and spiritual activities. The Ratnatraya "Three Jewels" are divided into three parts: correct perception and faith, right knowledge, and right behavior. In Jainism, meditation attempts to bring about self-realization, salvation, and total liberation for the soul. It seeks to get to and maintain the purportedly pure condition of soul, which is pure awareness free from any attachment and aversion. The practitioner aspires to be nothing more than a gyata-drashta (knower-seer). Dharma Dhyana and Shukla Dhyana are two basic categories that apply to Jain meditation.

Meditation practices used in Jainism include pindstha-dhyana, paddstha-dhyana, rpstha-dhyana, rptita-dhyana, and savrya-dhyana. A mantra is the center of padstha dhyana. A mantra may consist of a string of fundamental letters or phrases referencing a deity or certain topics. Jainism has a long history of using mantras. Mantra practice is common among all Jain adherents, regardless of sect—whether Digambara or "vetmbara." Chanting mantras is a significant aspect of every day life for Jain monks and followers. Chanting mantras may be done aloud or quietly in the mind. A very ancient and significant meditation practice is contemplation. The practitioner engages in lengthy contemplation of nuances. Agnya vichya involves reflecting on seven realities, including life and non-life, inflow, bondage, stopping and removing karmas, and ultimate release. In apaya vichya, one thinks about the false

insights they have and finally creates the true ones. One ponders the eight causes or fundamental forms of karma during vipaka vichya. When listening to sansathan vichya, one considers the size of the cosmos and the emptiness of the soul [6], [7].

Buddhism

Buddhists use meditation as a step in their journey to enlightenment and nirvana. The closest terms for meditation in the traditional languages of Buddhism are "development" and the fundamental practices of "mindfulness of in-and-out breathing" (anapanasati) and "body contemplations" (repulsiveness and graveyard contemplations), which lead to "jhna/dhyna" or "samdhi." Even though the majority of classical and modern Buddhist meditation manuals are school-specific, the fundamental techniques for breath and body meditation have been preserved and passed down orally between teachers and students as well as through Buddhist texts like the Satipatthana Sutta and the Dhyana sutras in almost all Buddhist traditions. These traditional traditions have also undergone several diverse interpretations and changes.

According to the Theravadic tradition, there are over fifty ways to cultivate mindfulness based on the Satipatthana Sutta and forty ways to cultivate concentration based on the Visuddhimagga. Both of these practices are crucial to the development of samatha and vipassana. The Tibetan tradition created many visualization meditations by combining Sarvastivada and Tantric practices with Madhyamaka philosophy. The Zen tradition included mindfulness and breath-meditation via the Dhyana sutras, which are founded on the Sarvastivada-school. The early Chan-tradition developed the ideas or practices of wu nian "maintaining the one without wavering," shifting the attention from the objects of experience to the nature of mind, the perceiving subject itself, which is equated with Buddha-nature, while downplaying the "petty complexities" of satipatthana and the body-recollections but maintaining the awareness of immanent death.

Buddhism spread via the Silk Road, reaching China in the second century CE and Japan in the sixth century CE, where it was disseminated to other Asian nations. Due to the effect of Buddhist modernism on Asian Buddhism, western laity interest in Zen and the Vipassana movement, and the uptake of meditation practices by many non-Buddhists, Buddhist meditation methods have grown more popular in contemporary times. In turn, mindfulness-based treatments have emerged from the modernized notion of mindfulness (which is based on the Buddhist word sati).

Dhyana

The founder of Buddhism, Gautama Buddha, may have invented dhyana around the fifth century BCE. According to a number of modern scholars and scholar-practitioners, it is actually a description of the development of perfected equanimity and mindfulness, which is apparently induced by satipatthana, an open monitoring of the breath without trying to regulate it. This is often presented as a form of focused attention or concentration, as in Buddhagosa's Theravada classic the Visuddhimagga ("Path of purification," 5th c. CE). The "seven factors of awakening," which are described using a different formula in the bojjangha, may thus be referring to the main practices of early Buddhist bhavana. Vetter claims that the sense-restraint and moral restraints outlined by the Buddhist tradition appear to naturally lead to dhyana.

Vipassana and Samatha

The Buddha recognized samatha (calmness, serenity, and tranquillity), and vipassana (insight), as the two most important mental characteristics that result from healthy meditation,

or bhavana. Samatha and vipassana were recognized as two different meditation practices as the growing tradition began to highlight the benefits of liberating insight and dhyana came to be considered as concentration. According to this interpretation, whereas vipassana helps one to examine, investigate, and distinguish "formations" conditioned phenomena based on the five aggregates, samatha calms, composes, unites, and focusses the mind.

One may decrease the obscuring obstacles and bring the mind to a collected, pliant, and still state (samadhi), in accordance with this idea, which is fundamental to Theravada orthodoxy and also plays a part in Tibetan Buddhism. The development of insight and wisdom (Praj), which is the mental capacity to "clearly see" (vi-passana) the nature of occurrences, is therefore facilitated by this mental characteristic. The specifics of what is to be perceived vary throughout Buddhist traditions. According to Theravada, all experiences should be seen as transient, painful, not-self, and empty. When this occurs, a person experiences viraga, or dispassion, for all occurrences, including all flaws and obstacles, and lets them go. One achieves freedom by letting go of obstacles and abandoning yearning via the reflective growth of insight.

Hindu Meditation

Within Hinduism, there are several schools and meditation practices. Yoga and Dhyana are practices in pre-modern and traditional Hinduism to realize "pure awareness" or "pure consciousness," unaltered by the operations of the mind, as one's everlasting self. The individual self, or jivatman, is acknowledged by Advaita Vedanta as illusory and, in Reality, identical with the all-pervasive and non-dual tman-Brahman. The Self is referred to as Purusha, a pure awareness unaltered by Prakriti, or "nature," in the dualistic yoga system and Samkhya. The liberating occasion is referred to as moksha, vimukti, or kaivalya depending on the tradition. Patajali's Yoga sutras (about 400 CE), a literature connected to yoga and samkhya that explains eight limbs leading to kaivalya ("aloneness"), is one of the most important scriptures of traditional Hindu yoga. These include the yamas (ethical discipline), niyamas (rules), asanas (physical postures), pranyama (breath control), pratyahara (separation from senses), dhya (one-pointedness of mind), dhyana (meditation), and samadhi (finally). The compilation of Hatha Yoga (forceful yoga) compendiums like the Hatha Yoga Pradipika, the emergence of Bhakti yoga as a significant kind of meditation, and Tantra are examples of later advancements in Hindu meditation. The Yoga Yajnavalkya is a significant Hindu yoga literature that incorporates Hatha Yoga and Vedanta Philosophy.

Sikhism

According to Sikhism, simran (meditation) and good acts are both essential for a devotee to reach his or her spiritual objectives; meditation is useless in the absence of good deeds. Sikhs want to experience God's presence and emerge in the holy light when they meditate. Only God's divine will or command gives a devotee the motivation to want to start meditating. Namjapn entails concentrating one's thoughts on the names or lofty qualities of God. Science has a difficult time unraveling the mysteries of the mind, in large part because we lack effective instruments. Many people, including many scientists, mistake the mind for the brain, yet these two concepts are really extremely distinct from one another. The brain is a physical network of biochemicals, synapses, and neurons. The mind is a stream of irrational feelings including pain, joy, rage, and love. Biologists believe that the mind and feelings like pain and love are produced by the brain and billions of neurons, respectively, via biochemical processes.

But as of yet, we have no idea as to how the mind separates from the brain. Why do I experience pain when billions of neurons fire electrical impulses in one way, yet love when

they fire in a different manner? We are completely clueless. Therefore, even if the mind does truly develop independently of the brain, researching the mind requires different methods than studying the brain for the time being.

With the aid of microscopes, brain scanners, and sophisticated computers, brain science is advancing rapidly. But a microscope or a brain scanner cannot provide us with a view of the mind. However, these tools do not provide us with any access to the subjective feelings connected to these biochemical and electrical activity in the brain. 2018: The only mind I can directly reach is my own. I can only get an understanding of what other sentient creatures are going through based on secondhand accounts, which inevitably have many restrictions and distortions. Without a doubt, we could assemble a large number of second-hand information from several sources and utilize statistics to spot recurrent trends. With the use of such techniques, psychologists and brain scientists have improved and even saved millions of lives while also gaining a far greater knowledge of the mind. However, relying solely second-hand reporting makes it difficult to go beyond a certain stage. It is preferable to personally see a phenomena while researching it in science.

Although anthropologists, for instance, often consult secondary materials, if you really want to comprehend Samoan culture, you will eventually need to pack your bags and go to Samoa. Visiting is obviously insufficient. A blog published by a traveler through Samoa would not be regarded as a scientific anthropological research since the majority of travelers do not have the required equipment and expertise. Their observations are much too sporadic and partial. We must develop the ability to examine human civilizations methodically, objectively, and without bias if we are to be regarded as reliable anthropologists. That's what you learn about in the anthropology department, and that's what made it possible for anthropologists to contribute so much to bridging cultural differences.

This anthropological paradigm is infrequently used in the scientific study of the mind. Anthropologists often write about their travels to remote islands and enigmatic nations, but anthropologists seldom go such in-depth, solitary excursions into the psyche. Because I can only examine my own mind, which is the only mind I can directly view, it is far more difficult to study my own mind objectively than it is to observe Samoan culture. After more than a century of arduous labor, anthropologists now have effective methods for unbiased observation at their disposal. In contrast, although researchers in the field of the mind have created a variety of instruments for gathering and analyzing secondary data, our understanding of how to observe our own thoughts is still in its infancy.

We could experiment with some of the instruments created by premodern societies in the absence of contemporary techniques for direct mind observation. Many ancient societies paid close attention to the study of the mind, but they didn't rely on gathering first-hand accounts; rather, they taught individuals how to meticulously monitor their own thoughts. They collectively referred to the techniques they created as "meditation." Although the word "meditation" is often used in the context of religion and mysticism nowadays, it may really refer to any technique for direct self-observation. Although many faiths have used different forms of meditation extensively, this does not always entail that meditation is religious.

Although many faiths have used books extensively, this does not imply that reading books is a religious activity. Humans have created hundreds of different types of meditation throughout the ages, each with its own ideas and methods. Vipassana is the only method that I have personally used, hence it is the only one about which I can speak with any authority. The Buddha is supposed to have discovered Vipassana in ancient India, along with a number of other meditation methods. Numerous thoughts and tales have been attributed to the

Buddha over the ages, sometimes without any supporting data. But to meditate, you don't have to accept any of them. The instructor I studied Vipassana from, Goenka, was a really useful type of mentor. He regularly reminded students to ignore any secondhand accounts, religious doctrines, and philosophical hypotheses while observing the mind in order to concentrate on their own experiences and the actual realities they face. Many kids would visit his room each day to ask questions and seek advice.

'Please avoid theoretical and philosophical conversations, and concentrate your queries on issues linked to your real practice,' read a notice at the door to the room. The real practice is methodically, continuously, and objectively observing bodily sensations and mental responses to stimuli in order to identify the fundamental thought patterns. Sometimes people use meditation as a means of pursuing unique blissful and ecstatic experiences. However, the greatest mystery in the cosmos is awareness, and everyday sensations like heat and itching are just as strange as experiences of ecstasy or cosmic oneness. Vipassana practitioners are advised not to hunt for singular experiences but rather to focus on comprehending the reality of their minds, whatever that reality may be.

Researchers that study the mind and the brain have recently showed an increased interest in such meditation approaches, although most have only utilized this instrument inadvertently thus far. Most scientists don't truly meditate on a regular basis. Instead, she brings seasoned practitioners to her lab, covers their heads with electrodes, instructs them to meditate, and then records the brain activity that results. That may teach us a lot of fascinating things about the brain, but if our goal is to comprehend the mind, we are omitting some of the most crucial lessons. It's comparable to someone studying a stone under a microscope to learn about the structure of stuff. You approach this individual, offer him a microscope, and instruct him to do this. You had considerably clearer vision. He takes the microscope, grabs his dependable magnifying glass, and carefully examines the material that the microscope is constructed of via the magnifying glass.

A technique for directly studying the mind is meditation. If, instead of engaging in meditation yourself, you choose to observe electrical activity in another meditator's brain, you will mostly miss its benefits. I am not recommending that the current methods and techniques used in brain research be abandoned. They are not replaced by meditation, although it could help. It resembles construction workers tunneling through a big mountain. Why just dig on one side? Better dig from both simultaneously. The two tubes must eventually cross if the brain and the mind really are one and the same. What if the brain and the mind are distinct entities? Therefore, it is even more crucial to go beyond the brain and into the mind.

In fact, rather than just serving as a study subject for the brain, meditation is now being used in several institutions and labs as a research instrument. However, this process is still in its early stages, in part because researchers must put in a tremendous amount of effort. Serious meditation requires a great deal of self-control. The first thing you'll notice if you attempt to objectively study your senses is how erratic and impatient the mind is. Even if you concentrate on monitoring a pretty clear feeling, like the breath entering and leaving your nostrils, your mind can often only do it for a short period of time before losing concentration and beginning to wander in thoughts, memories, and dreams. We just need to turn a little handle to bring the microscope back into focus. We can get a repairman to fix the handle if it is broken. However, we are unable to fix the mind as readily when it loses concentration. The mind often has to be calmed and trained to focus in order to begin monitoring itself deliberately and systematically. We could be able to instantly concentrate by taking a pill in the future.

However, because the goal of meditation is to explore the mind rather than just concentrate it, using such a quick cut could backfire. The medication may increase our attention and alertness, but it also may keep us from fully exploring our mental potential. After all, even today, watching a fantastic thriller on TV is a simple way to focus the attention, but doing so prevents the mind from seeing its own dynamics. But even if we can't depend on these modern conveniences, we shouldn't give up. Astronauts, anthropologists, and zoologists are role models for us. Spending years on remote islands, anthropologists and zoologists are exposed to a wide range of illnesses and risks. In order to be ready for their perilous space missions, astronauts put in years of arduous training. It could be worthwhile to put just as much effort into understanding our own thoughts as we do into understanding other civilizations, undiscovered animals, and faraway worlds. And before the algorithms decide for us, we had better comprehend our own thinking [8], [9].

CONCLUSION

Due to its potential advantages for both physical and mental health, meditation is a potent practice that has attracted a lot of attention recently. Meditation may aid people in reducing stress, anxiety, and sadness as well as other negative emotions, which enhances overall wellbeing. Additionally, studies have shown that meditation is beneficial for physical health, decreasing blood pressure, alleviating chronic pain, and enhancing sleep. Although further investigation is required to properly understand the mechanics and long-term consequences of meditation, the available data indicates that it is a useful technique for those looking to enhance their quality of life and attain a state of inner peace and tranquility. The regular practice of meditation has the potential to improve overall wellbeing and promote a more healthful society.

REFERENCES

- [1] M. Farias, E. Maraldi, K. C. Wallenkampf, and G. Lucchetti, "Adverse events in meditation practices and meditation-based therapies: a systematic review," *Acta Psychiatrica Scandinavica*. 2020. doi: 10.1111/acps.13225.
- [2] J. Wielgosz, S. B. Goldberg, T. R. A. Kral, J. D. Dunne, and R. J. Davidson, "Mindfulness Meditation and Psychopathology," *Annual Review of Clinical Psychology*. 2019. doi: 10.1146/annurev-clinpsy-021815-093423.
- [3] P. Stapleton, J. Dispenza, S. McGill, D. Sabot, M. Peach, and D. Raynor, "Large effects of brief meditation intervention on EEG spectra in meditation novices," *IBRO Reports*, 2020, doi: 10.1016/j.ibror.2020.10.006.
- [4] L. Hilton *et al.*, "Mindfulness Meditation for Chronic Pain: Systematic Review and Meta-analysis," *Ann. Behav. Med.*, 2017, doi: 10.1007/s12160-016-9844-2.
- [5] D. J. Lee, E. Kulubya, P. Goldin, A. Goodarzi, and F. Girgis, "Review of the neural oscillations underlying meditation," *Frontiers in Neuroscience*. 2018. doi: 10.3389/fnins.2018.00178.
- [6] C. Heeter, M. Allbritton, R. Lehto, P. Miller, P. McDaniel, and M. Paletta, "Feasibility, acceptability, and outcomes of a yoga-based meditation intervention for hospice professionals to combat burnout," *Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health*, 2021, doi: 10.3390/ijerph18052515.
- [7] K. Matko and P. Sedlmeier, "What Is Meditation? Proposing an Empirically Derived Classification System," *Front. Psychol.*, 2019, doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2019.02276.

- [8] R. Kaplan-Rakowski, K. R. Johnson, and T. Wojdyski, “The impact of virtual reality meditation on college students’ exam performance,” *Smart Learn. Environ.*, 2021, doi: 10.1186/s40561-021-00166-7.
- [9] M. A. Youngs, S. E. Lee, M. O. Mireku, D. Sharma, and R. S. S. Kramer, “Mindfulness Meditation Improves Visual Short-Term Memory,” *Psychol. Rep.*, 2021, doi: 10.1177/0033294120926670.