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ABSTRACT

Fundamental human rights cannot be discussed without defining humanity. This two-part paper revives an ancient model that has been forgotten ever since the implementation of dogma by the Roman Catholic church. It is shown that the definition of humanity was perfected in the Qur’an, the only written document that is preserved for over 14 centuries in its original form. The original claim by prophet Muhammad was that the Qur’an was a divine revelation. This book has the word ‘science’ (ilm in Arabic) over 700 times and contains no dogmatic assertions. The Qur’anic model states clearly the role of humans as the Khalīfah (viceroy) of the creator that must spend a set period of time on earth. It lays out the foundation of a society based on conscious and conscientious participation of every individual. It represents the epitome of liberalism while providing one with a roadmap that is permanent. So, the lifestyle of this Caliphate model is the optimum of liberalism and conservatism. The current Part I of the paper shows that the viceroy model is the only one that removes the ‘original sin’ attribute of humans. We examine fundamental traits of humans if the assumption of ‘original sin’ is removed. It is shown that humans emerge as ‘godly’ only if they act based on conscience. Any departure from conscious and conscientious pathway makes humans and all ensuing policies and agendas inherently impulsive. This model of humans can be best characterized as based on sustainability and hope, thus replacing all current models that are based on fear and scarcity. The paper shows how the viceroy model was progressively replaced with the currently used ‘born sinner’ model.
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1 Introduction

AVERROES, THE FATHER OF EUROPEAN SECULAR PHILOSOPHY, famously stated, “Ignorance leads to fear, fear leads to hatred, and hatred leads to violence. This is the equation”. Today, at
dawn of Information age, such statement couldn’t be more timely in the face of extreme violence around the world. This paper investigates what are the natural traits of humans and how such traits can be best utilize to promote hope in stead of fear and love instead of hatred. The meaning of human life is a research question that is as old as humanity itself. In the post-Roman Catholic church era, this question has been rephrased in different forms, such as "Why are we here?", "What is life all about?", and "What is the purpose of existence?" or even "Does life exist at all?"

It is recognized in modern Europe that these questions are universal and worthy of research and authoritative opinions. Although not explicitly recognized, these questions have been answered in all disciplines with philosophical, scientific, and theological speculations of similar rigour. All speculations in Europe avoided any reference to the Qur’an, the book that claims itself to be a divine revelation, thereby being the external and universal standard. In absence of this universal standard—unlike what happened after the Qur’an’s acceptance gained momentum in Islamic political philosophy—there have been a large number of proposed answers to these questions, all of which contain an Orientalist/Eurocentric or apologist perspective. These one-sided views, as manifested by the often covered-up fundamental premises that are aphenomenal, are then purported as the universal view of practically all disciplines, ranging from social science to engineering.

2 Cognitive Background

Recently, there has been a surge of research ‘findings’ that tie in the answers to the fundamental question of humanity to numerous issues involving symbolic meaning, ontology, value, purpose, ethics, good and evil, free will, the existence of one or multiple gods, conceptions of God, the soul, and the afterlife. This new surge delves into the ‘science of intangibles’ and attempts to legitimize aphenomenal premises through dogma-like discussion. This narration focuses primarily on describing related empirical facts about the universe, exploring the context and parameters concerning the ‘how’ of life, always involving an illogical, unfounded fundamental premise. With such a modus operandi—viz. the creation of theories with an unfounded first premise—new philosophical and even natural science also studies and provides recommendations for the pursuit of well-being and a related conception of morality. An alternative, “humanistic approach” poses the question “What is the meaning of my life?” The value of the question pertaining to the purpose of life may coincide with the achievement of ultimate reality, or a feeling of oneness, or even a feeling of sacredness. Again, this narration of morality is entirely Eurocentric and devoid of any sound footing.

Over the last millennium, even after the notion of ‘original sin’ has been discredited as aphenomenal, it is widely and falsely believed that natural cognition, or some form of normative cognition, is backward-looking, and that humans are incapable of finding their own path of knowledge, they must be indoctrinated into being “enlightened” based on the fundamental principles of the Enlightenment Philosophical tradition. What is interesting to note, however, is that at no time did science depart from a dogma-like characterization of humanity since the introduction of dogma by the Roman Catholic church and the Roman Empire that adopted Christianity as the state religion, every biblical designation has been overtly criticized while the very traits of ‘original sin’ has been blended in various forms. This narration starts with the childhood model as proposed by educational philosophy Piaget, who infers without justification that the thinking of children at this age is based on intuition and still not completely logical. This
in turn transforms the ‘original sin’ model into ‘original illogical’ model. What is important to understand is that there is still the use of a “model” nonetheless, each model which is just as illogically justified as the original sin model of the Roman Catholic Church. Just because adults look at things in a different way doesn’t mean infants are illogical. A proper analysis would put this in perspective as a transition between intangible cognition to tangible cognition. Rather than saying that the infants cannot yet grasp the ‘more complex concepts such as cause and effect, time, and comparison’, we ought to point out they don’t use the same concept as adults to transit from intangibles (e.g. thinking) to tangibles (speaking). Considering that *homo sapien* literally translates into ‘thinking men’, we cannot regurgitate the old concept that children are subhumans.

Sadly, this has been the only narration allowed in modern era. Piaget’s theory of cognitive development is only an example of, specifically, the creation of an unfounded first premise used to deduce data and observations from. This constitutes quite literally what we may call normative deduction. Surprisingly, the idea of normative deduction from our first premises has not been criticized, but rather, encouraged in the modern era. Criticism of normative deduction is often limited to deduction from religious scriptures, finding its peak in the enlightenment era.

The “original sin model” has been accommodated in all social science models, ranging from Feminism to law, in which individuals channel their observations into theoretical constructions before—or a priori—the observations. The main criticism of Orientalism, that one uses preconceived notions of the east instead of studying “the east” for what it is, is the same criticism being deployed towards modern theories in the social sciences. This ‘orientalist’ view of humanity has become synonymous with indisputable and ‘secular’ notion of feminism, and more recently in the form of neo-Orientalism. In science, the original sin model has become synonymous with theories that attempt to define the fundamental trait of humans, tantamount to independent thinking and free will, for example. For instance, Moore rationalizes conscientious behaviour as an act similar to Adam and Eve’s ‘original sin’ of eating forbidden fruit. He draws parallels between his experience of undertaking insider research and the original sin the biblical Adam and Eve committed when they “ate the forbidden fruit from the tree of knowledge”. Here, anarchy and revolt against the Establishment’s agenda is made synonymous to ‘original sin’. We can clearly see how the use of a single premise—in this case, that we are rebellious—can lead to the use of channelling observations (such as this unorthodox interpretation of the Bible) into theories (which, again, is the first premise).

This accommodation of ‘original sin’ has been based on Newtonian mechanics and accentuated by practically all new “scientific” theories, even though the name ‘God’ has been absent from the works of hard science. However, the connection to God has been made by anyone interested in the exploitation of religious sentiments of the unassuming public, with the overwhelming conclusion that: “the laws of gravity and quantum theory allow universes to appear spontaneously from nothing”, therefore, legitimizing questioning Hawking’s conclusion that there is no need for God. This same premise-based deduction is found even in the natural sciences. Absent from this narration is the consideration of the premise if there is a god, the human perception of ‘need of God’ is irrelevant, at best.
The fact that new science has adopted cognition means that are as illogical as dogma made way to the surge of numerous publications asserting that new science is compatible with doctrinal philosophy. In particular, quantum mechanics has made room for incessant possibilities of matching any illogical premise, including the faith dictating reality. Quantum computing is literally a computerized version of the deduction of theories from a first premise, a priori to an analysis of observations. Others have conveniently extended the notion to behavioural science, forming the basis for applications in healthcare and pharmaceutical industries.

To-date, very few, if any posited the appropriate question that would generate true knowledge, leads to dogma-free cognition. Apologists have emerged from both extremes of the liberalism spectrums. The feminist narration created a new line of apology and shunned any possibility to question the fundamental premises of the doctrine of feminism or neo-liberalism. A few recent articles have made suggestions that feminism and neo-liberalism are infused with dogmatic double standards and that they are little more than original doctrine of money and control. It would be inefficient to delve into each and every one of these theories while their logical deconstructions have been completed elsewhere. What is necessary to note is that these theories and schools upon which much literature and theoretical work have been written is inherently flawed due to the non-questioning and non-validation of their respective first premises.

What is also interesting, is that in even modern western discourse, in the entire discussion of humanity and humanism, mention of the Qur’an has been absent. This is remarkable, considering what Qur’an offers in clearest terms all the answers that elude Eurocentric thinkers. In a way, the terrorist attacks of 9/11 have triggered the discussion of Islam, albeit in the context of ‘clash of civilizations’. However, as Islam has pointed out, this discussion barely made any dent on true nature of Islam or humanity. Of course there have been numerous critiques of both ‘savagery of Islam’ and hegemony of USA in the context of war on terror, but most work didn’t delve into the humanity model that is the principal focus of this paper. Even the most sympathetic papers limited the discussion in pointing out double standards of neo-liberalism and feminism.

As a note regarding the methodological background of this paper, one should understand that we use a void, valueless deductive method of logic as proposed in Islam et al. Cognition is seen as a 5-step process that has origins in questioning, as is summarized below.

- cognition starts with a real question that has only Yes (1,+), or No (0,-) answer. Such question doesn’t arise if it has already been resolved in a source of absolute truth (if one can be confirmed exists though this same process)
- make niyah (original intention) to start the cognition process solely in search of the truth (haq) so a right (haq) decision is made at the end of the cognition process;
- collect all available data and filter out questionable sources;
- fuzzy logic (manteq) phase: ask questions of dialectical nature (manteq) that will have qualitative answer (by collecting a series of yes/no answers). Each manteq questions should be motivated by qsd (dynamic intention) that is in line with niyah; and
- logic (aql) phase: Ask the final question to determine the yes/no answer to the question asked in Point 1.
In the first part of this two-part paper, a consistent and logically sound model for humanity is presented. It is inspired by the designation of khalifah (viceroy) as used in the Qur’an. Using that designation, the paper examines how the purpose of life as well as accountability of individual actions can be blended in to form a guideline for pursuit of knowledge in every discipline. In developing a more whole theory of humanity so as to provide a construction of universality and human rights, we must start from examining definitions of the purpose of life, and its role in the lives of others. Our discussion of the process of false premise-based cognition is demonstrated in Figure 1.

**Figure 1.** This is the inevitable outcome of the ‘original’ sin model that reverses the cognition process, and thereon corrupts the entire humanity. Unfortunately, there is no exception that we can cite in the entire history of modern Europe.

### 3 Purpose of life and ideal behaviour

For whatever one can gather from ancient cultures, there was no confusion about the purpose of human life. Prior to behaviour, humanity, and the following legal and ethical systems of life that religions may have represented, there was always a conception of humanity and purpose of each individual life. This purpose starts off with the designation of a formal status for humans. This section analyzes the definitions and conceptions of the purpose of life from Hinduism, Islam, and Christianity.

In ancient India, it the concept of representation, or life’s purpose, is founded in the notion of ‘avatar’. The word derived from the Sanskrit avatāra ( ), meaning ‘descent,’ from ava ‘down’ + tar- ‘to cross.’ The word was use dot describe believed deities or representative of Gods on earth. This is not to be conflated with the notion of the reincarnation of Jesus, for example, as the word Avatar can be used to describe pious and gurus in general—i.e., the expert
practitioners of God’s attributes. It in fact can signal to the fact that God’s presence is in all creatures. This implies that Hinduism itself supported the notion that on an ideal level, the purpose of life is representing and practicing the attributes of God. Hence, we can attribute the purpose of life (or the many lives, according to the laws of reincarnation) to be fulfilling of a Godly ideal.

In Islam, the Qur’an formalized and expounded upon the notion of the purpose of life. As found in verse 2:30 of the Qur’an, humans are all seen as ‘khalifah’, the word best translated as viceroy or vicegerent. In Islam, man's ultimate life objective is to worship (Arabic word ‘abd’ literally means ‘obey with love’) the creator Allah (English: God) by abiding by the Divine guidelines revealed in the Qur'an and the Tradition of the Prophet. It is stated: “And I (Allâh) created not the jinn and mankind except that they should be obedient (to Allah).” (Qur'an 51:56). Earthly life is merely a test, determining one's afterlife, either in Jannah (Paradise) or in Jahannam (Hell). The Qur'an describes the purpose of creation as follows: "Blessed be he in whose hand is the kingdom, he is powerful over all things, who created death and life that he might examine which of you is best in deeds, and he is the almighty, the forgiving" (Qur'an 67:1–2). So, a viceroy (human) is sent to the earth (Ardha in Arabic means ‘habitat of humans’) for a test period. If he carries himself well, he gets to return to heaven, if not he goes to hell.

Figure 2 demonstrates how when one is able to realize their objective of life, their actions are based on that objective. This would be what a viceroy would use to be constantly vigilant of what he requires to do in order to conform to the job description. Hence, if the objective and nature of life is pro- humanity, such actions will follow.

Figure 2. The operative axis of a viceroy.

Does a human have to have a fair chance at going to heaven? In Islam it is believed that humans are created with best of features (Quran 95:4), even the word ‘human’ (insan in Arabic) meaning ‘adorable’, ‘trusting’, yet forgetful. This notion of forgetfulness makes it a test, a perfection would be impossible to test. However, this ‘weakness’ is anything but a description of ‘original
sin’—such a theoretical conception is directly opposed to the Islamic theory of ‘fitra’, human traits that naturally flow towards good and consciousness.⁴ In fact, it is logical that the Creator equip humans with qualities that prepare them to be a viceroy. For instance, a good King would send a good person to represent him as a viceroy. What is a good viceroy? He keeps in contact with the King (‘salah’ in Arabic and yoga or yoga in Sanskrit both mean “communication”), manages the finances with utmost care (generosity and charity is fundamental trait that is mandated), and acts the same manner the King would have acted in case the viceroy were not there.

So, how does one act like the King? He follows the king’s traits. How is that trait embedded? The word ‘deen’ in Arabic and dharma in Sanskrit both mean ‘natural traits’ (and not religion as commonly mistranslated). It is also logical that a good King would prepare his viceroy well and give him enough provisions to fulfill his job. Finally, for him to be held accountable, a viceroy must have certain freedom. Islam gives the freedom of intention, whereas everything else (including provisions) are a part of the universal order for which he has no accountability. The first Hadith of the book of Bukhari states that a man will be judged for his intention. In addition men are equipped with 99 good traits that re similar to Creator’s, albeit at miniscule level. Let's review some of the traits:

1. Ar-Rahman (literally means ‘a womb’ that extends to infinity in space). Humans are, therefore, born with Rahma, the simplest translation is 'empathy' for everyone and everything;

2. Ar-Raheem (literally means ‘a womb’ that extends to infinity in time). Humans are, therefore, born with empathy at all times;

3. Al-Malik (literally means ‘the owner of everything’). Humans are, therefore, born with one item that they have full control over. This happens to be intention. It is logical, because first hadith of Book of Bokhari confirms, we'll be judged by our intention. Now, does this ownership risk violating universal order? No. Intention has no continuity with anyone other than the individual whose intention is in question. So, what it does is gives people the freedom to intention, without disturbing the universal order, thereby holding him responsible for the intention that he had full control over;

4. Qur’an names a total of 99 such traits of the Creator and asserts that humans are created with those qualities so they are prepared to be the viceroy of the creator.

In both Hinduism and Islam there are Godly ideal role-models and traits in which the purpose of life (more emphasized in Islam) is to represent the creator. Hence, the idea of a human being was that of naturally good actions, actions which have been ‘good’ by the originator of creation—the creator. So where did this conception of humanity go wrong? Chronologically speaking, the first major distortion of this understanding of human life was imparted by the Roman Catholic church. Metaphorically speaking, this distortion would akin to the development of “sugar” following the HSSA degradation (i.e., indicative of the origin of the degeneration of sweeteners: in our case, of humanity).⁵⁹ Although Islam accepted Jesus as a prophet or messenger sent by Allah, Islam did not recognize Jesus as Son of God and therefore could not accept Christ as standing at the centre of recognizing Allah. Yet, this was not the most critical difference.
The critical difference as far as religious doctrine was concerned lay elsewhere and went beyond the realm of purely religious doctrine. At the core of real Muslim-Christian differences lay the fact that Muslim outlook did not exclude the possibility that social and individual conditions of the believers were neither necessarily eternal nor static, and that the effort to harmonize and sort out internal differences under such conditions could strengthen the internal unity of a Muslim community. For Christians, prior to the Reformation, all this was absolutely incompatible with their religion’s conception of Original Sin. This doctrine, which in itself holds out no hope for reconciliation of any kind among individuals or reunification of community purpose, is a defining feature of Christian belief. Indeed, Christian observers of the apparent internal cohesion of most Muslim communities over the period of the Moorish empire preferred to interpret these phenomena as evidence of mass submission to rule under a variant of oriental despotism. Allan Keith notes that horrific crimes, bloodshed, war, oppression, suppression against people by Christians and others—what we may term ‘crimes against humanity’—has been justified and tolerated (i.e. encourages passivity) due to the Christian conception that humans are being punished for their original sin.30

Throughout this period of the rise of the rise and spread of Islamic belief and the spread of Islamic rule, the Christian religious community itself was also divided or even crumbling. On the one hand, there were the followers of the Bishop of Rome, designating himself as Pope in most of Europe. On the other hand there were the followers of the Eastern or Greek Orthodox rite in Greece, Russia and parts of the Balkans influenced by Russia.

Life's purpose in Christianity is to seek divine salvation through the grace of God and intercession of Christ (cf. John 11:26). The New Testament speaks of God wanting to have a relationship with humans both in this life and the life to come, which can happen only if one's sins are forgiven (John 3:16–21; 2 Peter 3:9). It is at this point where dogma comes into play and the nonsensical argument emerges as: “I (God) am going create man and woman with original sin. Then, I am going to impregnate a woman with myself as her child, so that I can be born. Once alive, I will kill myself as a sacrifice to myself. To save you (humans who accept me as the ‘savior’) from the sin I originally condemned you to”.

If the only reference to Christianity one gives is the Bible, then one finds out that there is no such thing as bible (the book) that has 40 varying translations in English alone. How has that dogma changed when 'enlightenment' came in terms of western philosophy? In terms of the origin of universe, the big bang theory, the introduction of quantum nature, multiple (numerous) history of each point, nature as the creator of 'numerous universes', and even the definition of what's true and false has introduced a logic that is more illogical than dogma. What dogma did is introduced one aphenomenal standard,31 whereas the 'western philosophers' have introduced numerous such standards. The scientific equivalent of this transition is a quantum leap from bipolar to multi-polar (schizophrenia) and is best described as ‘deliberate schizophrenia’.32

In fact, similar to the cognition found in Figure 1, the fact that Christianity has a negative interpretation of the purpose of life—that we are naturally evil and deserve our material misfortunes—and that the way to remove the evil is through faith (and not action)—i.e., the lack of a systematic criteria to behave and act in a manner that is coherent with God as well as society.
(as we demonstrated Islam and Hinduism do, and as we show the ancient Greeks have)—there are fertile grounds for the insertion of immoral material pursuits that can suppress humanity. In other words, because Christianity and its actions lack a holistic approach of action in this world based on the objective set by the creator, political manipulation and economic systems can occur even when people are practicing the religion of Christianity. This is what we call the “trinity model” in which the original sin doctrine gave birth to the trinity model of religion. This trinity model, based on a lack of appreciation for humanity and involvement in the material (societal, political economic) sphere of life, fuelled the alternative material trinity that developed: the government, society, labour, all based on devotion to money. Similar to Marx’s theory of materialism, it is in abstract and historically true that Christianity is disconnected from the purpose of the creator (original sin) and lack of it allowed for the existence of the material trinity found in Figure 3. A comprehensive of Christianity in abstract and in history is beyond the scope of this paper but would be a timely supplement to our comments here.

Figure 3. The material trinity.

As an example of false-premise based deduction in the natural sciences, one can cite the word ‘quantum’. In physics it means: a) The smallest amount of a physical quantity that can exist independently, especially a discrete quantity of electromagnetic radiation; and b) This amount of
energy regarded as a unit. This formulation that starts with the false premise that something ‘independent’ can exist in nature disconnects mass and energy matter and renders subsequent build up irrelevant. Apparently, such ‘isolation’ is necessary to observe phenomena. However, the invoking of a false premise and subsequent truncation of history render the entire process aphenomenal. This has been going on for millennia. Ever since the concept of atom that was thought to be fundamental particle of even thought material or God, scientists have only made the scope of atom bigger or smaller, both ending up with an aphenomenal point. In the smaller scale, it has ended up with Higgs boson of zero mass, and on the larger scale, it has become Big bang of a infinitely small object with infinitely large mass. Yet, scientists are celebrating the ‘discovery’ of these particles. Both scientists (as demonstrated here) and religious scholars (as demonstrated through the proposition of the original sin) have developed concepts of what they believe to be the ‘true’ first premise, and both have justified externally observed phenomena by their first premises which themselves have not been conformed true. This leads to us finding logical inconsistencies in the respective theories, as well a disconnection (in Christianity’s case) from the human conscious and its surroundings (through the original sin concept).

After the introduction of dogma, it has been all downhill. The purpose of life has been reduced to ‘be happy’, ‘have fun’, ‘live to the fullest’ (translation: Maximize pleasure and minimize pain). Everything in history has been reconstructed to support this latest notion of the purpose of life. For instance one can cite the example of Antisthenes, a pupil of Socrates. He is known to have outlined the themes of Cynicism, stating that the purpose of life is living a life of Virtue which agrees with Nature. Happiness depends upon being self-sufficient and master of one’s mental attitude; suffering is the consequence of false judgments of value, which cause negative emotions and a concomitant vicious character. This philosophy has no contradiction with the purpose of life outlined above. In fact, it is further stated that Cynical life rejects conventional desires for wealth, power, health, and fame, by being free of the possessions acquired in pursuing the conventional. Once again, there is no contradiction with the status of humans being ‘viceroy’. However, how is this interpreted by New scientists? It is said: “as reasoning creatures, people could achieve happiness via rigorous training, by living in a way natural to human beings. The world equally belongs to everyone, so suffering is caused by false judgments of what is valuable and what is worthless per the customs and conventions of society.” Then it is described whatever comes naturally is called ‘natural’ and whatever gives one instant pleasure and quick short-term victory is valuable, turning everything into a race for pleasure in this world.

Instead of finding a purpose of life and adjusting life’s difficulties around it, removal of the concept of a creator has paved the road for philosophers to claim that something is natural, and hence good, when it occurs physically (or even such that it “feels” natural or good). This idea has led to human thought to be disconnected from a) the truth (what God wills from people), and b) humanity: people who subject external phenomena to their own subjective beliefs regarding the universe. This explains how Christianity can ignore and even justify human suffering around the world—through the unfounded and illogical conception of human sin—, and how, on the other extreme, physical pleasure can be a dictator of morality. This is complete disconnection from the purpose that was known since the beginning of time.

Another case in point is: Epicurus, a pupil of Pamphilus of Samos. He allegedly taught that the greatest good is in seeking modest pleasures, to attain tranquility and freedom from fear
(ataraxia) via knowledge, friendship, and virtuous, temperate living; bodily pain (aponia) is absent through one's knowledge of the workings of the world and of the limits of one's desires. This is entirely consistent with the original purpose of human life as stated earlier in this section and is supported by numerous verses of the Qur'an (e.g. 79:37-41). However, later interpretation took it to the other extreme making it in line with Roman Catholic church’s stance on self-emolliion and avoidance of social responsibilities and such conclusions were made: “Combined, freedom from pain and freedom from fear are happiness in its highest form. Epicurus' lauded enjoyment of simple pleasures is quasi-ascetic "abstention" from sex and the appetites”.36

Another example of morality devoid of being based on a purpose of life, is the evolution theory that characterizes humans as a continuity in the evolution of animals. The first person to posit the theory of natural selection and the co-discoverer of the theory of evolution by natural selection with Darwin, Alfred Russel Wallace, did not think human evolution could be explained solely in terms of adaptation processes, at least as far as human cognition and behaviour was concerned. This cost him his scientific reputation because science is run by elites who keep ancient knowledge to themselves. Darwin was less specific in theorizing why he also acknowledged man didn't fit the model like the other animals. We got upgraded, and when genius scientists like Wallace speak the truth they are rendered invisible by the media, and black balled rim academics, a wholly corporate subsidized enterprise. Today, we have Stanford scientists perpetrating the notion that homosexuality is natural because more than 400 species practice part-time homosexuality. Similar to supporters of dogma, they cannot answer why incest or zoophilia is not natural. In the mean time, the likes of Dawkins freely talk about pedophilia being natural while other talk about incest being natural.37 The purpose of this article is not necessarily to denounce any of the presented beliefs, but to point out the logical mess humankind has gotten into in both social and natural sciences once scholars avoid their study from the purpose of creation, providing some sort of grounding of morality and consciousness.

The ‘enlightenment’ phase of European history made the entire process of fulfilling purpose of life travel further down this very degradation route. The original purpose was perverted by the Roman Catholic church to be ‘salvation through Jesus’ – a dogma the post ‘enlightenment’ replaced with replaced by notions of inalienable natural rights and the potentialities of reason, and universal ideals of love and compassion gave way to civic notions of freedom, equality, and citizenship. There, the definition of ‘natural’ and ‘universal’ remained arbitrary, devoid of any reasoning of logical thought: even if some universal ideas of rights and justice could be discerned, there was a lack of justification as to why they should be accepted. This leads to the human mind being unable to realize which part of a theory can be considered ‘moral’, and what is not considered ‘moral’.

Being unable to tell the difference between what is logically moral and immoral lead to the notions of ‘freedom, equality, and citizenship’ to merely be assumptions of righteousness. These assertions then became dogmatic and unjustified. This has lead to our modern era, which we can characterize to be the era of a rollercoaster ride of spiralling down of all values through a successive degradation through ever more lunatic dogmas and false premises listed below, each of which are equally unjustified. If you recall, they are unjustified on two grounds: a) the fact that they are assumptions used to channel observed phenomena, and not objective conclusions;
and b) the fact that they are disconnected from a fundamental root of the purpose of creation—which can provide as a moral grounding.

1. Classical liberalism (humans as beings with inalienable natural rights (including the right to retain the wealth generated by one's own work), and sought out means to balance rights across society. Broadly speaking, it considers individual liberty to be the most important goal, because only through ensured liberty are the other inherent rights protected.)

2. Kantianism (all actions are performed in accordance with some underlying maxim or principle, and for actions to be ethical, they must adhere to the categorical imperative. Kant denied that the consequences of an act in any way contribute to the moral worth of that act, his reasoning being that the physical world is outside one's full control and thus one cannot be held accountable for the events that occur in it.

3. Utilitarianism (“Nature” has placed mankind under the governance of two sovereign masters, ‘pain’ and ‘pleasure’, then, from that moral insight, deriving the Rule of Utility: "that the good is whatever brings the greatest happiness to the greatest number of people").

4. Nihilism (Life is without objective meaning. A natural result of the idea that God is dead, and insisting it was something to overcome. This is fighting the God that is now ‘dead’)

5. Pragmatism (Truth is whatever works, and "only in struggling with the environment" do data, and derived theories, have meaning, and that consequences, like utility and practicality, are also components of truth. Purpose of life is discoverable only via experience.)

6. Theism (God created the universe and that God and humans find their meaning and purpose for life in God's purpose in creating.)

7. Existentialism (Each man and each woman creates the essence (meaning and purpose) of his and her life; life is not determined by a supernatural god or an earthly authority, one is free.)

8. Absurdism (the Absurd arises out of the fundamental disharmony between the individual's search for meaning and the apparent meaninglessness of the universe. As beings looking for meaning in a meaningless world, humans have three ways of resolving the dilemma: 1) Suicide; 2) “Religious” belief; and 3) Acceptance of the Absurd).

9. Secular humanism (the human species came to be by reproducing successive generations in a progression of unguided evolution as an integral expression of nature, which is self-existing. People determine human purpose without supernatural influence; it is the human personality (general sense) that is the purpose of a human being's life.)

10. Logical positivism (the question: what is the meaning of life? Is itself meaningless)

11. Postmodernism (seeks meaning by looking at the underlying structures that create or impose meaning, rather than the epiphenomenal appearances of the world.)
12. Naturalistic pantheism (the meaning of life is to care for and look after nature and the environment).

Overall, the decline of human values can be summarized in the following transition. The purpose of life is to be the creator’s viceroy (and therefore have Godly moral qualities) fallen sinner with original sin in need of salvation inherently selfish and stupid (as part of the animal kingdom) inherently selfish but intelligent self-sustained and capable of controlling his surrounding to maximize pleasure and minimize pain.

4 The Truth Criterion

At the core of this discussion of the purpose of life, humanity, values, and deconstruction of first premises, is the notion of truth: how can we know the difference between truth and falsehood? This question is especially important in knowing how and why something can be moral or immoral. In 2006, the lead author posed the question “What is true?” with the aim of uncovering and specifying the various ways of distinguishing truth from falsehood. After six months of research, the following criteria for truth were developed. This logic was used to define natural cognition or natural material or natural energy as follows:

a) there must be a true basis or source;
b) the truth itself must remain non-refuted continuously over time (it must be absolute); and

c) any break in its continuity or a similar exception must be supported by a true criterion or bifurcation point.

The third-mentioned item in the above list sets scientific cognition apart from doctrinal or dogmatic cognition; namely, that logical discontinuities and observations in phenomena must and can be supported by other truths. Notwithstanding the longstanding general acceptance of the distinction that Thomas Aquinas is the father of doctrinal philosophy and Averroes\textsuperscript{38} (Ibn Rushd) the father of secular philosophy, our research uncovers the fact that, regardless of the claim to be operating on an entirely secular basis utterly disconnected from ‘religious bias’ of any kind, all aspects of scientific developments in modern Europe have been based on doctrinal philosophy. If the assumption that modern New science is based on non-dogmatic logic is set aside, it becomes clear that, precisely because so many of its original premises are unreal/unprovable, unnatural or non-existent, modern science is full of paradoxes and contradictions.

In other words, the degradation of science and political philosophy from Roman Catholic times to the modern day is solely due to the use of dogma-based philosophy in which philosophical traditions are discussed and accepted prior to accepting the foundations (the premise) of that philosophy to be true. Unless there is an absolute truth one derives cognition from, it is impossible to have ethical grounding in any subject matter, including the natural sciences. On the topic of humanity, based on the down-spiralling history of political philosophy, the disconnection of the human conscience and human morality—humanity—occurred historically when people disconnected the purpose of their creation (or belief of their purpose) from their actions.

5 Conclusion
The first part of this article attempt to develop a relevant framework as to how on can conceive of logic and cognition so as to be able to eventually conceive of holistic theory of humanity. In terms of cognition, we reviewed the several components of objective cognition and how objectivity—that is, lack of a non-discerned first premise—is needed to come up with a theoretical conception of anything, including humanity.

Specifically discussing humanity, the bulk of this article focuses on how without God, or at least a discernible purpose of creation, it is impossible to objectively or purely analyze any phenomena, as there will always be an existence of a first premise distorting the reality one sees. We also show that Christian, enlightenment, and post-enlightenment philosophical traditions paved the road for the major roadblock in the search of morality—the existence of both unproven and illogical first premises that distort the purpose of human existence end up distorting what humans are “supposed” to do, and consequentially, what humanity is. Islam, Hinduism, and ancient greek philosophy were analyzed and deemed logical due to the fact that they acknowledged a purpose of life and based their actions (human actions) on it—these actions collectively defining humanity. It is however important to note that, as perhaps Derrida and Kierkegaard imply along the post-Kantian tradition, any conception of God what God believes to be moral is in fact moral. This allows anybody to claim a subjective version of morality—this problem is addressed in the next part of the paper.

Finally, we pinpointed the origin of Godless material ethics with Christianity, due to the faulty concepts of the original sin and the Christian trinity. Afterwards, centuries of so-called secular ethics destroyed the ancient concepts of humanity being an attempt to imitate Godly qualities. Classical liberalism, utilitarianism, Nihilism, and their respective first premises have overwhelmed philosophical discourse and created room for actions and policies to be justified on those grounds, irrespective of whether or not truth-based ethics were followed (or with deliberate disregard for it). This article pinpoints the fact that ethics started of with the need to imitate God—the purpose of life—, and that later discourse polluted these innocent ideologies with their illogical first premises. The next part of this article looks at re-constructing a logical an ethical definition and framework for humanity.
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Notes
8 We can loosely attribute one of his foundational texts to be the following: Bärbel Inhelder and Jean Piaget, *The Growth of Logical Thinking from Childhood to Adolescence: An Essay on the Construction of Formal Operational Structures* (London: Psychology Press, 1958).
9 Jane Flower, “Divining woman: the Waterpourer's Lineage: establishing woman's spiritual genealogy through the emergence of her sexual and spiritual specificity after deconstruction of the grand narrative on woman as 'misbegotten male' and cause of 'original sin',' (PhD disss, University Of Western Sydney, 2001).
14 Ibid.
16 Ibid.
32 Islam et al., cit op, 3, p. 266.
35 This Benthamite philosophy—being devoid of God as found in any of the great religions—proposes that something is ‘good’ when it maximizes pleasure and minimizes ‘pain’. We see below that without a dictator of absolute standards, we can develop any theory of morality we believe to be true, without actually being able to conform whether or not it is true. Unlike which is the case in Hinduism, Islam, and Greek Stoic philosophy, when one cannot pinpoint what God believes to be natural and good for humanity, any number of people can claim to have the absolute truth.