Cheerfulism / v.0.0.2

General Index:

Full Index:

0.- The purpose of this text.

Aiming for assuring happiness in my life and raising happy children I might have ended up crafting the final answer for the eternal prosperity of humankind.

How can I be the happiest I can in this life? What will I teach to my future children? Those questions wander around my mind since I was 15, now six and a half years later, I think I've found the answer.

I always aimed for general explanations agnostic to my personal life. I was aware of the existence of useful answers according to your personality and environment. I was also aware that if any of those ever change the answers might become useless. Thus I always tried to find the general pattern that could apply to everyone and would allow me to adapt when facing changes in the future.

All these resulted in a sort of guide to understanding and achieving happiness at the same time of resulting in a social critique which aims to find the overall patterns that allow a better quality of life for all humans. That is what this text is all about.

Disclaimer: In some cases, I could have used more specific and shorter wording to make the text more professional and brief. But this text is not aiming for that, I'm trying to make this text available for the widest audience I can reach without compromising clarity.

It all started understanding what happiness was.

1.- Happiness

Many philosophers and people in general say that for a human to have a good life it needs to be happy. But, *what is being happy?* I present you my definition:

> ``*Happiness is what a being feels when survival is statistically granted and possess enough intelligence so as to avoid boredom in a desired basis.*``

Disclaimer: In the definition I used the term being instead of human. I'm not sure if this applies to other animals. I will keep it this way to encourage thinking.

This definition comes from 2 facts:

1. You need to be alive to feel happiness thus the surviving part on the definition.

2. If you get bored for too long a human won't feel what they call as 'happiness'. Notice different humans have different boredom tolerance but all of them have a limit in which they start suffering from it.

Now the following question can be: *How can I be happy?*

Easy to say harder to carry out, as not only depends on yourself but also on your environment. The more of the following conditions you achieve in your life and the more sustainable long term they are the happier you will likely be.

1.1.- Conditions to be happy.

- Survive:

In fact, being alive with your basic human needs covered: food, water and co-existing safely with other humans so you inhibit your individual weaknesses against nature. (a.k.a. it is very hard for a human alone to last in nature)

- Be entertained:

Now a very hard question, at least it was for me to answer, what is boredom, what is being bored? Well I define _being bored_ as:

> ``_A state in which your brain does not segregate chemical rewards when you analyze, repeat or experience a pattern. Being a pattern any activity humans can do: listening to music, play any game, any sport, an instrument, sex, building, studying... Any activity._``

For the rest of the text I will use the verb "to execute a pattern" as any combination of analyzing, experiencing or repeating a pattern.

Now we see that when executing a pattern, eventually you stop segregating chemical rewards. A logical approach on why is this is so as to the body doesn't get stuck on a loop doing the same over and over again, thus favoring exploration and adaptation which are the key factors for avoiding extinction and survival through time. Boredom is natural, in fact, boredom is essential for a race to adapt and last in time passing through the natural selection filter.

Boredom is also another key point on why humans aren't designed to be alone. Notice that when loneliness is faced, eventually, as there is a limit on the number of activities a single human being can do alone, it is impossible to scape boredom on your own. And when I say loneliness I mean it in its purest sense, not even a dog with you, not a single being apart from yourself. This is another reason why a human needs other beings, not just for pure "biological survival" but for this other intrinsic adaptation mechanism we have called boredom.

Notice, you can't be bored if you are in danger, if you are hungry, if you are thirsty. Thus boredom only appears when a human is in a safe state, where its basic biological needs are satisfied. It feels natural to understand boredom as a biological mechanism that encourages our bodies to explore when our survival is statistically granted. This mechanism allows us to discover new things even when our basic needs are satisfied thus granting us new information that allows us to have a greater chance to adapt and survive in unpredictable future scenarios.

So, _what is boredom?_ I define boredom as:

> ``_A biological mechanism humans (and maybe other beings) have which promotes exploration and discovery once their body feels like their survival is statistically granted in order to have better chance of survival for future unexpected changes._``

Notice maybe this mechanism is a result on natural selection, those beings which didn't feel boredom and didn't discover useful information before unforeseen events happened might have been eventually, or still slowly, becoming extinct.

Now, this being defined, we can see that the next rewarding factor for feeling happiness is being entertained (not being bored). The frequency and the variety of activities vary on an individual basis so the quantity of the following requisites you will require will be different for each one of you.

This is the most complex part of mastering happiness, via self analysis and introspection, deciding _how many, how much of each and how to get_ the following requisites:

   - **Health:** Enough health, physical and mental, to carry out the activities that you enjoy. The healthier the more activities you can carry out for a longer time, thus the more solutions you will have to the boredom problem, thus the more likely you are to be happy. But this is just statistics, on an individual basis you decide how much health you really need. A clear example of this is: An obese climber will be less likely (or will find it harder) to enjoy the views while eating something at the summit of a mountain due to its obesity. So someone whose happiness is brought by climbing should stay in moderate weight for better chances to enjoy better that activity.

   - **Money:** A tool for freedom, not the end goal. Money does not buy happiness, but buys other people's time so you can spend yours freely. And as mentioned in the health part, the freer you are the more activities you can do to satisfy your boredom. Not everyone needs to be rich in order to not to suffer from boredom, some people will need more, others less. You should analyze how much money is usually required to carry out activities you like and whether you can afford them long term in order to live happier.

   - **Relationships with other beings:** As mentioned some paragraphs ago, a human alone will eventually get bored. Relations with any other beings are needed, an animal, another human etc. These add randomness to the interactions that result in unpredictable patterns to execute that will likely segregate the proper happiness chemicals in your brain as they are something new, something being explored.

All these factors are easy to name yet harder to analyze for each individual. That is why chapter 3 of this book delves deeper in the intricacies of analyzing complex problems. Delving into explaining the best solution I could think of according to our current reality and state of technology. So anyone can make their best try in answering the questions presented on their own circumstances.

Before concluding the chapter let me touch upon a word that has been used a bunch of times so far, freedom.

1.2.- The relation between happiness and freedom.

I define freedom as:

<div align="center">

``_The capability of satisfying a need in multiple ways._``

</div>

Disclaimer: I'm not discussing 'freedom' in a deep philosophical way. Some might define freedom as "the ability to have done otherwise." This text isn't about deep existential debates. Instead, it's a practical guide to help find solutions for human needs. Questions like 'to be or not to be' or debates about free will are complex and, for now, without clear answers. I won't delve into them here. My goal is to offer logical insights into human existence and give real-world advice to enhance it.

The freer you are the more options you will have to satisfy your needs.

Notice, you can be happy without freedom or just with less freedom as long as your survival and boredom needs are satisfied. Here is a key point to fully understand the relation:

If someone has a problem and only one way of solving it, chances are if that solution path, for whatever reason, becomes impossible or harder, the person will likely not be happy. Thus the more options you get the higher your chances of being happy... or are they? Only if you are intelligent enough to handle them. This will be developed more in depth in the next chapter: _On Quitting Beliefs: What is intelligence?_

X.- Conclusion: Chapter-1.

Summing up everything, we could understand happiness as a combination of: survival and entertainment. Those are the 2 real pillars that hold it. There are also some sort of 2 hidden pillars, freedom and intelligence.

In order to achieve happiness after having high assurances of survival you have to not to get bored for too long. Boredom is a phenomenal that can come and go when executing patterns.

Therefore, in order to be happy, each one of you will have to find a big enough quantity of patterns they can execute in a sequenced manner so that they never get tired of too many of them for too long. In the meantime, if too many of them bore you, then explore and experience other patterns in the hope that they will kill your boredom. Or in the hope that any of the previously bored ones now become entertaining again.

Important is to know that each person has a unique need of pattern execution, boredom tolerance and different reactions to different patterns.

Transition from Chapter 1 to Chapter 2.

After understanding what happiness is you might have noticed that for you to be happy it requires analysis of different factors like health, money, relationships etc. A lot of complex decisions which all need 1 thing to answer them successfully: intelligence.

But what is intelligence? Let's go to chapter 2.

2.- On quitting beliefs: What is intelligence?

2.1.- Introduction: A very efficient way of thinking, thinking like an engineer.

This section is meant for you to know the secret to maximizing your brain capabilities by explaining how the smartest think about the most complex of systems.

As we mentioned at the beginning, this text aims to find a way of thinking about life that maximizes an individual's happiness long term. A sort of philosophical doctrine based on science to guide humans to the best possible society where everyone is as happy as they can be. But for that you need to intelligently analyze your specific life's situation and with time and constant effort improve it.

Situations can be incredibly diverse, the economy of your country, your gender, your height, the predominant religion near you etc affect the specific steps you have to take in order to maximize your happiness.

With this being said it starts to make sense if we understand each life situation as a system with different modules conforming it. Just like engineers see their creations, everyone should know how to analyze complex systems so they can analyze their life and maximize its happiness the best way they can.

In this ideal doctrine it is key for everyone to learn how to "think like an engineer" about technical and more abstract topics in life. More on how to do this later.

This analysis method is the one the smartest people use, but it takes time due to iterations of trial and error. This is the reason why your effort needs to be continuous, life is a really complex system and you will need a bunch of iterations of trial and error to get to your maximized point. For some will be harder than for others but, no matter what, its complexity will make it time consuming and probably exhausting. This is why I recommend taking this approach to life along with your closer ones, to support each other when the steps you have to take become quite steep. More on this later.

It is impossible for me to give specific instructions for each situation thus here I'm just going to lay out the general rules anyone should follow. I hope that people reading this apply this thinking to their specific situations and later maybe share how it worked out for them. This way we can have a wide resource of real-life examples in the current and following human history for specific steps to take for each individual's nuances. Like a useful big database of specific examples where these steps where applied. Who knows, if we create this database maybe we can train an AI with the data that helps us to be happier. Alright let's stop speculating for now, and let's come back to defining and understanding core terminology.

The main takeaway from this chapter is _what intelligence is_, the idea of the _fixed variable resolution technique_ and how it relates to your intelligence and thinking like an engineer.

The fixed variable resolution technique:

Sometimes in math, if a function depends on more than one variable like f(x,y), it comes handy to fix the value of one variable to figure out the value of the other one and then solve the problem.

A real and metaphorical example of math problems can be found at the end of this section to illustrate better what I mean. Please wait for it and keep reading.

2.2.- The impact of beliefs.

Now why is the title of this chapter related to beliefs? Because they put limits on your actions thus your freedom, your boredom and overall they are correlated with your happiness.

These limits can be understood as a natural reaction from your brain to fix some variables while it solves others and at the same time protects itself from the incredibly high amounts of information it can receive but can't rationally process.

Before a detailed explanation on how to "thinking like an engineer" and what is intelligence, I find it useful to understand how we use beliefs and how they relate and cooperate with rational thinking. For that, let's talk about the summit of beliefs, religion.

2.3.- Religion: its benefits, downsides and alternatives.

The clear manifestation of beliefs are religions. Now, what is a belief? What is a religion? Well let's start vaguely saying that religions are "a thing" that brings a lot of people happiness and stability to their lives. How do religions bring happiness? There are 3 benefits of a religion in peoples' life:

1. It helps people to give meaning to their lives.
2. It satisfies the natural need of people of belonging to a community.
3. In case of loneliness or danger or a mix of both, generally speaking, in case of a position of weakness, the figure of a god or some religious belief can help people feel more hope for a better future.

We can understand that religion is related to happiness in the way that creates and coordinates a community while answering questions. Notice as discussed in the Happiness chapter, the community satisfies the survival need and also the boredom one as it gives a wide variety of patterns to execute. In this case it is the pattern of understanding and answering questions about human existence and proper ways of living plus actually living them.

Now those are the benefits of religions, but they also have their downsides. Religions are based on beliefs which create limits to people's actions which are not general enough to adapt to any follower of the religion. Of course, as it has been discussed is always a probability matter and each individual will have different responses. Some will be happy enough with the beliefs of their religion and others might be unhappy.

All these being said this is how I define _belief_:

> ``_Belief is a fixed rule a human follows that never changes because it is never questioned or doubted upon._``

Now that is the key difference between religion and science: science might not be 100% certain, but it can be questioned and changes over time whereas religion does not or takes a bunch of generations,

thus lots of time, to do so. Thus for a better chance of being happy due to its adaptable nature, here I propose and discuss scientific alternatives for the 2 first benefits of religion and a complement for the third one.

2.3.1. A substitute to the first benefit of religion: don't get too bored.

Now a pretty generalized pattern that humans execute is trying to answer the most metaphysical questions. As said religions offer an answer, but, what does a scientific thought answer to those questions?

The questions and answers by science nowadays are:
Why are we here? Because we are a specific molecule configuration capable of reproducing similar copies of itself while promoting pattern recognition, execution, and analysis.

How are we here? Due to a physical phenomena that occurred long long time ago that created an incredibly long domino effect that eventually created this special molecule pattern configuration we call ourselves humans.

And the most important question:

What are we supposed to do? What's our meaning? Our bodies are biologically programmed to try to survive and feel happiness executing patterns. We are meant to do exactly that.

Now if survival is statistically granted like in lots of nowadays societies, and you find enough patterns to experience without getting bored of them, happiness will occur in you and you will feel realized. Which is basically, one of the needs religions satisfy. Therefore, to adopt a more flexible and potentially happier life, _don't get too bored_.

2.3.1.1.- The answer of religions to the third question: Good and evil.

Now lets mention that religions generally answer to the _what are we supposed to do_ question with: We are supposed to do good and not bad. In summarized terms. Now you might be wondering how you define good and bad without being based on beliefs or subjective ethics? Here is what I propose as a neutral definition:

``_Good and bad are those patterns that have seemed to grant this better or worse likelihood of survival and happiness according to a group of people's personalities and their nature around them._``

Thus you can conclude that good is the adjective chosen to describe those pattern executions that increased the likelihood of survival and happiness of a community and bad is vice-versa, those patterns which decreased that likelihood.

The needs of human communities vary a lot because they depend on a lot of factors like the nature surrounding them: weather, fauna, flora, day light available, water available... It also varies with each individual's personality in the community which is a constant change as new humans are born and others die.

Notice if we understand and embrace this unavoidable constant changes, specially the individual's personality one, we can better arrange our desires so everyone needs are satisfied. Thus an

individual journey on quitting beliefs can be beneficial for the greater community if done intelligently. More on this later.

2.3.2.- A substitute to the second benefit of religion: find freer "communities of pattern enjoyers" (hobbies).

Regarding the need of belonging to a community I recommend finding people who experience patterns you like in a more freer way away from dogma and belief. This could be joining meetings of people that do activities you like.

As examples of communities that interact with each other experiencing patterns they like without recurring to strict beliefs is for example social dancing encounters for the dancing pattern lovers, book clubs for the reading pattern lovers, couple swinger places for people who enjoy the sex pattern and so on.

Of course, each community might have some "beliefs", you can actually see or understand as a belief the rules of a sport. The key is now to safely distance yourself from beliefs that don't fit you, and find the ones that fit you the most. This is an individual journey each one of us has to take and I will keep insisting, together with friends it gets easier. This is the power of friendship, might sound corny but it is the purest of reality since we had to survive as cavemen all together.

Some beliefs clearly put limits to the freedom of exploration you can make or to the things you can search, therefore they limit your chances of being happy. It's essential to remember that I'm not talking about a given processes that provides assured results, I'm talking about how to maximize the chances of a goal, in this case the goal of living a happier life.

2.3.3.- A complement for the third benefit of religion: get literally stronger and scientifically wiser.

When people find themselves in vulnerable situations, the figure of a god or a religion's belief can help them feel more hope for a better future.

In this situation where they are not strong enough to understand or act upon the problem they happen to be involved in, it makes sense to cling onto even the most non rational hopes as some kind of natural instinct for not giving up and surviving.

I don't think this benefit can really be substituted in all cases that is why I said it is a complement.

There is always a big enough amount of fear when in weak positions, regardless of where the fear comes from (towards loneliness or extreme physical danger for example), that will always trigger in you some of these 3 survival instincts: paralyze, fight or flight. And in any case, the idea of some super-powerful belief supporting you can help you carry out these actions better. In these extreme cases as it is an intrinsic reaction to human nature this can't be substituted.

If you are lucky enough to find yourself not in an extreme situation. Doing the following, if you fancy like so, can help you to limit your dependence on this source of belief:

- Training body and mind (psychology) in a healthy way.

- Reinforce your knowledge and your learning skills. The more you know and the more topics you decide to tackle and feel comfortable understanding, the stronger will be your attitude towards the unknown, as you have already been there before with different kinds of knowledge. More on this in next chapter.

2.4.- Rationality and Faith, 2 faces of the same coin.

Aren't religions against human adaptable nature then? Why do they exist?

If religion is so against this intrinsic adapt to change behavior of human nature... why has it been so useful and influential? My answer is: because their benefits mentioned earlier create more good that the bad carried by their slow down to change.

Also even though beliefs are against quick adaptable change, other parts of religion are actually intrinsic to humans.

First, the belonging to a community feeling that it creates is actually aligned to human nature and in some cases its positive weight counters the negative one of their beliefs.

And, as contradictory as it might result at first, beliefs are not really against change as they are actually part of another human intrinsic technique to solve problems, the above mentioned: *fixed variable resolution technique*. Change will always be intrinsic to humans and beliefs are just, lets say it that way, the rate of change. They can accelerate change or slow it down, but never stop it. Thus they are actually not against change, just against quick change.

As said a human faces and processes lots of information, religion might be very helpful to fix answers to some questions while finding answers to others like: What would be the healthiest cookie to buy today in the supermarket? Is there a healthy cookie in the first place? Where am I going to find people who like the same humor as me?

Being in a religion would allow you to explore the world without worrying about answering by yourself complex metaphysical questions, also maybe without doubting your sexuality or sexual behavior and other potentially time consuming topics.

This leads to the realization that *rationality and belief are 2 sides of the same coin*, a human problem solving technique. Where thinking is the science that explores and allows improvement and belief creates, hopefully, a controlled environment that allows some peace to think better or easily so as to later have better results.

And this is why there is and there will always be beliefs but they are not essentially something bad but something that should be understood and addressed to be changed via intelligent rational thinking if necessary (a.k.a. if it gets in the way of your happiness or survival). I must add that if the change can be carried out pacifically and progressively, the better for long term happiness and prosperity.

Some might argue that being religious is a sign of being dumb because of not being capable of adapting or changing as fast. But it is actually false. Rather the only thing that can be concluded with just that information is that the religious person probably has chosen to prioritize solving some

variables first while fixing others. What makes you intelligent is not which variables you chose to solve and fix but...

2.5.- On intelligence.

We have mentioned during this chapter the "doing things intelligently", but what is that?

Whether or not a religion or something is good for you will depend on what patterns provides to you and how they affect your happiness. You have to be able to use your intelligence for handling those patterns. When handling a pattern I mean discovering them, understanding its influence on you (limits they create), and practicing them so as to figure out if they are a good maximizer of your happiness at your current state.

So, finally here it is, this is how I define intelligence:

> ``*Intelligence is the ability to handle patterns in such a way that maintains survival and later happiness in the longest term perspective.*``

2.5.1.- Are you dumb or are you intelligent?

For example, in my personal life my conclusion is that I dislike to apply religion to it because I'm capable enough of handling and adjusting better on my own the variables religion would do for me. This doesn't mean I'm smart nor dumb, this just means I've solved some variables on my own first while fixing others.

Notice that even if it's undeniable that some religions create limits to exploration and searching therefore making it more difficult for more intelligent individuals to be happy, following a religion doesn't conclude your lack of intelligence or dumbness.

Believing doesn't necessarily makes you dumb. As I explained before, I see it as a converting variables to constants in order to explore other variables in life. What variables you decide to turn into constants doesn't make you necessarily less intelligent. What makes you intelligent is the ability of sustaining your survival and later happiness along time, and the longer you can sustain it the more intelligent you are as it takes more effort to adapt for longer periods of time.

Someone who punches harder is stronger, someone who adapts for longer is "intelligenter" (more intelligent, yeah I know the correct English term, I just like "intelligenter" better).

A clear example is that there are professions where a clear amount of intelligence is required like doctors, lawyers, engineers etc and still there are believers among them. They are clearly not stupid but for different reasons they decided to fix some variables through religion. Examples of why would they do it are: because that religion limitations are enough for their happiness, because maybe they never pondered alternatives, because they did ponder alternatives and found out they didn't work for them etc etc. Belief doesn't imply stupidity the same way freedom (less limits) doesn't imply intelligence.

Free individuals can act in stupid ways and end up worse than before, or they can act intelligently and end up better than before. The same way a believer can act as it preaches and be better of that way, or maybe, worse off.

I understand an individual's intelligence as its capability to survive and find the patterns to enjoy its life. And the faster you achieve this and the more long term sustainable your patterns are, the more intelligent you are.

2.6.- The math examples as analogies.

I think you might have already a sort of feeling and understanding of what I mean by the fixed variable resolution technique, but, to make it as clear as math here are 2 problems, one realistic and other one filled with analogies.

To understand this you need to understand what a variable is, and what is a function in math. I'm going to explain the first problem with a good bunch of detail for those of you who know very little about math, hope everyone finds these examples useful.

2.6.1.- A realistic first problem: The carpenter problem.

You own a small workshop that manufactures wooden chairs and tables.

- X will be any number that represents the amount of chairs you have crafted.
- Y will be any number that represents the amount of tables you have crafted.

- Each chair (X) requires 3 planks of wood.
- Each table (Y) requires 5 planks of wood.
- You have a stock of 40 planks of wood.

Given the constraint of 40 planks of wood and given that you've already promised a customer you'd make 5 chairs, you would like to know how much tables you can still craft after spending that 5 chairs' wood. This is so next time the client comes asking you to craft some tables you are well informed and ready to make a decision on whether you have enough wood left. So now, how much tables can you craft given that you have 40 planks some of them are reserved for 5 chairs?

Understanding the problem:

Now, notice this function represents our problem:

$$f(x,y) = 3 * X + 5 * Y$$
(* → this symbol means multiplication)

This function is used to calculate the total number of planks we have consumed given a production of some tables and chairs.

You can read this function as:

- f(x,y) => 'f' stands for function. Its value is any number that results from doing the operation written on the right side of the equal sign after giving fixed values to the variables involved. X and Y in this case. So if, for any reason, we fix the variable X = 1 and Y = 2 so they are not anymore any variable number but a very specific one, then:

$$f(x,y) = 3 * X + 5 * Y \rightarrow 1) \text{ Now we write X as 1 and Y as 2}$$

$$f(x=1, y=2) = 3 * 1 + 5 * 2 = 3 + 10 = 13 \rightarrow 2) \text{ Which is the same as writing}$$

$$f(1, 2) = 3 * 1 + 5 * 2 = 3 + 10 = 13$$

Now you know what the elements of the equation mean. Let's see what they represent:

- *3 * X* : This means, for each chair (X) we multiply that times 3, the amount of planks of wood required to make a chair. So the result of this operation is the total amount of wood consumed by all the chairs we have produced. If we make X = 2, this means we have produced 2 chairs, and each chair consumes 3 planks, the total planks consumed is 3 * 2 = 6.

- *5 * Y* : This means the same but for tables.

- (3*X) + (5*Y): This, therefore, is the sum of all the wood consumed by chairs and tables. Which as we can see we say its equal (=) to f(x,y). So f(x,y) = Total Sum Of Wood Consumed.

This is why this function represents the total wood used in terms of the number of chairs (x) and tables (y) produced.

Solving the Problem:

You have already promised to make 5 chairs, so you have some quantity of woods that are already used or reserved for use, that quantity is:

$$3 * X = 3 \text{ planks per chair} * 5 \text{ chairs} = 15 \text{ planks of wood}$$

Using this value in the overall f(x,y) that represents our total production:

$$(3*X \text{ now is} = 3 * 5 = 15)$$

$$f(x, y) = 3 * X + 5 * Y = 15 + 5 * Y$$

Now we know that our wood planks can't exceed 40 as we only have 40. So the total wood consumed = f(x,y) can't be higher than 40.

$$f(x,y) <= 40$$

The sign <= means smaller or equal.

$$15 + 5 * Y <= 40$$

Solving the equation we see that. To solve the equation you have to make the same operations in both sides of the equal until the only thing left is the variable (Y in this case) and a number:

$$15 + 5 * Y <= 40$$

We subtract 15 from both sides

$$15 - 15 + 5 * Y <= 40 - 15$$
$$5 * Y <= 25$$

Now we divide by 5 on both sides:

$$5Y / 5 <= 25 / 5$$
$$Y <= 5$$

This means that Y, the amount of tables we can produce is at most 5, given the limitation of 40 planks of wood and having a bunch of it reserved for the chairs.

So next time someone comes asking for tables we can say, I can only make 5 tables as much.

Notice we fixed the X variable when promising something to the costumer and then we solved a problem.

2.6.2.- A metaphoric problem: The happiness production problem.

You are a human that uses energy to do stuff to try to survive and then be happy. And thanks to society and technological advancements you don't have to worry about survival now so you are just trying to be happy.

- X and Y will be any activity that you carry out to be happy.
- The numbers multiplying them will be the amount of energy required to carry out the activities.

- Activity X requires 3 units of energy.
- Activity Y requires 5 units of energy.
- You have a total of 40 units of energy.

Notice that in real life each person has different amounts of energy and the same activity consumes different amounts of energy for different people.

Maybe for someone else activity X only requires 2 units of energy because they are naturally build for it. Let's use the activity of playing basketball to give a sense of what I mean: If you are taller you will likely spend less energy scoring points because you will nail most of the shots due to being closer to the basket.

Given the constraint of 40 units of energy and given that you already like and have done activity X that consumes 5 units every time you do it. Now you ponder how much times you can do another activity Y to keep being happy given the energy you have left.

Notice the amount of energy that consumes something also depends on your beliefs. If your beliefs don't let you eat during the whole day and in that day you have to run, that run will be more exhausting for you. You can understand this as a variable inside the X variable, or maybe as another different variable Z. Notice this is starting to get complex. And notice again, we put away survival

from the equation at the beginning, that is another variable conformed of other variables, drinking, eating etc.

And this is it, that is life described as a math problem. But as explained, in life there are not just X and Y, there are more variables than letters in the English alphabet and that is why solving the equations turns out to be way much more difficult, even for the smartest mathematicians.

This is also why solving some problems with just math and technology for now seems impossible too, we don't have such an advanced technology capable of solving that many variables in a realistic time.

So, with time and trial and error trying to solve or maximize the equations fixing some variables from time to time is how we can manage to maximize the value returned by our happiness function.

X.- Conclusion: Chapter-2.

Happiness clearly depends on intelligence and the limits (beliefs) you put yourself when executing the *fixed variable resolution technique*.

This technique is intrinsically defined and used in the "engineers way of thinking" where you fix stuff with definitions and then explore.

Now that you know this way of defining intelligence, what parts conform it (rationality and belief) and how this relates to and individual's happiness and nature. It is time for explaining the "engineers way of thinking" in the next chapter.

But first, here I leave a step by step guide on how to maximize your happiness.
Iterative actions that will tend to result, sooner or later, in you being happy:

1.- If you are unhappy: Find your patterns, explore. If it is with friends, the better. If you are alone, don't worry friends can come along the way. I'm aware some humans don't even have this basic freedom, in those cases, bravery, perseverance, conviction and acting alone or together with others for a better future is the key for success. Good luck to all, specially to those with the hardest positions.

2.- You found the patterns? Good, enjoy them and find ways of sharing them with other people who likes them too. This step helps satisfy the natural need for a community.

3.- Getting bored? Explore and execute other patterns. (Back to point 1) But this time maybe the new friends found on the exploring can go along with you.

Tip: Ponder more about or be extra cautious executing patterns or joining a community that would limit your exploring capabilities. As this exploring capability is what allows you to adapt against expected or unexpected changes in the future.

Transition from chapter 2 to chapter 3.

Let's explain the "engineers' way of thinking" and how they use the _fixed variable resolution technique_ to analyze and solve complex problems.

This technique is very useful nowadays as a means to achieve intellectual strength which serves as a complement to the third benefit of religion I mentioned in the previous chapter.

This might be the hardest part of this whole text. Read it, reflect, and research on it as much as you want until you understand it and it makes sense.

3.- How to analyze complex systems: The engineers' way of thinking

If you are an engineer or already know this technique, congratulations, keep doing it and keep getting better at it. If you have never heard of this, please keep in mind the key fact is that this is not just a technique that you learn and you instantly are good at using it.

It is like playing football. You won't be good at it just because someone explains the rules to you and tells you how to kick a ball. You need time to practice along with knowledge to be good at it. With time, you will get better and it will get easier. I would recommend focusing on learning one topic first with the technique like mathematics and then going to an "opposite" topic, like literature, and try to apply it on it too. Variety after some specificity will make your brain able to get used to this method, and eventually, you will be able to apply it to every kind of question in life.

Personally, I'm a computer scientist/software engineer, so I have experience with this thinking process, and it has been useful during my whole life. I was lucky to figure this process out around the age of 7, but it wasn't until a few weeks ago at the age of 20 that I came across with an explanation on how I had been learning stuff my whole life. It turned out to be one of the best, if not the best, ways of learning according to some experts (one of them from renowned universities like Stanford). Names on the acknowledgments' section.

I will do my best to explain my view on this learning process now let's begin.

3.1.- The steps of thinking like an engineer.

You can generally define the process in these 10 steps. Later, I will show specific examples in different areas of knowledge where I apply this general explanation:

Note: With "a system" I refer to basically anything. A system is "something that is conformed of other things that work together to create a result". A computer is a system, mathematics is a system, social behavior is a system, religions are systems, every single person is a system...

Steps of thinking like an engineer:

1. Choose a system.

2. Define what the system is with the information you have so far. If you know nothing about it, use your imagination.

3. Write down what you are trying to achieve by analyzing the system.

4. Divide the system into sub-modules with each different functionalities. If you had to use your imagination to define the system, then research a bit about how people define the system and create a better definition before dividing into the system's modules.

5. Choose one module and analyze it by executing steps 2 to 4 but for the module.

6. Check and redefine the system's definition if necessary according to the new insights the analysis of the module gave you. And update the "what are you trying to achieve" section if necessary.

7. Write down in a list any interesting thing you have learned or noticed so far.

8. Choose and analyze another module and repeat steps 5-8, but this time in step 6, you have to check if you need to alter or redefine not only the system's general understanding but also the one of the modules analyzed previously.

9. Repeat all these steps until you have analyzed all the system or the desired amount of it.

10. Read and process any conclusions you have arrived at during the process to consolidate the learning.

I said write down but do it as you please, writing, highlighting, drawing diagrams or figures, or any mix of the previously mentioned. Use and experiment with the most comfortable way for your brain to understand and represent information.

That's why mastering this technique requires time. Individuals tend to adopt distinct approaches and strategies when applying these principles, changing little details on their analysis based on comfort and preference.

For instance, some might opt to delve into unfamiliar modules within a system first, finding that the unknown promotes their analytical skills more effectively. In contrast, others may prefer modules they're already familiar with, easing themselves into the analytical process.

Additionally, it takes time to discern which form of information representation enhances your comprehension: diagrams, texts, a combination thereof, etc.

The choice of tools also requires time to analyze and experience, whether you process information better through handwriting, digital diagrams, or graphical software on computers, etc.

Ultimately, it's about exploring and embracing the methods that resonate with you plus applying the steps explained above constantly through time and different topics to develop the mastery of the method.

3.2.- Examples.

The following examples are from different branches of human experience and their purpose is not to teach you the topic they are about, their purpose is to give you a sense on how to ask questions, how to modularize the information and how to go back-and-forth within systems.

3.2.1.- Example 1: Solving a first-degree math equation.

You found yourself with this equation:

$$78x + (34/2) = 88 – \log(3^x)$$

And for some reason you want or need to solve it, but you only know the numbers, the equal sign, and basic operations, you don't even know what that "x" is and what that "log" means.

In that case this is a pretty complex thing you got in front of you, but, how would you start tackling the problem?

First define it. You have yourself a system here which this time can be called as "An Equation". Furthermore you have to "solve" the equation, but you don't know what that means. This, _what means to solve_ question can be understood as a sub-module to analyze within the "An Equation" system.

You might have an idea of the final goal and you have heard the word "solve" before in other contexts so you can try to define yourself what solving means: It means finding some solution to a problem. Now you might realize that in this case we are handling stuff with numbers, so that solution might be a number. At this point you got yourself a definition of the problem, even if you knew nothing you should try to define it and then, it's time to research. Let's research to see what solving an equation means.

After your research you find that solving an equation means something like:

Finding the value(s) of the variable(s) that make the equation true. It involves performing the same operations on both sides of the equation to maintain equality. The solution is verified when substituting the value back into the equation balances it.

Then you will probably be a bit confused and have more stuff to learn and define. Keep track in notes in a comfortable format about the stuff you are defining and understanding so you don't get lost, systems can get pretty complex real quick.

You realize in the answer found that the concept of a variable appears, and that is something you don't know. Now you can do 2 things, try do define the concepts you don't understand in the new information found, like variable, or go back to your main system and find or analyze more parts.

Let's just go back and find more parts. Now you kinda have a feeling of what solving is, but there is another thing catching your attention, what is that x? So you research about it.

Fortunately this research should take you to the concept of variable and you would accidentally join two modules of the system together, making it simpler to grasp your head around it.

So once you understand what that X is, you have already divided the system equation in 2 sub-modules, a module about "what solve means" and module of "what is X?". Luckily they were a bit related and the questions you had to keep asking got narrowed down. Notice this doesn't always happen, usually the system gets more complex and as said before this is why you should keep track of stuff in some kind of notes or maybe, keep track of part of it, in your own memory to go faster. But don't put too much in memory, you should be able to recall, to remember perfectly and efficiently, what you put there.

We just defined a system, "An Equation", we defined sub-modules that define that system. But the key part is that after the definition you could either keep getting deeper in the understanding of each part or go back-and-forth with the other modules to keep understanding and learning everything better as a whole. It depends a lot, sometimes going back instead of getting as deep as possible results in a more efficient and easy learning and sometimes it does not.

Notice if we focus on analyzing another sub-module we could have gone the path of "what is a log?" then the answer would be more complex and we would have felt confusion for a longer period of time. But eventually you would step back and go through the other simpler parts that also eventually will help in understanding, one way or another, the harder sub-module of log we just defined. As knowing what a variable is helps when understanding what is that "log" in the equation.

This go back-and-forth part is something you gotta master and that takes time. Choosing the wisest option to efficiently analyze systems has no go-to answer. It is just something you will get a feeling of and get better at the more you practice the method.

With time you will develop some kind of intuition for it, if something seems too complex and needs to be broken down even more while there are other parts in the system that might be less complex, most of the times is better to retreat and come back to the complex topic later. This is because sometimes, as with the X example the parts of the system correlate and you learn simple stuff that conforms parts of more complex modules, so later, when you tackle that module, it feels easier. Or who knows, maybe you are more familiar with the topics on the complex module and delving into it first feels better.

Choosing to delve deeper or go back depends on your knowledge, on what you are trying to achieve etc etc This dependence on such unique variables makes it so there is no go to answer as we said.

Optimizing how to efficiently tackle a system based on your knowledge is a complex thing or system on itself if you like. And, as we are so many people and so different from each other in small aspects like these ones, all the decisions curiously converge into this method being "a sort of art". There is no right answer. Like a painter that gets better at painting through time but that follows some rules on how to paint shapes, shadows etc.

So, when analyzing systems, despite of the "art" on it, if you pay attention everything comes down to: divide, define, ask, answer and go back-and-forth. With this, sooner or later, you will eventually become a master.

3.2.2.- Example two: Understanding the literature of a Spanish author, Federico García Lorca.

I myself know almost nothing about this one. I'm just going to show my thought process and how I would define and analyze this system to conclude on its broader implications.

Okay so we know that this guy is a person, a person has feelings, literature implies writing, writing is an art and thus can express feelings. Maybe "understanding" is being able to express what the author meant in his books which is correlated to his feelings. So now that I have a feeling of what understanding an author could be, then I would start researching: what does it mean to understand an author? After that, let's say I discover that the different parts of the "understanding an author" process are something like: knowing his historical context, feelings, personality and why he took the artistic choices he did. I would start researching about those, going back-and-forth and so on.

3.2.3.- End of the examples, their broader implications in any kind of human system.

Notice the second example was like understanding a person, indeed he is a person. When you try to understand someone you can modularize it in different ways. A way would be, just for example:

- Personality: how extroverted is he, how does he react against some scenarios... what does extroversion mean in the first place?

- Environment: does he live in a country at war or at peace, what's the main religion there, what do they do in their free time, what economical system do they use?

- His family, his relations, his desires, and so on.

Define them, go back-and-forth. And eventually if you analyze someone, and then the ones next to them, and keep going back-and-forth finding definitions in common you might end up defining what is known as a culture. And, as with the previous math example, sometimes some answers will overlap and there you got yourself more knowledge or unexpected links in information which enrich and facilitate yourself the mastery of different parts of human knowledge.

Of course, this person being analyze can be, and must be at some point, you analyzing yourself. Go and analyze efficiently like an engineer everything you feel you want or need to understand.

3.3.- A glimpse into the current situation of thinking in society.

This is what is called understanding, and, at least in my society and current world, people don't seem to understand things enough or, sometimes, they don't even seem capable of analyzing them in the fist place. It's an art that takes time to master and to apply to big, complex systems. Mastering analysis is neither easy neither fast to do.

A part of the people lack proficiency in this ability because they are not trained for it since they are kids. They are usually trained to memorize information, copy-paste, eat information and vomit it in a sheet of paper thus leading to way more simpler and "less capable of understanding" individuals.

Of course memorization is also important yet at least nowadays it has been given to much attention. A useful case of memorization has been shown above: when analyzing a system, instead of taking notes that consume times you can memorize and move on with your understanding journey.

The "engineers' way of thinking" can be applied to anything thus allowing you to master anything. Whether the system is mathematics, literature, economy, or you as a person and your loved ones. If

we keep focusing education in simple "copy-paste", "action-reaction", we take the risks that ignorance and lack of intellectual flexibility carry with them. I think they are not risks we should keep long term.

So, because today the educational systems will not prepare you enough, I encourage you to start defining stuff, research about its current definition, break it down, define the parts and keep doing it until you are satisfied. Find something you would like to understand and thus control better, maybe it's your personal physical health, maybe your financial situation, maybe your own psychological well being, whatever, go and master it.

But keep in mind you will have to dare to redefine previous concepts or already old established ones in a way they sustain your happiness long-term. Managing this is what I define as an intelligent human and thinking like an engineer can help a lot due to life being a complex system and due to this method basically applying the previously mentioned "fixed-variable-resolution" technique which we all use by birth to manage through life. Due to this natural connection with human nature I think this is the way to go for the purest truth and happiness in a long-term lasting manner.

It is intrinsically uncomfortable and you will need to be smart and brave because redefining certain topics will imply certain big or small changes in your life, which, sometimes, might be better to delay in order to be happier long-term, and sometimes won't. Indeed it's complex. Now it's your turn to analyze your situation, your system, if you feel like, in the way an engineer would.

Use assumed truths or definitions on concepts because they are necessary but treat them as less statically as you can. Don't take one definition for granted forever, learn, explore, adapt. Don't fall into dogmas too frequently, be a scientist against everything, question even the most awkward or unpleasant questions. I know it's not easy, just telling you that with time and effort, trial and error, you will eventually feel more and more strong and it will likely lead you to tackle the questions that you thought you would never defy, technical and moral ones. The more strength you gather the lesser the discomfort or the more bearable it becomes. I wish you good luck.

3.4.- A glimpse into the role that nowadays technology has in thinking.

Current society are very bad using this method but... good news! This method today is as efficient as it has ever been specially thanks to the tech we currently have. Previously it made sense to memorize more than analyze because we didn't have computers to easily compute and store information, now we do. And even more recently we have AI which is capable of not just computing and storing information but arranging or digesting it in incredibly useful ways really fast.

Thanks to these advancements the process of research has accelerated dramatically thus our capabilities for understanding systems have ben strengthen dramatically too. It wouldn't surprise me if my grandson at 15 years old, with proper training in the engineers way of thinking plus the aid of the new tech would be smarter that all current 20 year old people of today. The same way as me, thanks to internet and the flow of information, I'm wiser than my parents at my age.

It wouldn't have been possible in the past for everyone to apply this technique and thus you could eventually conclude that this is not the best "way of thinking". This is because we didn't have such an easy way to store information, search it and analyze it. But now we do.

That is why I truly think the better we get at analyzing problems with this dynamic method, the better we will get at solving even the hardest ones like world hunger, wars and moral dilemmas. As this technique is designed and complies with the nature and current state of human's boredom and happiness, survival needs and information processing.

X.- Conclusion: Chapter-3 till 3.4.

Summing up, this chapter was meant to show how we should think of problems in the modern world, how we should analyze them to truly understand them and make the most of our brain and technology in order to facilitate the search for happiness.

From here I encourage you to go out there and use this to analyze anything: how can I bake this tasty lemon pie? Why are these 2 countries at war? How can I cure this disease? Why do objects fall to the ground? How did my baker bake that lemon pie? Oh my god it was so tasty. Why do I love this person? What is love? Baby don't hurt me Etc etc (last phrase was a referene to a song)

The more systems you analyze, the better you will get at it and the closer to the truth you will be in each step you take. Combine this with:

- Starting at a young age so we can manage through life better as adults thanks to the practice in our childhood and teenager times.

- Learn not always alone but along others too.

I truly think this is the way to go for having the most prosperous human kind we ever had. Furthermore because of the emphasis on cooperation and learning with others I think this will avoid all issues arising from extreme individualism that our current society also faces.

3.5.- So... what is Cheerfulism?

ChatGPT said: Cheerfulism is a practical philosophy for life, centered on the pursuit of long-term happiness through a thoughtful and scientific understanding of the factors that contribute to it. At its core, Cheerfulism is about maximizing happiness in a sustainable way, ensuring that it endures through the inevitable changes and challenges that life presents.

The philosophy of Cheerfulism is built on the foundation of continuous learning, analytical thinking, and community building around those areas. It encourages individuals to analyze their circumstances, understand the underlying patterns that influence their happiness, and make informed decisions that enhance their well-being and those surrounding them. This approach is not just about seeking pleasure or avoiding pain but about cultivating a deep, resilient state of happiness that can adapt and thrive in various conditions.

Back to my words, in very simple terms Cheerfulism says:

Mate just think deeply as fuck about everything that annoys you until you understand it and see if you can do something about it. In the meanwhile share those learnings and worries with others, maybe they know better or you help them know better. Oh and by the way, this is what happiness is (Chapter 1) and this other thing (Chapter 3) is the most efficient way of thinking deeply. :D

If you feel like, give it a try, it won't be easy, better do it with someone. Create friends, a sort of community please, it is way much better than going alone like I did. I strongly recommend this specially for those with the hardest starting points. I'm aware mine is not the hardest, not even close. You might be faster alone, but together you will arrive further, and sometimes, even faster.

My understanding of happiness and critical thinking thanks to complex system analysis and its application through the years, has lead me to a safe and sustainable state that seems to be applicable to any human. I think it is, this is the main reason why I'm writing this text.

To conclude, these are the 3 basic action lines that Cheerfulism promotes:

1. Always learn and, when discomfort, question.

2. Explore as response to discomfort. Sometimes alone and sometimes with people.

3. All being peaceful but able to defend yourself if necessary. Physically and psychologically. Use violence only in imminent life or death situations.

These are the main ideas I hope people take with them after reading this intricate book. All other chapters are just explanations on how I think all this can transform our current world. I truly think this understanding of happiness, intelligence and thinking can cultivate the most prosperous humanity ever.

Good luck to everyone whatever you decide to do and I wish you a great cheerful life.

Transition from Chapter 3 to the following chapters.

So far I've explained how to tackle and manage life in the most efficient way possible at an individual level. In the following chapters I will explore the possible consequences of this behavior if a majority of us adopt this way of thinking and get good at it.

1.- Cheerfulism is actually just the first 3 chapters

Thus now it comes a part of the text which is more speculative, you can see the following chapters as a way of making sense of society from a cheerful perspective.

I've been thinking and analyzing society based on the principles already explained and these have been my conclusions so far. Of course, as an engineer, I'm applying its way of thinking and changes in the explanations can be carried out in the future as new experiences and hypothesis prove me wrong. But that is the beauty of this philosophy, being able to guide yourself towards the truth without fearing the acceptance of being wrong.

With this being said, here are my thoughts on societies and how, "the perfect society" would look like. I don't aim for this text to be filled with theory, I'm going to propose individual changes based on Cheerfulism that I believe if we all do them together and helping each other, they will bring us closer to an utopia.

Please remember, a real world problem can have different solutions and maybe some of them can be deducted from the same principles. The following parts are MY thoughts on real world stuff, Cheerfulism is the building block to reason about these thoughts. The following is not what Cheerfulism thinks about the upcoming topics. It's just what me, trying to apply its principles, has come to conclude.

Different authors have concluded different things along history being based on the same ideology, ones having better results than others. Don't take what you read as the summit of truth when applying Cheerfulism's philosophy. It's just what its creator concluded. And just because I'm "the creator" in the way of putting its pieces together, it doesn't mean I'm right, as you should have already noticed if you think like a "cheerful" person.

2.- Person who applies Cheerfulism == cheerful

Yes here I declare that someone who faces life with Cheerfulism can self-identify himself or herself as "cheerful". I'm aware problems are not cheerful, indeed they can be the complete opposite, intricate serious life or death situations where the word cheerful might seem like an idiot's choice. I chose it as a hope that it will serve as a little little bright at the end of the tunnel for those who are facing the toughest of situations to solve.

3.- Why do you call this Cheerfulism?

I am Spanish, and one of my last names means cheerful.

<p align="center">Carlos Alegre == Charles Cheerful</p>

And I'm the one writing and thinking this, so why not. Furthermore, those who have this flexibility in life, try, fail, get up, talk to people, cooperate, and never stop living tend to be happy. Happiness creates smiles, smiles define a cheerful person. My last name being that one was just a happy (or cheerful) accident, but it adds some romance to it, doesn't it? Am I JoyBoy from OnePiece, whatever that means? Don't think so, but at least I'm a bit of it I guess. If you haven't read the series One Piece and do not understand what I'm writing now, don't worry, I'm just recommending it to you.

Now, without further ado, let's go to my cheerful perspective on different essential topics of human societies.

4.- Thoughts on the ideal society, part 1: On power dynamics, morality plus the influence of Cheerfulism and new tech on them.

In all societies of humans who co-exist for living, the situation of conflict arises when at least 2 beings want to solve a problem in different opposing ways. So what happens then? Assuming the beings have nowhere else to go. The world is finite and you can't be running to uncharted lands forever.

The answer to what happens is always one of these two or some combination of both:

1.- They talk and decide an outcome.
2.- They physically fight and the winner decides an outcome.

We could say that the first option is the peaceful one and the other one is the violent one.

Despite all this, there are conflicts unsolvable by peace, like lack of enough food for everyone. I can not prove why, but if you have no food and you and your neighbor have to chose between their child or yours, you will eventually most likely end up physically fighting for the survival of your children.

That is where strength comes in, the winner decides, or in other words, the winner rules.

Given our advanced technology, these kinds of problems might seem alien for some of us but it's as real as our origins so we shouldn't forget about them.

When societies grow and when violent conflict arises on them, it is not anymore about pure fighting strength but coordinating strengths of people who agree with you, thus we create armies. And for whoever becomes the one who rules, the ruler, you need strength and coordination of that strength so you keep being the ruler. To coordinate strength you need to communicate, to transmit information.

As a ruler, for example you can opt to rule by fear or by other different means.

It feels natural due to the simplicity of human societies back then, that the most simple way of solving an issue, violence, is used and blood needs to be shed in early history so someone rises at the top. And then, if they are intelligent enough to implement a proper ruling order for their population, the society thrives for a long time.

I'm not so sure about the "naturalness" of violence in all parts of human history though, for example in the future with enough technological advancement maybe humans can coordinate in a very optimal way thanks to AI and in a trustless manner thanks to blockchain bringing the most peaceful outcomes. More on this in the next chapter.

Despite of the "naturalness" question, what is a ruling order? Well an order is a set of rules, and the order allows for someone to decide the outcomes of problems, in slightly different words: it's a set of rules that dictate the power dynamics. Dynamics are how the outputs correlate with the inputs. Those dynamics in this case come from the moving muscle and information management which conform power.

As exposed on chapter three life can be seen as a very complex mathematical function. Power dynamics can be represented that way too. Where muscle and information management are the operands (sum, multiplication, division, etc) that operate over the variables. The dynamics of power can be seen reflected in this function:

$$f(m, y) = m + m * y = m * (1 + y)$$

Where f(m,y) value is the amount of power, and "m" is the amount of strength people have and "y" is how good they manage information.

The function encapsulates the principle that a smaller group of individuals, if they possess superior information management skills, which often translates into advanced technology, can exert greater influence or power than a larger group.

At the same time the function also recognizes that there is a natural scaling limit to this principle. As "m", the variable representing the size of the group, increases, there comes a point where the sheer volume of individuals can compensate for less efficient information management.

In other words, beyond a certain threshold, the quantity of people can offset the disadvantage in information processing. Allowing a larger but less informed group to surpass a smaller, more technologically superior one in terms of power.

This balance between the quantity of a group and the quality of its information management is a central theme in the dynamics of power.

Notice: If you understand the text but not the equation don't worry, as long as you understand one is enough. I just added it for those who like math and might find it helpful.

Curious fact: I've designed the function such as the power value is directly proportional to "y" and "m" and also in a way that "y" has a certain proportionality weight on the size of the output. I could have made the relation of information management with people's strength even more heavy with "y" via exponentiation for example. But I have no data to back this up so as long as "y" has a greater weight than "m", the equation makes sense despite how much heavier "y" is in reality. This equation is created not as a pure truth to exactly calculate power, but as an image of what truth almost looks like.

4.1.- On power dynamics.

As we have discussed, power depends on how strong you are and how well you coordinate the information among different strong allied individuals so as to win against the opponent.

Those groups of strong humans coordinated is what we call armies, and when an army can do whatever they decide upon a territory by physical force and no-one can fight back successfully, that is what we call a state. This is why German sociologist Max Weber defined the sate as the one who holds the monopoly on violence.

Some anarchist thinkers think this is avoidable, other thinkers outside any type of anarchism think it is not. Either way, once some power dynamics have been established, here it appears and it's applied the other answer on how to solve a problem, the dialogue way, solving problems via talking.

And how do people solve things when talking? In chapter 2 we saw how humans use good and evil as an answer to the what am I supposed to do question, which a useful question to answer when in conflict with others. This is how ethics ends up influencing power.

4.1.1- The static-dynamic dilemma of good and evil and its role in power dynamics.

From previous deductions in chapter 2 we came to define good and evil (bad) as:

``*Good and bad are those patterns that have seemed to grant this better or worse likelihood of survival and happiness according to a group of people's personalities and their nature around them.*``

I will refer as ethics to the labeling method that humans use to define what is good and what is evil.

So when it comes the time to solve a dispute by talk between two parties living as a society, ethics tends to be the resolving factor, and this factor has an intrinsic dynamic nature. As it lies on a lot of always changing variables like human personalities and the very same natural environment.

Here is a little example of what the dynamic part of ethics looks like:

Bob sees Alice's son driving their family's tractor just being 10 years old. Technically illegal and maybe bad (evil). But in that small group from within the society they belong to, it's considered completely fine and good as the kid   is doing something useful and might even be having fun with a big tractor that does cool big noisy stuff. But, maybe in another village in the same society Bob would consider this as evil and as some kind of negative child labor.

Now check this interesting extract from a story:

"Pirates are evil? The Marines are righteous? These terms have always changed throughout the course of history! Kids who have never seen peace and kids who have never seen war have different values! Those who stand at the top determine what's wrong and what's right! This very place is neutral ground! Justice will prevail, you say? But of course it will! Whoever wins this war becomes justice!".

- Eiichiro Oda, from its manga One Piece, through the fictional character Donquixote Doflamingo. -

Nowadays and throughout history morality and ethics have been defined at a greater scale by indeed who holds the power. But when tackling small groups inside the same society controlled by that power, morality also acquires a new actor to play into its definition which is what people of this small sample group (a small town of 200 people for example) feels or thinks as of their own sense of good and evil (ethics) or what they think is even able to be judged (moral).

Disclaimer: Ethics and morality are different. The lack of mentioning the nuances of morality comes from a previous disclaimer of the text, this text aims to be as accessible as possible without compromising clarity. And, I think the morality part just adds unnecessary complexity to the explanation due to the fact that humans, whether it is moral or not, they will eventually likely act and do what they think is good for them, thus ethical.

We can now see that despite the intrinsic dynamic nature, there is another intrinsic, general and "static" ethic in societies too. It is the justice defined by the power, the law. Again, some anarchist might think this is not truly intrinsic as some think society can work as small communities without law but common neighborhood agreements based on every day decisions rather than fixed texts as laws.

Whether is truly intrinsic or not, a fact is that nowadays, all societies have both, the static and dynamic manifestations of ethics.

Due to these opposite but intrinsic static and dynamic natures of the same concept of justice (good and evil) there are times where this leads to clashes between these natures creating big problems and injustices.

Even with our technology of today this static-dynamic source of good and evil is unbelievably hard or impossible to coordinate, specially because nowadays there are lots of nations and each one of them has its own unique static ethic and dynamic ethics. That is why I believe anarchism to be impossible yet. Because the variables involved in solving the static-dynamic nature of ethics dilemma are too much for us to optimize to the extent of not causing too much chaos in the way.

It's clear that the system should be build upon some kind of adaptive morality to better function according to its unavoidable nature.

At a village level we can see that morality is kind of adaptive due to the close relations of the villagers themselves, as long as they talk to each other about their problems peacefully and the problems are not a related to a lack of any essential resources (food, water and security), then it should be resolved successfully enough in a peaceful and thriving manner.

But what do you do when you lose that proximity factor? What do you do when your society has too many individuals so they all can't take into account each other's needs in a closer day to day basis?

That is where the state comes in with its monopoly on violence and the nationalism phenomena, more later on this chapter.

4.1.2.- The static-dynamic dilemma on large societies: democracy, the balanced method.

For a society to work as best as possible its undeniable intrinsic dynamic nature of ethics should be respected, or in other words, power shouldn't be abused. Its justice should be flexible but at the same time clear and a have some degree of "static-ness" so we have an order to guide us through. I hope this starts reminding you to the fixed variable resolution technique.

Now what is the best technique humans have came up with in order to strike this balance? Democracy. A few rulers with limited power due to the independence from one another that set a bunch of rules for co-existing and if detected evil, the rulers or the rules, can be changed via the mechanism of voting and district representation by the very same individuals in each ones' small group. This is brilliant as it links the static stability with the voters that are the source of the dynamic part of ethics. All these while preventing abuse of power. Of course, if applied ideally.

Now in the case of smaller societies some anarchist might interestingly argue that there will be no law and need for democracy as the closeness of intelligent neighbor bonds, motivated by the promise of prosperity through peace, will be enough to encourage peaceful arrangement of problems that do not imply the absence of basic needs. And I think they are right in that hypothetical scenario, but reality is conformed of big societies and our information management capabilities are too rudimentary for coordinating and have under control the lots and lots of different variables that affect the urge of conflict. More about the amount of variables and technological challenges in the next chapter.

Now regardless of the power dynamic chosen by a society, whether democratic, authoritarian etc you need a way to manage the information in order to make the muscle (the people) move, act.

4.1.3.- The information management role in power dynamics.

In the past, to get easy support from big amounts people, you could use religion. People see good things in religions and they just needed to speak a language to understand them, not even reading was necessary. So they might as well do what the thing that they understand and perceive is bringing them good says.

Religion was among, if not the fastest, quicker options for information flow and moving masses in a primitive world where information couldn't flow fast but where big societies had to cooperate or dispute over things.

Now we got internet and, even more recently, powerful AI plus blockchain that bring very important factors to power dynamics: faster access to information (internet), faster search of information (AI) and verifiability and trustless systems that require the minimal to no trust between individuals (blockchain), so, what are the implications? More on this on the next chapter.

The thing is, it is easier to move people by religion, easier to move people is easier to move "information" and people and information are power and power determines who owns an uncharted or disputed land or rules over it. Maybe this is an essential part on why religions play quite a role in lots of humanities' problems along history so far. But nowadays people are less religious and maybe that is a natural consequence to the enhanced access to information and its understanding.

So nowadays that religion is not enough to control the biggest crowds due to more information available with a better understanding of it from people. New things have to be used to accumulate big amounts of power. Good and evil, the communist vs freedom, the (insert right wing) vs (insert left wing), packages of simplified information to move people and get power is what seems to be joining religion in this quest for supremacy.

Which due to the complex topics this labels or sides embrace, its simplifications eventually make them be based on arbitrary truths that people believe applicable in general context when they are not. They are adapted to a reduced, often wrong, vision of reality. Which through history it has been seen that leads to conflict in complex scenarios as life itself.

When seeing this phenomena from an individual point of view seems quite absurd, because it is designed or it is a consequence that only makes sense from a crowd flow point of view. It's the little mistakes made upon this simplified truth that get aggregated and with time conclude in some kind of conflict.

So we can see that religion is not as big of an excuse to move information anymore but now the flow of information is carried out in other ways (simplifying and opposing concepts) to win disputed decisions or to win a fight and see who gets more power.

Some examples of simplifications used for the flow of information in the quest for power are:

- Simplifying the feminism movement to confront men vs women.
- Simplifying the resource allocation problem to confront libertarians vs communist.
- Simplifying renewable sources of energy and adaptation to confront ecologist vs "planet killers".
- Simplifying human sexual desires and love to confront heterosexual people vs whatever is not straight.

Artificial rivals deduced from a real intellectual effort to describe a problem which might be true and real but both of its simplified derived dichotomies are wrong to some extent as they have been created through a simplification of reality. And when simplifying you always miss little details that in complex systems tend to be crucial at minimizing chaos. What is worse, usually they are not dichotomies but different faces of the same coin, like faith and reason, which usually leads to the feeling of absurdism and the feeling of "this could have been avoided" after some conflict ends or diminishes.

All these dichotomizations, for learning purposes are not bad, but for solving real life complex systems, those little details are as important as the whole. A small perturbation in the complex systems we live in can cause unpredicted, and probably undesired, consequences like butterfly effects.

But the people nowadays seems to use this simplified truths to guide themselves and don't usually adapt or it takes them lots of years or a big catastrophic event to change their minds or maybe just extend their vision just a bit to encapsulate parts of the omitted truths inside of their simplified ones.

Politicians and whoever is fighting for power in this world (maybe some others with lots of money) know this, people demand simplified actions for complex truths.

And as they are often fighting for power not by conviction but out of necessity as their economical earnings depend on it. The world leaders tend to act like in a market, there is a demand for a product and they just offer it. Leading to them acting in stupid ways out of the simplified demands of its people, and, if any politician or powerful individual dares to act in a reasonable manner abstracted away from the simplified truths, people won't understand and for sure the powerful person will gain unpopularity or just be ignored due to most of people not being able to understand what it proposes. Then they will label the powerful as good or bad and that is it. They won't change short or medium term, if labeled good they will praise the powerful and if bad they will just hate him.

In this polarized due to simplification mindset people live, making someone hate you can have horrible extreme consequences, from the most extreme ones like live or death to weaker but disgusting ones like social bullying. So, even assuming some powerful people might be doing this out of malice and self-enrichment, their motivations to stop will be little as for sure, due to the simplified truths, they have gathered hatred from people and they won't feel physically safe coming out of power. Thus this creates a vicious cycle and an alienation feeling from the powerful to the citizens and vice-versa.

To sum up so far, people live out of simplified truths that are dangerous due to the butterfly effects in our complex societies and the powerful ones are not incentivize to renounce to these simple actions due to 3 different reasons:

1.- Their economical dependence from it as they must remain in power to keep having earnings. Wether they are clinging to it because they don't know how to do anything else with their life to earn money or out to malice and short-term benefit in spite of long term common well being, the demands of people are ultimately what keeps them doing what they do.

2.- The fear against losing power and returning to a polarized society that curiously enough has cerated itself in a vicious cycle. This resulting in the alienation from the powerful to the citizens and vice-versa.

3.- It is easier to guide and rule out of simplified truths rather than affronting reality. Thus some powerful people might just be lazy to evolve their workflow.

Powerful people find themselves in a tricky situation, whether they keep doing what people demand and thus result in hate and thus in the impossibility to adapt to a life more aligned with everyone else or they renounce to simple solutions and risk their power and money to go back living around "normal" people which are polarized an are dangerous for them. Curiously enough that polarization is sourced in the people themselves but catalyzed by the powerful ones' decisions. It's a tale of destined doom.

This vicious cycle of simplification and polarization hinders progress and creates a disconnection between the people and those in power. The prevalent reliance on simplified truths, which people cling to like as they don't require much complex analysis but more memorization of messages, action-reactions, like the ones mainly rewarded in school, impedes adaptability. It leads to wrong actions by those in power, who, caught in a cycle, lack the incentives to pursue genuine solutions whether they are doing it out of malice or not.

The challenge for advanced societies is to overcome this cycle and bridge the alienation gap between the citizens and its leaders. Cheerfulism offers a path forward, fostering a more understanding and connected society via efficient critical thinking and empathy.

This critical thinking reduces the first incentive for powerful to hang onto simplified truths. The empathy reduces their risk of co-existing with non powerful individuals over time. And, assuming new power people will also be or raised cheerfully, the lazy solution shouldn't appeal to them as much as they will also be equipped by the efficient thinking leveraged by nowadays technologies to finds solutions. Plus, if they are ever tempted by the easy solution, a cheerful population will notice and take them out of power.

As a call for empathy I must add that maybe we all, powerful or not, are natural victims of a necessary consequence of the industrial revolution when memorization was needed, automated actions where needed for progress, thus lots people grew up with this tendency of acting based on action-reaction on simple concepts without requiring much or zero analysis. Add this to a world where religion was still pretty influential which leads to beliefs and less tendency for change and we got ourselves a pretty high likelihood of craving for simplified truths. Whether out of malice or not, this leads to the quest for power to be a matter of simplification and polarization as explained.

The goal for advancing our civilization is to change the rules on the game for power so they don't depend that much on simplified truths.

The conclusion of this chapter will outline the steps toward this goal, but first, let us revisit the concept of nationalism, which was mentioned earlier.

4.1.4.- On nationalism.

Coming back to big societies where a physical closeness to neighbors doesn't exist, nationalism urges as the need for one, the need for something to coordinate us all.

All the big societies so called countries use nationalism as a glue to stick the different dynamic parts of the ethics and ways of living from its people within a diverse nation. An attempt of creating a shared identity among societies' citizens which allows them to have bigger terrain to rule over. Now here you might notice you got a static concept trying to rule the dynamic human existence. Exactly, that also lead to problems through old and current history. So, whats the fixed variable resolution technique that allows us to adapt along with nationalism?

4.1.4.1.- Thoughts on a substitute for nationalism: language and law.

Currently, the feeling of belonging to a nation is linked to the culture of a region. Understanding culture as the collective average way of living: their traditions, language, religions etc. This feeling of belonging or shared identity is nationalism, the glue which sticks big and small nations together as mentioned earlier.

But basing a shared fixed identity in ultimately dynamic ever evolving things like traditions and habits can create conflict when those traditions, that shared identity, starts to change and some people stop feeling identified with it.

But how to avoid this conflict? How to create a dynamic identity for a nation as dynamic as the nature of its people?

If you think it practically the only things needed to define and coordinate your society (your nation) are the language you speak and the punishments that can be applied to you (the law). This sets the basic atomic rules for organization: the ability to process and respond to information plus the ability to decide upon contradictory one.

The only 2 essential conditions that must be met to have a stable society is people talking the same language so they can communicate and coordinate ideas and some kind of way or being capable of punishing them in case of misbehaving, meaning by misbehaving resolving contradictory information clashing.

It is true that language and law are also dynamic, the key factor is that its evolution pace is something that people can follow along with. Also both factors are general, meaning with this that they are the same for all, not arbitrary like if someone likes or not a tradition and beliefs or not on some religion.

Thus, in order to stick a big nation together, people should be able to follow along the natural pace of change of language and law. This will result in breaking or weakening as less as possible the national feeling of a shared identity while linking it to a way more dynamic source thus creating less friction.

As a personal example of tradition that weakens/breaks national identity is bullfighting in Spain. In my grandparents time it was part of the culture but now a good amount of people reject it creating discomfort in society, a deep change in what it truly means to be Spanish.

In the most efficient future, big or small nations with rational individuals like cheerful ones, will use this purest version of nationalism based on the 2 factors of law and language. Sounds logical to consider a future where nationalism is way more, or ideally, totally unlinked from arbitrary changing factors like culture and feelings to a more general and absolute factors like information flow (language) and power (law).

In this future, a Spanish person would be someone who speaks Spanish and which can be punished by the state that controls the current Spanish territory. It must be said that in this long-term future I envision I don't think the borders will be as they are today, they will probably change a lot.

In this ideal case people will slowly redefine borders and group up according to their ethics represented in punishments (law) and according to the languages they speak. Hopefully, in a cheerful and pacific way.

This should end up creating a more efficient nationalist feeling on humans. Easier to feel related to along time creating a base which should help in tolerance and acceptance leading to solving or directly not creating internal conflict thus creating a more peaceful world.

But what about external conflict? What about 2 nations? As said, hopefully, in the end, cheerful individuals are able to redefine borders in a cooperating, empathetic way. Only resulting in violence and war when vital resources are truly limited.

Must be added that in this remaining path to this ideal society there is still wars and blood to be shed. People are currently very emotional, at least if you compare them to the cheerful individual I envision long term. Thus in the upcoming times troublesome nationalism closely linked to culture will still exist and disputes or new borders definitions will still cause trouble. I hope people start educating new generations in Cheerfulism, so slowly with time and generations, the new ones tend to create less trouble than the previous ones. Eventually landing in the peaceful utopia I envision.

4.1.4.2.- What will shape big nations if not nationalism?

Law and language mainly plus probably hobbies and jobs.

Thus I envision a future where people won't say, I feel from this country cause of a flag or tradition but nationalities will be defined by languages and the grayest moral areas, stuff like abortion for example.

You could say that hobbies and jobs are what originated the feeling of belonging to a place and from where all cultures come from. Indeed that is the origin and I think they will still play a role in shaping the future nations.

I hope the future is conformed by people aware of the dynamic nature of their nationalist feeling thus walking towards a more flexible version of it that creates less conflicts.

I hope the people from the future, being aware of that their traditions are just hobbies or jobs that have lasted along time and not necessarily what defines their shared identity as not everyone has the

same hobbies, jobs or even beliefs along time, will eventually substitute and/or complement all these with something we all follow along and can agree along time, like law and language.

4.1.4.3.- How Cheerful individuals will change borders peacefully?

A Cheerful individual will look at a foreigner who doesn't speak its language and see it as an equal, just with some inefficient communication between them. See it as someone who is the same as him, just trying to be happy before the ultimate punishment we all share, death.

Add to this that cheerful individuals worry, care and know their neighbors, then it is even easy to imagine people feeling from the same nation as others physically far away from them as cheerful individuals can easily connect and communicate with others thanks to sharing this common goal of long term happiness.

Due to the empathetic view of seeing everyone as equal and sharing the goal of happiness despite of trying to achieve with some different rules (law) and different languages, I think cheerful individuals will be able to change the borders in the most peaceful way if required.

4.1.4.4.- Adapting to law and language: Progressive asymmetrical statistical gauge of law.

Don't worry this section is not complex, I just wanted to give it a fancy name.

The following idea presents a way of molding law in order to make it easier for people to adapt to it. When nationalism is shaped by law and language it is key for people to feel related to it, to adapt with it.

Adapting to language should not be a problem as people who share a language and as that language evolves their speakers can learn the changes easily. Elders might not understand some of the new teenagers' jargon but that is it, they still can communicate. Can't prove it but I don't think that that, historically has been the source of wars or big misunderstandings inside societies.

Law suddenly changing, on the other hand, might be. So a democracy is crucial for people to feel as represented as possible, and on top of that the following idea can help in the process of making law the actual reflection of societies' current morals and needs for control.

This method should make law changes be more aligned with human nature and thus allow citizens for easier adaptation and better reaction to these changes. This should reduce the weight of emotions in the process of modifying some laws to make it more scientific, reliable and adaptable.

This method might also help to transition and ultimately coexist with this language and law based nationalism.

I name the technique: _Progressive asymmetrical statistical gauge of law_.

The idea is to slowly change (_progressive_) law punishments or law enforcements (like taxes) along time based on data analytics (_statistical_).

Based on data analysis slightly increase or decrease the enforcements of the law, but, doing it in a bigger amount when the data has deemed worse results along time and improving them in a smaller amount when the data has shown good results (_asymmetrical_).

Briefly and simply explained in 2 examples:

_1.-_ Crime rate increases this year, punishment for those crimes also increases in some amount. Then crime rate decreases in the following year? Then punishments decrease that year, but at a smaller pace that they increase.

_2.-_ A sugar tax increase or decrease to regulate people caloric intake and try to prevent obesity. Just for the example assume this measure works. The percentage of tax in sugar would go up if more people are obese compared to the previous time period, and if less people are obese, the tax goes down. But as said, the rate at which the amount goes down will be smaller than the rate at which the amount goes up.

This asymmetry is to assure it takes a proved larger continuous good behavior of citizens in order to really get a reward, making sure a human has taken the habit of "well-behaving". This reflects the life truth of: _rewards from good habits take time and consistency to manifest but damages from bad habits take shorter to do so_.

Simply explained, it is easier (takes less time and effort), to fall into drug-addiction than quitting from it.

This asymmetry is meant to reflect the true nature of human change, again falling into bad changes is way easier that making good ones. Thus hopefully will make people more related to the laws they create and mold.

How to determine each rate of change for each law? How to determine how frequently this rates should be updated? How to determine which direction is bad and which is good? Trial and error and democracy is the best way. Plus starting with values not taken at random but from already existing data and human knowledge. For example knowledge on human psychology specialized on punishment and reward mechanisms with a bit of sociological analysis.

I must mention as I've done throughout the text, people raised or/and that live by Cheerfulism should eventually be able to do answer all these with certain ease.

X.- Conclusion: Chapter-4.1.

Let's sum up the main ideas presented so far in this chapter. We explored how humans apply and coordinate their power with one another, also defined ethics and presented is acquired dual nature when applied to societies which creates the static-dynamic dilemma that creates conflict and pain-points inside a society.

How do you coordinate a society of big amounts of people each one with their own ethics and lifestyles then? Part of the answer is called nationalism. I explained why the current understanding and definition of nationalism is conflictive and proposed one that could and I think will be used instead (long-term, if people become cheerful) due to its more flexible and adaptive nature: nationalism based on law and language. With that I also presented the progressive asymmetrical

statistical gauge of law to help the static nature of ethics in law be more reactive abiding real dynamics of society.

Also during the chapter we explored how democracy is a really good method of coordinating this two natures of ethics inside a society as it updates every now and then the static order with the dynamic will of the people.

Among all these I presented how all these societal phenomena are just a way of arranging information to coordinate people to execute their power and I explored some methods commonly used to move big amounts of people and thus power. Like religion or the simplification of truths to easily dichotomize and move groups.

4.2.- Going deeper in Cheerfulism and new tech on power dynamics.

Now given the understanding I've presented on power dynamics I'm going to conclude how I think cheerful individuals would change society in relation to the power dynamics if most of the people acted like them.

4.2.1.- First, regarding the dichotomization of society.

Regarding the confrontation techniques of simplified truths to get power by managing crowds of people against each other.

Cheerfulism, as it is a mix of critical thinking adaptation and empathy, might make the effectiveness of this techniques or phenomena reduced maybe even to the point of ending them. This crowd movement techniques or phenomena polarize people and result in conflicts and even wars which, sadly, sometimes, as the truth they are based on, make no sense or seem avoidable when analyzed generally.

We, finally as species got the technology for allowing ourselves the luxury on focusing on the critical thinking part of our behavior more intensively rather than the memorization one. The focus on critical thinking and on an adaptation tendency will make people adapt faster and reliably thanks to new technologies to digest and verify information (AI and blockchain). And at the same time, thanks to the empathetic view we won't be only improving ourselves towards happiness but also others with us, we will all walk more synchronized and peacefully. Like that, we will reduce conflict at its purest minimum.

As a personal note, when changing along with people it's super important to respect each others' learning timing to avoid conflict. An abrupt change will bring more chaos spikes than a gradual one along your friends. As a personal example my father is obese and he has been trying for years to be healthy. I know the basics of nutrition and exercise so as to avoid that condition and I've told him and made for him a plan to change it so. Yet it is taking him years to change it but not for that I must get angry at my father. He is not intelligent and strong enough to execute it yet getting angry, even if you feel impotent, will only stress everyone up even more creating more chaos.

I hope the empathy people will eventually develop will allow the pace of change to be as peaceful as possible. And, I hope that if Cheerfulism's principles get enough popularity people with power will also change slowly with their friends and without fear of being killed or being punished very hard

for their stupid decisions. Some of them might have been truly evil but others are just a victim of this focus on simplification just as normal people are.

This empathy and community involvement (specially in diverse communities) can also be expected to reduce hate levels. For example when virtual social media spreads hate, which quite a bunch of times it's fake hate from bots, can be reduced by seen your very same neighbors every day as a healthy reminder that someone having X nationality or religion or whatever idea doesn't imply him or her being an enemy that hates you or deserves to be hated.

Ultimately, whether this phenomena of confrontation is natural or induced by some capitalist power or any kind of power like some people say, Cheerfulism adoption should be able to reduce its presence in society to the purest minimum and the conflicts that arise from them will be mainly consequence of making mistakes in the pace of change.

Now notice all these ideas can be generalized to a sort of "abuse of power" from someones to others due to lack of information processing capabilities or the same but with other words, ignorance reinforced by belief. And that is why the mastery on the engineers way of thinking will make any people, power holding ones too, feel stronger and safer when confronting change in the search of a common better future.

4.2.2.- Second, regarding democracy and raw power dynamics.

I think due to the rational and empathetic nature of cheerful individuals we will all, sooner or later, end up on a democracy.

But actually it will be whatever system fits best to coordinate the human natural static-dynamic ethic dilemmas plus the raw military dispute on extreme problems and territory distribution.

Yet I got a feeling that democracy in small libertarian countries will eventually be the way, more on why this in next chapter.

The thing I want to point out in this section is the adaptability of rational thinking and the tendency for it to find the most optimal solution long-term when taking into account others' happiness too. Which is something Cheerfulism promotes via the self quest for happiness next to your loved ones.

4.2.3.- Third, regarding nationalism and army redistribution.

Country borders are defined by how strong is your army relative to your neighbors' ones. But also it is defined by how cohesive you have your people under the feeling of belonging to the same place, nationalism.

Cheerfulism's flexibility really seems like aiming for a world without boundaries. But I don't think so, it might lead to a world with very flexible ones. I'm not sure about how the dynamics will be army-wise as boundaries evolve. Both are essential for stable development as they are crucial to solve some extreme but realistic problems (like starvation) that can eventually happen as life is complex and not always has a predictable outcomes.

Assuming a society that slowly transforms into one where nationalism is mainly defined by law and language as explained in previous sections of this chapter, let's delve a bit into the other side of the power dynamics and borders question, military power.

Here is a guess I have related to what can happen to the distribution on military armies around the globe.

Nowadays we got a very strong army player, the U.S., and the rest of armies are small compared to it. Eventually the US is this powerful army-wise because they are like "the controlling part of a couple". They do not trust others' decisions and information management enough so as to let them free and cooperate honestly thus they send their power to influence and ultimately sort of control them clinging to short-term benefits.

But, with cheerful individuals, the empathy and adaptability will lead to a "greater trust in your couple", thus armies will really really slowly redistribute more evenly across the world.

The need for a powerful police force only gets reinforced when you don't trust your neighbor, this is the same at global scales. And, as I expect Cheerfulism and blockchain to increase the trust among neighbors and cooperating parties, I expect the police power and concentration of armies around the world to be distributed more evenly.

But this will happen very very very slowly, due to the intrinsic need that security is for human nature, and thus any small mistake can lead to catastrophic consequences. But indeed eventually distributing the army power around the world.

Thus this new distribution of armies will clearly affect nations and its shape and who knows, maybe the nations will get smaller and there will be no need for a nationalist glue to stick one together. Only time will tell.

Using awareness and constant improvement with our neighbors and friends is the way to go. And if everyone takes this action, we all can have something in common, brotherhood, an intrinsic human friendship that who knows, maybe eliminates the need for nationalism. The world might reach the greatest amount of peace ever achieved.

4.2.4.- Nationalism after the army is distributed, the prisoners' dilemma.

My guess is that if people become cheerful the world's problems of independence movements due to nationalism feelings will resolve according to what economically benefits long-term both parties the most.

I came to this conclusion in part from the prisoners dilemma. The prisoner's dilemma is a standard example of a game analyzed in game theory that shows why two individuals might not cooperate, even if it appears that it is in their best interest to do so.

If both prisoners cooperate in an interrogation (stay silent and don't blow their partner in crime), they both serve a short sentence. If one betrays and the other stays silent, the betrayer goes free while the silent one serves a long sentence. If both betray each other, they both serve a medium-length sentence. Despite cooperation (staying silent) being mutually beneficial overall, the risk of betrayal often leads both to choose betrayal, resulting in a worse outcome for both.

This thinking process can be interpreted when asking the question on whether to make your army bigger or not just in case your neighbor attacks. If you don't do it you take the risk of the neighbor betraying you yet all the wealth and money invested in army will be used to improve society in other ways. So if both co-existing states trusted that the other won't betray they could focus their economical efforts in other stuff that can be seen more useful at first like social welfare or other investments for example.

Thus increasing the military or not eventually is a philosophy of trust which can be seen as the prisoner's dilemma. If we assume both parties are rational but also empathetic, they might probably chose those paths where both maximize their mutual profit instead of the more egoistic or betrayal paths.

It's a complicated topic because nationalism (along with the law system) is part of what avoids having to fight or even shed blood every time some small amount of people disagree. Pretty complex, as life, nationalism nowadays is a "medicine" for maintaining a bigger nation that can cause secondary effects like hate which leads to international wars or civil wars.

This is a very deep and complex topic and I'm not specialized in politics (the "science" on the fight for power), the understanding of it's dynamics is just a hobby in my young life. So please see that I might be missing something on my thoughts. But this is not the point of all the following chapters, I must declare this is an analysis on society from someone who is cheerful, it does not mean it's 100% an accurate or correct analysis.

Power dynamics understanding is a hobby that I felt myself forced to learn about to some degree if I ever wanted to draw the life path that would make me happy in the longest and more sustainable manner. Cheerfulism is meant to create individuals capable of handling and breaking down these complex life challenges in manageable and logical ways.

I hope other people adopting this philosophy feel this too and get better and distribute among them who gets deeply specialized on each and every complex problem of humanity, like power dynamics dilemmas.

Empathetic and critical treatment among all of us will lead us all to that mutual benefit end of the prisoner's dilemma.

X.- Conclusion: Chapter-4.

Here are the key points of this chapter, maybe Cheerfulism with its focus on the fixed variable resolution technique and emphasis on peaceful and cooperative exploration and critique will allow the humans (holding power or not) that adopt it to be more aware of the static-dynamic powers that govern their society and thus having a better quality of its control and a better adaptable responsiveness to their bad decisions or decisions in general.

Creating a more robust society but at the same time flexible on its parts that adapts to change as they come.

Anyway this is the point I'm trying to get across, adaptability based on cooperation and self-awareness is what I'm trying to reinforce or add to society and people's lives. And now, with the technological advancements, it is more doable than ever before.

In this chapter I've explored possible cheerful consequences on power dynamics. And, what I'm more confident about is that the transition or evolution can be carried out in a more peaceful way than ever before due to the explained principles Cheerfulism promotes plus our new technologies.

Transition from Chapter 4 to Chapter 5

In the following chapter, I will emphasize the use of "I believe". Please notice, I'm saying I believe, I can't affirm it, I don't have the data. I think it is healthy to heavily reiterate on this: I'm tackling a problem with a Cheerful approach, but as mentioned long before this doesn't define what Cheerfulism thinks of socialism or libertarianism or any other -ism mentioned later. I reiterate Cheerfulism is a base for thinking and living, and any conclusion people arrive at by applying it it's not Cheerfulism itself.

As Cheerfulism would say, *conclusions are based on the systems analyzed and they are meant to be changed if necessary*.

A bunch of bad things have been done through history because of trying to apply philosophical knowledge inconsistently or not adapted to real-world specific circumstances. Cheerfulism can mitigate the damage when this pattern happens, not completely remove it though because trial and error is intrinsic to humans.

Here is a little note on trial and error avoidance:

"*We gotta look at the past sometimes to try to predict our present path, but not for creating it. For that we should look at the present itself and think of the future.*"
(The author of this book, around 2022)

Now from power dynamics, once a nation is build and satisfies the natural needs of food, water and security, you need to find a way to allocate the rest of resources so everyone is satisfied, that is what next chapter is about. Let's step into chapter 5.

5.- Thoughts on the ideal society, part 2: On organizing resources plus the potential influence of Cheerfulism and new tech on it.

In this chapter I will delve into the 2 core problems of organizing resources in a society and how recent advancements in technology and Cheerfulism can help us solve them.

The technologies I will be talking about are the most recent ones: AI (Artificial Intelligence) and blockchain (a technology that allows for distributed, decentralized databases, like the one Bitcoin uses). Despite these more recent advancements it's worth noting that internet is also a technology that marks an inflection point in the information and resources management history.

But before getting into technical stuff related to the resource allocation issue, technologically speaking or sociologically speaking, let's talk about some other related more day-to-day human things that caught my attention and that are important to understand beforehand.

5.1.- Politicians, citizens, and their mistakes.

It's somewhat ironic that politicians, equipped with enough intelligence to manipulate, convince or control people, often fail to recognize the long-term value of the common good. Setting aside technicalities, I believe their mistakes lie on a personal level. In contrast to the average citizen's problem, they aren't that much ignorant, they rather are misusing their intellect. At the end of the day, if they can't grasp the significance of a future where we all thrive, I must conclude that I believe they are, indeed, dumb. Or at least dumb in that part of life.

Disclaimer: As mentioned in the transition, (this is a key aspect, that is why I'm repeating myself) notice I will say: I believe, I can't check and affirm some stuff, I don't have the statistics. (Hey! Little cheerful call to explore here, I encourage you to search them, and if they don't exist, go and gather them).

I said I believe, I can't affirm it either because there's a chance that these politicians, despite their intelligence, are fully aware and choose to act "short-sightedly" out of malice or egoism despite the bad outcome. However, even if they are intelligent malicious individuals, they're still making dumb actions thus I see them as dumb. Acting with malice doesn't disregard the fact that they are being or acting dumb by renouncing to a wealthier future in exchange of some personal present luxuries. The average citizen of today has more luxuries than medieval kings, so what is the point on having let say 10% of wealth in a poor society when you could have 5% in a much much more wealthier society. The fact that that 5% can be bigger than the 10% is what makes me see them as dumb, and lazy, regardless of potential evilness.

Clearly an institutional framework to control such behaviors is crucial, something that's currently lacking in a lot of countries in the world. Yet as someone with libertarian tendencies, I prefer to focus on individual mistakes to highlight the direction of change.

5.1.0.1.- A critique to libertarianism.

I'm an advocate for libertarianism, but I acknowledge its imperfections. It operates on the hope that individuals will act wisely when shaping their life's path, which isn't always the case. Hence, I believe there should be a 'socialist touch' when educating people, whether in public school or in the family household, about the importance of considering others and the medium to long-term consequences of your actions in them. Whether those actions are accidentally or directly affecting them. An example of action could be you deciding to help or guide them in their bad choices.

It is true that libertarianism already considers others in its discourse, I just want to emphasize that in my opinion it clearly requires a greater highlight with a clearer definition.

Libertarianism says that you, the individual, are the supreme leader of your life and everyone should respect your life project and ambitions as long as they don't cause damage to other people's life projects.

Sounds good right? Well this is actually non-sense, it contradicts itself. Why?

It marks the individual as the unbreakable, impregnable unit of society. And all action should be taken in order to respect the individual as he is the supreme leader of his life. But, only as long as he is not negatively impacting other supreme leaders of their own lives, other humans. But... what if I got a definition of what I want that aggressively clashes with what you want, who decides who is the actual supreme leader of its own life?

One of us has to get the supremacy and become the leader of its own life while the other doesn't. Then what? Libertarianism is true for some and false for others? Indeed.

And if you coordinate your society in a truth that only applies to some, even if they are the majority, you will for sure be acting in an inadequate way to other realities.

Not necessarily in all situations, but eventually the supremacy of one individual will come at cost of the supremacy of another individual. Basing your line of actions in the freedom of the individual is impossible because it is impossible not to suppress any individual in a society forever.

Libertarianism's premise is false, you can't always be the supreme leader of your life if you are surrounded by others. Humans will never be, we have always needed and depended on each other since ancient times. It is in our nature the need of coordination with others, whether through cooperation or domination. Thinking it is possible for a individual to always be free is anti-natural and false.

Saying that individuals are their own shapers of their life-path as long as they do not cause negative externalities to others' paths is a non-sense, always true, useless phrase. It's like saying apples are blue as long as they are not red. And if you decide to delete the second part of negative externalities the phrase just becomes false.

We humans need others to survive, we inherently have a natural dependency on others and basing all decision making on that we are the only one who decides our life-path leads to some inconsistencies and conflicts in coordination.

So no, basing ourselves in libertarianism won't make this world an utopia because of this non-sense phrasing at its base.

I do not think libertarianism principles focus properly on real empathy. Do what you want but if you cause negative externalities you will be punished, then it can't always be what I want, who defines what a negative externality is? The individual? Which individual, you, me? Different things bother each of us and the clear definition of what things are a negative externality will change depending on who you ask.

And this is why libertarianism defends the existence of a state, as minimal and small as possible, but a state. A state that rules over the individual while at the same time governing for him? That will, unavoidably, be true for some and false for others. Libertarianism has premises that are incompatible with each other, a minimal state next to individual freedom? next to respecting private property, freedom of association? I doesn't matter with how many words libertarianism tries to describe freedom of action of an individual, with a state this will always be suppressed to some extent.

The supremacy of the individual unless he causes negative externalities meas no supremacy of any individual at all. It contradicts itself and it is a useless phrase that adds no information. Or is it?

If you read the phrase assuming the first part as the impregnable one, it is contradictory. But if you read it as the second part being the impregnable one, it actually makes sense. Sure, as a human you are free as long as you don't bother others too much. So what then, is libertarianism really contradictory? Only if you think the first part of the phrase is true.

But wait... if you think the second part of the phrase as the true one... isn't that socialism? Correct. So, yeah, no matter how you see it, libertarianism is based on a non-sene contradiction, and if you try to see it in another way, boom, you became socialist.

Communism is build on a straight up wrong premise of any human productive interaction being an abuse, libertarianism is build on a contradictory non-sense premise, anarchism is also build on a straight up wrong premise of humans never having dangerous discrepancies with each other and socialism might be the truest protocol to human nature.

Yet I think we should aim to get away from socialism as much as we can and try to be as libertarian as possible. Sounds contradictory at first right? Am I really someone with libertarian tendencies? Of course I am, don't you see that now I'm sounding contradictory just like libertarianism? All will be fully explained and linked together later in this chapter.

Back to 5.1.1.- Politicians, citizens, and their mistakes.

Now setting aside criticism towards libertarianism and going back to humans' mistakes. The main mistake of citizens is their collective ignorance and lack of desire or ability to learn efficiently. As I'm Spanish, I will use the Spanish example.

The average Spaniard should be more educated in economics and geopolitics, especially in universal concepts that transcend ideologies. This includes understanding the principle that power abhors a vacuum, that money is a source of power, the technical nature of money, how personal debt operates, interest rates, what truly constitutes separation of powers inside a state, and the ability to understand and deduce possible long-term consequences of economic and political decisions.

They also generally lack of: personal planning long-term, personal finance planning wisdom (mid and long term) and lack of knowledge about the laws that regulate the taxes thus their money and future. An over-age Spanish (+18 years old), from my generation at least, can become an adult without no-one ever explaining to him how to pay his taxes or how to plan his financial future. A grown Spaniard can have no idea about how much he will pay in taxes or how their underneath laws work or even why they really exist in the first place.

All these are essential for the search of a better future if desired. Thus we are creating lost people unable to guide themselves or that guide themselves in very poor ways, like following leaders without questioning them. Which by the way increases the likelihood of a scam being successful.

Apart from this lack of knowledge, our education system centers around memorization of allegedly useful information too much, instead of embracing the engineer's way of thinking. So not only the knowledge my society is getting is mostly useless and incomplete for the current state of the world and for current life needs, but also the methods they use to get knowledge are on the wrong track if we aim for an efficient, thriving society.

Both the knowledge and the methodology give raise to weaker and more dependent humans in the psychological point of view. This will be hard to change as we are raised weakly and with a lot of

useless information since we are kids. That is a lot of wasted time. Spanish people have a big challenge ahead of them. They must overcome it or slowly deteriorate and get enslaved or extinguished.

5.1.1.- A solution for the citizens.

Coming back to the general case, the citizens have part of the blame, but you shouldn't be too harsh on them, or yourself. It's by no means entirely your fault. You have been in a trap, a scam, a system that molds you that way and coerces you to waste your time.

Hope can be found in the fact that we are like water, our shape can mold, it's not fixed. So I really encourage you in order to get a better future to improve yourself and encourage those around you to improve that inefficient, non-sustainable part of yourselves that has been imposed. More on how to do this later but for now let's just say Bruce Lee was right: Be water, my friend.

5.1.2.- A solution for the powerful.

Now, while the average citizen holds some blame due to ignorance and weak inefficient learning capabilities, we can't overlook the individual responsibility of politicians, who are, after all, our neighbors and compatriots too. Just another human like any other citizen is.

From here, I encourage politicians to use their intelligence in embracing and get persuaded by the medium and long-term benefits of communal well-being, which are: greater collective wealth (even their personal wealth will be greater long-term than their short-term benefits of today), reduced crime, more enjoyment, better parties, and so on.

I'm talking to politicians but I'm generally referring to anyone who has power and influence on decision making in the institutions, specially in the education system related ones. I encourage you to apply Cheerfulism in you and talk about it with those around you so its influence slowly creates changes that lead with little to no trauma to this better future. We will all walk together to a better future and then... we will throw all together the biggest party ever. I personally find the party argument and goal super exciting.

Don't you find that appealing powerful ones? Let me try to seduce you even further:

A note for the powerful ones:

It is true by reasons that will be explained later in this chapter that I believe Cheerfulism will create a tendency for a more distributed world.

A more distributed power will probably lead to you not having as much power as of now thus it is understandable if you repudiate Cheerfulism at first glance. Yet this is why I mention paces of change and trauma. As an example of people with power, rich oligarchs, are also people, and sudden great down shifts on their wealth will create a strong opposing force to change.

     1.- That is why I don't stop mentioning the idea of gradual change to avoid trauma. This trauma and stress is thought from all perspectives, from the average citizen to the oligarchies. The emphasis of cheerful individuals to learn and adapt sustainably with others should let you fear less the appearance of big changes that lead to worsening your conditions in an unbearable pace.

2.- Furthermore another reason not to fear Cheerfulism is that if you as an oligarch also decides to live by cheerful principles, you will find yourself with more flexibility to adapt to the new changes that will be brought to the world. Good news for you are that you probably already have the resources (money) to reinvent yourself in a really efficient way, the only thing you need now is the personal will and dedication that Cheerfulism can grant you.

Thus for these two main reasons you should not fear a cheerful society powerful ones.

But wait... what about people who got into power through extreme crime and violence? Like murdering, wars etc.

Simply explained my conclusion is that you are in a big mess and if I were in that situation, I would rather prefer my enemies to be cheerful. You might be in an unavoidable bad situation where people want you dead due to your crimes, Cheerfulism is just the lesser bad, the most empathetic enemies. I would rather have an empathetic intelligent enemy than a dumb cold one.

Cheerful people are expected to seek less harsh or no revenge, so if you committed horrible crimes to get to your oligarch position you can be a bit less worried about its consequences when you no longer hold as much power.

As an idea, maybe a cheerful nation does not kill you but just isolates you in a desert luxury island. You might think, why would they do that if I hold power no more, they will probably just kill me. And, in the current state of the world, indeed.

Good is to mention that in a cheerful world you would not have committed those crimes (abuses) in the first place. The problem arises mainly during a transition to a cheerful society.

If the one reading this is a powerful criminal with some people wanting you dead I can't assure you Cheerfulism will 100% safe you, yet I think it is the best option. You already made a lot of bad for some people. Cheerful enemies are the best inside the worst, because having an enemy is always bad. What would you prefer, the person seeking revenge on you being a religious radical from whatever religion, or someone cheerful?

Your chances of survival given an amount of pain inflicted to several people are low and it will always be like that, I just think that under Cheerfulism, those chances are the greatest realisticly possible.

My thought on what would be the best solution to your situation is to let you have your power until you die from old age while you agree on making the education of new generations cheerful so as to this chaos never repeats itself again. And hopefully, after your death, the person that takes your power (whether economical or political) is a bit more cheerful due to coming from a society with more cheerful individuals.

Teaching the cheerful life-path to future generations it the key for giving them the tools to shape a better world. And slowly but surely making newer humans more and more cheerful everytime is the way to go, whether you are in the purest decentralized state or the the most corrupted dictatorship.

Now imagine, just imagine, you are a socialist dictator. You can start focusing the education system in the engineer's way of thinking and team work with a really good socialist argument: A smarter average citizen that can work along their peers is the best equipped working class! What is better for

them that to give them a public system that equips them with the intelligence and teamwork to face the evil capitalism and libertarianism?!

And boom there you got it. You are still in power for years until you die and you can start making your population more cheerful and bring prosperity to your nation. Hopefully a good bunch of years pass until you die and the next one with power will have committed way less crimes than you or even 0 due to the beginning of the cheerful ideas' influence in your society.

Notice that it does not matter which ideology you follow in your dictatorship, you can always create your discourse in such a way to justify Cheerfulism into the education system. As in Cheerfulism's core lies useful human values that can be appreciated and integrated with any discourse due to its real general focus on the need we all crave and share, human happiness.

Also notice that if your crimes are less severe, like corruption by stealing public funds, all these arguments apply. Cheerful people are the best enemies due to its empathy and focus on sustainable change. As an example of a more cheerful perspective to punishment against corruption would be, instead of years in prison, you might jut live a normal life as a normal citizen but with a debt as big as the money you stole. Forcing you to live kinda freely yet anchored to your sins until you redeem them, a.k.a. return the stolen money.

Let's keep noticing stuff. Notice that being an oligarch does not necessarily mean you did something wrong, it jut means a small group of people having the power, which of course might lead to abuses, yet just might and some of them can perfectly be not abusive people.

Well powerful readers, hope all these reasons inspired you to start influencing society in a cheerful way. And, if you are just a citizen, hope this helped you understand your leaders' positions better. Do you see it? I'm trying to make everyone understand each other and make each other aware of the sacrifices both parties will have to make. This is an important part of what empathy is, a key trait to minimize abuse. More about this soon.

5.1.3- A general solution.

Changing the educational systems' approaches is the key factor to bring a cheerful world, more on why and how to do this in chapter 6.

Before getting more technical, I'd like to conclude with my vision of the 'perfect society'. A cheerful libertarian society, both ethically and economically, that focuses on allowing individuals to live and shape their life's journey. In this society, families should educate each other on respect and the importance of communal well-being. For example, if you're knowledgeable about nutrition, why not occasionally assist your family or friends in that regard? I believe the world will reach its pinnacle of happiness and resource distribution optimization if we achieve this.

I must declare I understand family as not just your DNA sharing relatives, I understand family generally speaking as those humans you enjoy hanging around with. This might include people with similar DNA or not.

How to improve the world:

So, coming back to getting a better future, how do we transition from where we are now to where we should be? It all starts with self-change.

From time to time take a ham sandwich (or something else if you're vegetarian). Then, energized, take a walk, the first one try to take it alone, and then take another walk with those around you, reflecting on your desires, who surrounds you, their desires, how you can achieve your goals, how you can be assisted, and how you can assist others in achieving theirs.

If most or all of us adopt this mindset, I genuinely believe we can make it. It's about taking those small but significant steps, day by day, decision by decision, that compound into a collective journey towards a society that's more conscious, empathetic, and, ultimately, more harmonious.

That is the essence, whether you hold power or not, on how you can improve the world.

Some of you might be in a place where you don't have much in common with the people around you and you might have to find a way to move somewhere else in the quest for happiness. The thing is people can be very different and that is why in these conversations, tolerating others, respectful speech and not to use violence is essential.

The key for this might rely on awakening a feeling of we both are different but no matter how different we are we want to cooperate for the same ultimate goal on the quest for sustainable happiness we all desire. Thus there you got something in common to calm you down, to talk about, and thus helping to see or feel different people as less like "the other", "the enemy", "the different", and more like a partner.

Hopefully this common quest for long-term happiness creates a bond that calms down the waters no matter the amount of differences. Of course physical or verbal fights can happen when discussing, the key is in those moments to remember we are here for the same reason and we are all moved by the same human nature we act upon, we all want the best for ourselves and our families despite the tags and descriptions we are using when trying to solve conflicting points.

All this will probably create a sense of brotherhood that calms down the situation to keep debating and solving the problems.

I'm assuming that water, food and security are assured. If that is not the case let me doubt about a high likelihood for this feeling of brotherhood arising. If you are hungry, you don't think, you are hungry.

Regarding the society I live in, Spain, I think we're already quite good at this. The main issue I perceive is that we're very ignorant in the parts of human knowledge I explained above. Plus we use really bad learning techniques which raise us up with reduced curiosity. As all we do is not to intellectually explore but mostly memorize during the golden years of childhood and teenage which is when most of our character will be developed.

This leads us to make poor decisions or be easily deceived or scammed or dominated by people or shyness. It's like we're stuck in a cycle, but it's not an unbreakable one. We can learn, adapt, and grow both individually and together as a society.

A big hug to everyone and stay strong. It won't be easy, but it's certainly worth it. (:D)

5.2.- The 2 core problems when distributing resources and the implications of Cheerfulism, AI and blockchain on them.

It is time to get a bit more technical so let me first define all the key points in the spectrum of resource distribution protocols humans have invented that we will be discussing along: anarchism, libertarianism, socialism and communism.

I will define them from a "capability of arranging resources through money" point of view.

- _Anarchism:_ an anarchist society is the one where public money does not exist. People use money, yet all of it is private (fully decentralized) and people freely spend it in whatever they want. As there is no public state nor no public army or any other kind of public service. Some anarchist might even define it as a society where money does not exist at all and people coordinate out of exchanging their feelings and wills.

- _Libertarianism:_ a libertarian society is the next centralization step from an anarchist society. In a libertarian society there is public money yet this is kept to the minimum amount required to fund a public army that forces people to abide by the law. People have private money and can spend it to organize resources as long as long as they do not break the law.

- _Socialism:_ a socialist society is the next centralization step. There is public money and it is used for creating more public services rather than just an army to enforce law. Yet, as in libertarianism, people still have private money which they can spend to organize resources as long as they do not break the law.

- _Communism:_ a communist society has no private money. Indeed has no money at all. All power resides in the government who organizes resources with the power of its own authority. Government says, people obey, resources get moved.

5.2.1.- Beginning of the analysis.

I will start this section with a bet and during the exploration of the problems you will understand the reasons behind this bet and why it is not something assured, but a bet.

The bet:

If people become cheerful, societies will become libertarian and socialism or any unnecessary centralization of power will eventually disappear.

The key resides in, you might have heard this in some economics class, satisfy unlimited desires with limited resources. The four methods mentioned above are an attempt to mange the resources as best as possible to create the best outcome. But what is the best outcome? The best society? I define that as follows:

> ``_A society where everyone has survival statistically granted and is as happy as they can be. And, for that, each individual has enough tools to imagine and pursue a way of finding its peak of happiness._``

So, after this long we understand how happiness works and we can conclude that for an individual to be happy it needs to: have enough money, relationships and health to be entertained, plus basic biological survival needs covered, plus enough opportunities to pursue all the things it lacks by birth due to possible limitations in its default environment.

Thanks to all the technological advancement a lot of us can be less worried about the survival part. But what about the rest? How can we organize society so everyone can try to be happy and succeed in their mission?

Well, it's all statistics and it might be, sometimes, quite impossible.

5.2.2.- The first core problem: too much variables.

There are multiple variables affecting this problem in this system. For example some variables are how much resources we consume and how much each of us needs to satisfy our desires.

Consider the current global population: with over 8 billion individuals, each with their unique desires and needs, the number of variables quickly becomes astronomical. If we very conservatively estimate that each person has at least one unique desire, we're already dealing with 16 billion variables. Furthermore, these desires can change at varying rates, adding another layer of complexity.

So we got ourselves $8 * (10^9)$ humans, times $8 * (10^9)$ desires-at-least * some-rate-of-change. This is at least $64 * (10^{18})$, and we are being very conservative.

There are a lot of variables that influence needs and desires, merely by generally defining them we already get such enormous numbers. This is the first core issue on organizing resources in a society, its mere complexity.

Modern AI, even the most advanced models, are not solely defined by their neuron count. The quality and quantity of data they're trained on are crucial too. While it's true that the largest AI models have around the order of $175 * (10^{12})$ parameters, this doesn't directly correlate to managing 1 parameter to 1 human desire or human life or societal structure. Plus some of these big AIs can only do 1 task and are not close to being AIs to purposely guide people precisely on everyday life decisions. Even in that unreal super powerful case of 1 parameter to 1 need correlation, we would still be short as the number of parameters must increase by:

(minimum number of variables – current number of parameters = parameters we still need for an unreal and conservative scenario)

$(64*10^{18}) – (175*10^{12}) = 6.4 * (10^{19})$, a.k.a. still a lot even while being incredibly optimistic and simplistic.

Furthermore, as said, AI is not just about the number of neurons and parameters, it's about quantity and quality of data too. So we must take into account that historically, we've struggled to yet fully solve global challenges like hunger and sustainable happiness. Training an AI on our current data might result in a model that inherits our limitations and biases. Thus yet relying on AI to manage our society is astronomically far from the current capabilities.

The problem is too big, but as explained in Chapter 3... All complex systems can be manged by humans when broken down in smaller parts. But, how to break down such a big problem?

Libertarianism does this pretty gracefully yet this is the main problem with socialism and communism and why they will never be as efficient as libertarianism at global scales or relatively medium and big scales.

This is the core issue they can't solve efficiently which ends up creating inefficiencies in resource allocation to satisfy needs and desires. Historically it has resulted in poverty, or less wealth, for societies that followed these more centralized protocols compared to those societies that followed more libertarian ones.

5.2.2.1.- Why socialism or communism can't handle these variables?

First, nowadays sometimes a human can't even handle properly the struggles and intricacies of its own life. The smartest of us can do it and help a few of their friends on the way. But, how to expect a government conformed by a small group of people to be able to allocate resources and satisfy needs effectively for a population way bigger than them. The amount of variables they gotta take into account escalates so rapidly that it easily creates unexpected, uncontrollable consequences with or without butterfly effects. There is just a very high chance they mess up on the try.

Even if they are the smartest people, there is no way they can allocate resources effectively for populations that are X times larger. The number of variables doesn't escalate linearly, nor quadratically, it escalates, at least, cubically as seen before. Because desires and needs are influenced by lots of ever changing factors.

Then increase the state size you might be thinking, but at this point, if most of the population are the state and have the power to take decisions on how to handle their resources we end up in libertarianism or anarchism.

I will develop this further in a bit but this is the essence on why socialism and communism are always so inefficient compared to libertarianism.

5.2.2.2.- Why does libertarianism handle this issue way much more gracefully?

Libertarianism breaks down the responsibility of handling variables to the smallest size, the individual. So as long as the individuals are intelligent enough to organize their life with their neighbors, it will work out.

Libertarianism gives each human the minimum amount of variables to handle when distributing its resources. Thus there is the highest likelihood for each individual to be successful as it has been assigned the smallest amount of variables possible by default.

Some individuals might be capable, some won't yet *the likelihood of success per individual with power* is higher than in statist protocols. This comes from the minimization of the amount of variables handled per each individual with power. This, on mathematical tendencies terms, leads libertarianism to succeed more easily than socialism or communism.

Libertarianism is not perfect and can also lead to inefficiencies but socialism and communism have guaranteed incredibly obvious inefficiencies as groups of hundreds of people have to mange groups of millions of people. And, obviously a current human can't even manage efficiently 10 peoples' life at the same time, so why to expect a government (humans) to handle population sizes a thousand times larger, at least, than themselves.

I see a possible reality, in centuries or decades, where humans live in libertarian societies where they take decisions with the aid of AI and communicate with their neighbors more peacefully and

transparently using trustless blockchain technology. Leveraging these decentralized and/or trust-minimized databases to minimize betrayal and corruption.

5.2.3.- How new technologies will help to deal with the first core problem of too much variables.

Regardless of the resource distribution protocol of choice, these technologies will be key on each and everyone's future as they are key to efficient information management which is ultimately what resource allocation is all about.

These will be their influences:

- *Internet*: faster and cheaper access to information.

- *AI*: helps to search for information and digest (understand) it very rapidly due to its incredibly high and fast capabilities of analyzing big chunks of data.

- *Blockchain*: all the cryptography advancements, networks and protocols that this technique is leading to will and currently allow humans to force to be private whatever data they need, and force to be public whatever data must be. This data is also unalterable thus creates promises that if ever broken they will immediately be detected. Some promises are even unbreakable. All this leads to more trust on different parties cooperating or associating with each other precisely because of the minimization, or disappearance, of trust needing factors.

These technologies have and will have these roles but which resource distribution protocol will prevail? I've tried to answer this question but it is impossible to, at least for me, 100% assure which protocol will be the predominating one in future cheerful societies. Why can't I? Too much variables.

I think that cheerful individuals will be able to adapt and change the protocol of choice according to their context along history. Yet if I had to bet on one, as said before I tend to believe that libertarian cheerful societies will raise due to its more likelihood of efficiency. There is another reason that will be explored in following sections.

Regardless of the protocol one thing is clear. We have to be able to handle more variables more efficiently, with the help of machines and in our own. That is the way to the most brilliant future possible, whether that ends up being anarchist or communist.

We can't precisely know what the future looks like, yet what we can do for sure is get more intelligent with the engineers way of thinking and also develop our technology more to improve our variable handling capabilities.

Then whoever ends up holding the power to distribute resources, they will do it so more intelligently than if technology was not as advanced and than if they did not analyze systems as well as an engineer.

5.2.4.- Clarifying my bet.

Remember the bet at the beginning of this *5.2* section? Well here I develop all the reasoning that lead me to that conclusion.

Why libertarianism?

Cheerfulism focuses on intelligence, empathy and efficiency. Even with advancements on technology that lead us to be able to manage more variables per person, why would people chose centralization of decision making? In a society where people can handle on average let's say 100 variables and smart people can handle 200. A government of 100 smart people can handle 20.000 variables, yet if power of decision is distributed in all the population, imagine a population of 20.000 people, with that average variable handling capabilities, their capability reaches around 2,000,000. Way better than centralization.

And as of today's world, there are way more people as citizens that governors. It is true that some society might have different traits: imagine that the average person handles 0.001 variables, in that case those 20.000 people would only handle 20 variables, way less than their government. So in that case centralization and socialism will have better results.

This is part of why this is a bet, it depends on the numbers of each society.

As of the current state of the world, by the lack of libertarianism in it, I do not think people are intelligent enough yet. Our reality is closer to the society handling 20 variables rather than the one handling 2 million.

So, as Cheerfulism focuses a lot on efficiency and intelligence I think cheerful people will tend towards libertarianism. As it is the protocol where each individual will be able to contribute more variables handling capabilities using its power with a guaranteed decent, even high, intelligence.

Why not anarchism?

I believe abuse is intrinsic to human kind. And from time to time if there is no superior statist force a bunch of human with the abuse trait will be born and will organize to create the need for a centralized predominant mafia (state).

So unless there is a way of making this kind of humans never be born, because of futuristic advanced genetic alterations or some way of detecting and killing them at birth, I do not think anarchism will prevail.

So, I believe as of now, from time to time, these traits will emerge from new or probably already existing humans in such an amount so as to create the need for military.

Why not communism?

Due to all I've explained in previous section: too much variables.

Allow me to repeat myself, even in a future where AI is so good that can create super-efficient governments. In that futuristic scenario why would AI not be available to all people? Thus here we have the argument again, if each person can now handle 300 variables, why rely on a smaller group called government to handle all variables when we all can access AI and handle way more together?

It can happen though that a government manages to develop in secret this incredible AI and controls everyone with it and plans to keep it to itself. I would say that the natural flow of that possible scenario is that they will eventually get bored of what they can do. As curiosity and killing boredom, as explained long before in the book, are intrinsic to all humans. The logical step to take for killing boredom is to give people more power so different stuff can be created. Then this leads to a progressive decentralization of societies at the rhythm of the governors' boredom tolerance. Sooner or later ending up in libertarianism.

Why not socialism?

Again, because too much variables and, something more. To explain this I have to touch upon other topics. Let me touch them and we will be back to finish this section later.

5.2.5.- The second core problem: parasitism behavior, abuse.

Now, given the state of art of human nature and technology, should we then embrace libertarianism and reject any other protocol due to its greater likelihood of efficiency?

Well, just wait a second for that answer. First let's notice that no matter which system you chose, someone can take advantage of others in one way or another. Abusing their ignorance or intelligence like parasites that take advantages of other bodies to survive. Luckily us humans are not parasites because we don't ultimately depend on parasitism to survive as we can learn to change our lifestyle to a sustainable one by cooperation instead of parasitism. That is the second core problem, parasitism, abuse.

You might be thinking about it, and indeed, this can be seen as a consequence of the first core problem. As there are too much variables, the inefficiencies of some humans solving them are exploited by others.

So yeah, people can take advantage of others. The real question is not only how to arrange the value and manage resources but also how to manage a key resource, each one's own intelligence. So how do you avoid it? Shortly and generally for now, the keys for maximizing happiness and cooperation, thus reducing abuse. are intelligence, empathy, and efficiency.

The key is finding an efficient path to maximize positive change using intelligence while minimizing trauma using empathy towards others and oneself.

Trauma is caused by an unexpected change made too quick, this can be seen as a consequence of some sort of abuse. But what is abuse really? Let's delve deeper on abuse so we can understand better how to minimize it.

5.2.5.1.- When abuse happens, symptoms of a sick society.

Let's "assert" something that might trigger some of you: *socialism is a symptom of a sick society*. Later I will proof this wrong but bear with me.

What do I mean by sick society? I mean by it a society whose individuals have too much of some of these negative traits:

- Laziness.
- Dumbness.
- Ignorance.
- "Un-empathety": lack of empathy.
- Egoism.

These 5 traits create the reasons for when ad why a human can abuse another thus creating a potential need for a policeman (a state) to regulate the humans' lives.

I define abuse as:

Purposefully harming another being to benefit yourself.

This is how abuse is carried out from these traits:

- A *lazy* human won't work and would like the work to be done for them by others: a boss in a small business that forces workers to work more, or a lazy person who doesn't wanna work and wanna live from public aid and taxes. In both abuses, a third party can (and probably will) appear to decide who gets punished.

- A *dumb* human is a human that, due to biological reasons, is unable to be over the average intelligence. These people are easier to fall into scams or be fooled. In any way, this trait also leads to people getting into each others' lives and probably requiring a third party with power to decide who is not abused.

- An *ignorant* is different from someone dumb in the sense that ignorance has a solution, studying. And the problem with ignorance, again as an example, is that it can lead to getting scammed. Thus another abuse that can require of a third party deciding who is punished.

- An *un-empathetic* individual is the one who can't understand how other people think and feel situations. Thus the definition of empathy is someone who is capable of understanding how people think and feel situations. Notice that for helping others you need to be aware of their situation, that is why the more you know each other the easier for a more effective empathy to arise. Then, un-empathetic individuals, as they don't know what the other considers harmful or wants, they can accidentally end up abusing it with their actions.

- An *egoistic* individual is the one who sees the opportunities of abuse and takes advantage of them instead of just doing nothing or, if possible, helping the victim to become better and avoid potential future abuses.

The less abuse the more efficient (better if you please) a society will tend to be. The point can be seen if we reduced the size of a society to 3 people. Let's say 2 citizens and 1 policeman. Clearly and ideally, if instead of 2 citizens producing and a policeman making surveillance, we had the 3 of them working together without dispute, we could optimize and increase the amount and variety of output we produce so as to make us happy.

Thus I must conclude we shouldn't be proud of needing a state (the policeman) even though it is necessary. We must aim to have citizens comfortable with the smallest state possible because that

will mean they fear as less as possible abuse from their neighbors. Thus then they can dedicate their time to productive seek and maintenance of happiness.

As a metaphore/parallelism, socialism is like a pill to lower down the blood pressure of fat people. Sure it can help to mitigate the pain for some time but the underlying cause of the problem won't disappear (the overweight) and will happen again. What we should do instead is not taking pills, but rather slowly leaving them behind as we get a more healthy life that allows us to function while working on getting a healthy weight.

This society of people getting along and with minimal state is what libertarianism aims to achieve but has a poor way of defining how the get there inside its principles, as explained in *5.1.0.1-*. A society of people who cooperate as much as possible and abuse of each other as less as possible.

We should not reject socialism for now, if there is people abusing others they should be stopped somehow, but we should be aware that the real and prosperous solution comes through education, studying and empathy rather than regulating which eventually means wasting resources and the existence of societal conflict.

Summing all up, this is the second core problem: laziness, ignorance, dumbness, lack of empathy and egoism that allow abuse to happen. We can also see the problem with the inverse definition: The lack of intelligence (to combat ignorance), the lack of seeking efficiency (to combat laziness and egoism which make others produce less useful output than they could) and the lack of empathy (to better combat abuse of the dumb and in general improve efficiency in coordination due to knowing each other better).

So, in a similar way as it was said before: *The key is finding an efficient path to maximize positive change using intelligence while minimizing abuse using empathy towards others and oneself.*

Closing the bet section.

Now that we know what abuse is and its sources I can finally fully explain why I do not think socialism will be needed in cheerful societies.

The abuse sources will be reduced to its unavoidable minimum by individuals who are efficient due to being intelligent and empathetic.

Phrasing it in socialist terms: cheerful individuals will make the abuse by the capitalist class to the working class as minimum as possible, perhaps, even none. Obliterating the root cause that originated socialism in the first place.

In this ideal prosperous society, for example, it might not be required to punish scammers with state intervention but societies, groups of friends, will talk to each other about who the bad people are and what they do thus leading to a social punishment in any shape decided. Whether social isolation or other kinds of punishment, the hood will decide. This is almost anarchism's answer to the ideal power dynamics of human race. But for this to be possible really intelligent individuals with a common shared goal are needed, just what cheerful individuals are.

Maybe socialism is just a natural part of human nature arising as a counter-force to the double-edge sword libertarianism as it is freedom for some but not really for others. Some kind of natural

phenomena to avoid rapid spread of bad abusive actions taken under the high speeds of libertarian methodologies.

Another natural cause where socialism arises from is the fact that not everyone is intelligent enough to handle certain amounts of freedom thus it appears as a way of guidance where a few rule over others who can't rule themselves. I think these two causes are actually tied together, the fast pace of change that sometimes happens leads to some people to be left behind and unable to adapt as fast as change thus then requiring this guidance. At the same time due to slow adaptation some faster people might abuse it fostering the state intervention.

Why would I follow Cheerfulism if I'm socialist and Cheerfulism will tend to reduce this? For two reasons.

First because Cheerfulism is not against your actions, Cheerfulism is agnostic to any protocol of resource distribution as it is based on the purest principles that determine human happiness. Principles that, given survival, they guide individuals yet as a group to to their maximum happiness, whether that ends up implying more or less freedom for them, more or less state intervention.

Second. Even though Cheerfulism is not really against socialism and if it is needed it will be used by cheerful people, I do think in the long therm Cheerfulism will minimize to its minimum all abuse sources making socialism a residual phenomena. Deleting as much as possible the reasons state and socialism exist in the first place. Thus if reduced to its minimum, why would you have more than the minimum state required? a.k.a. libertarianism. This is why I think that under cheerful individuals socialism is not a logical conclusion in the long-term yet it can make sense during a transition short and mid-term.

As of nowadays society, I think most of us are not ready to get rid of socialism for multiple reasons.

Just to name one, in the first 20 years of the 21st century the feeling of loneliness is rising a lot according to studies, if people feel lonely how are they gonna be able to coordinate and communicate as friends and neighbors?

Lack of intelligence and loneliness are the essential reasons for why I think nowadays people need and crave socialism. Yet they should aim to transition away from it.

X.- Conclusion: Chapter-5 until 5.2.5.

I want to conclude this section adding that the only non improvable factor of the ones mentioned is how dumb someone is, the other ones can be worked on. And even if dumbness can't be improved, empathy can and smarter people will abuse less the dumb. You can also see this as being less egoistic.

Yet regarding empathy, some individuals seem to lack it, the so called psychopaths. But these are a really tiny tiny portion of population. I'm talking in general terms here and the vast majority of us can improve significantly the factors involved including empathy and excluding dumbness.

For all these reasons and all things mentioned in this chapter so far, regardless of the resource distribution protocol of choice:

We all should aim to be as less ignorant as possible, as much empathetic as possible and as less lazy as possible.

5.2.6.- Interesting cases of statist resource management despite its implied abuse.

5.2.6.1.- Nordic countries, the happy socialists.

But... wait a minute, have you ever heard of Nordic countries? They registered the highest levels of happiness for a while and they are not the most libertarian countries in the world, in fact they are really socialist and have powerful states. So, is it really that socialism is a symptom of a sick society? Well, actually not necessarily.

I've already said what the real symptom is: abuse. Socialism implies abuse from the state indeed as they take your money from you no matter what and force you to abide by the law no matter what. And also implies abuse as it cam arise from the existence of neighbors who distrust each other.

Yet if that money is well spent, maybe even better of how you, as an individual, would spend it, and if laws don't go against your desires, there shouldn't really be any real problem. Socialism perse implies abuse yet it does not incorporate more inefficiency than an individual by definition. Yet it can be deduced that for relatively large societies, it will be, why? Already explained, too much variables.

Maybe Nordic countries as they are relatively small, they are so to the point that citizens are very close to power so it better represents them. Also, who knows?, maybe if they were more libertarian they would be even happier? Maybe they are the perfect place to try the experiment, they are already happy with socialism, let's see what a progressive liberalization through education can do?

5.2.6.2- Patents, an image of distrust.

The other day I also thought of an interesting case of distrust and lack of cooperation that might not be that obvious, patents.

They will always be by default problematic because you can't control ideas, once you tell them to a bunch of people, specially nowadays with the ease of information flow, they are uncontrollable and if you try it to do it so you will eventually fail or have conflict. Unnecessary energy spent in something impossible. I personally am against patents, first for this reason.

And second for the fact that, as all regulation, they represent distrust. They mean: You don't trust people to be smart enough to incentivize properly their own creative minds in their societies so you need to regulate it.

You regulate it because you think people will use those ideas without giving any or enough credit to the original thinker. And this is considered unfair, but is it?
Well fair and unfair eventually results on a god and bad dilemma, attaining myself to my definition of good and bad presented in previous chapters, I do think not rewarding original thinkers is bad. Because, why would they keep being original if it's not rewarded? Sure a bunch of them will do it out of passion or pure necessity but if we want the maximum amount of originality it will be brought by greater incentives. So the lack of thereof leads to a lack of innovation and creativity which is a less efficient way of living, thus I deem it bad.

The copyright solution to this issue of losing incentives on creativity that patents are, is impossible to truly carry out because, as said, ideas can't be controlled in this modern era. Thus we are wasting resources because we think we can not independently reward creativity.

Another reason on why we are wasting resources is that the amount of rewards patents grant to the inventors can't never be the optimal one. Why? Too much variables due to the subjective nature of value.

How do you measure what is the fair money an inventor should receive? How do you measure how much good it did to the world so as to get rewarded accordingly? That depends on how much it affected people's lives, but depending on the invention it can be very hard to measure. Like art. Furthermore an invention might be super useful for 1 citizen and not as much for other, adding a non-constant value provided to each person, you see? Another big and complex variable that should be taken into account precisely but can't, and thus won't.

Okay but how to incentivize creativity in a decentralized way? Donations, investors that re-invest in the brain that got the idea. For example businesses can re-invest giving X% of the profits to the inventor so that that brain can keep thinking and using its proven creativity.

The less patents are needed in a society the more you can really see that people communicate with each other and trust each other. There might not be the strongest of correlations between this two variables as of today, obviously there are more factors (variables) influencing trust and quality of cooperation in a society. I'm just saying that: if the patents variable goes down, it will probably be because the cooperation metric is going up, maybe a lot maybe a little, but going up.

For now I will just encourage society members to, without the need of legal enforcement, reward as much as you think you can and deserve creative minds that you deem of value for your life.

X.- Conclusion: Chapter-5

Main conclusions: It's not about socialism or freedom. It's not again about dichotomies that keeps us separated, it has always been about knowing oneself and one's neighbors and coordinating with them with the least abuse as we can manage to, whether through a state or not.

In smaller societies a state might be feasible in terms of efficiency but the bigger the society the more likely to fail and the better to lean towards trying to be comfortable in a freer world. Main reason for this is, as repeated all along, too much variables.

Please don't fall in segregation of society by freedom or statism, guide yourself in each case by following where and how the abuse is happening and what could fit better in your hood to avoid polarization and extreme consequences. It is a healthy reminder that the most optimal solution we should eventually have, sooner or later, as per the reasons explained, is libertarianism.

All this is why I think Cheerfulism mixed with libertarianism maximizes the optimal solution long term to the resource distribution protocol dilemma. Thus it can bring the best possible result to the world of today if introduced slowly into the education system so people can adapt with the minimum amount of trauma due to revolutionary fast-paced changes.
Being the best way doesn't mean there wouldn't be any bad in the world, it just means these are the best principles to think and act upon that reach minimization of bad while maximizing good.

Defining good and bad with the proposed definition in chapter 2 based on the human nature of happiness and survival.

So if we mix the versatility of libertarianism and its efficiency with people having a cheerful mindset, that's where humans will reach its peak of well-being given nowadays state of technology.

And as said in previous sections, another way to get closer to our peak of well-being could also be, with a lot of time and effort: Get crazy good efficient AIs and combine them with perfect size societies that communicate in a trust minimized manner using blockchain and decentralized networks.

Okay but... while scientist and engineers improve our technology, what can we all do to transition towards this new cheerful society? Well, little steps have been outlined along the text. Summing up again, use Cheerfulism philosophy while trying to reduce on your close life the 5 sources of abuse mentioned earlier.

Transition from Chapter 5 to Chapter 6

We explored the challenges of organizing resources in a society and the mistakes and problems the individuals in a society face. During all that we saw that the cheerful principles can help a lot in solving these problems in a very efficient manner. But as we were now commenting, how do we transition?

I've been giving advice along the chapters: share knowledge, take a walk with people and chat, research, practice the engineers' way of thinking, alter your education to learn more useful knowledge, etc. All these little steps aggregated over time should eventually lead to the greatest prosperity.

Is there anything else to do? Indeed, welcome to chapter 6.

6.- Thoughts on the ideal society, part 3: How to transition to Cheerfulism.

Apart from all the little actions mentioned so far, another very important key to transition to a cheerful society is shifting what education primarily focuses on.

- Instead of primarily relying on memorization, we should emphasize the analysis and understanding of systems.

- Furthermore, it's essential to prioritize learning useful knowledge, or in other words, analyzing valuable systems.

- This approach should be complemented with a stronger emphasis on genuine teamwork, while still valuing an individual's capability to be and work alone when necessary.

However, implementing a change, no matter of which kind, requires careful planning. To avoid causing unnecessary stress or trauma, these changes should be introduced gradually. Yet, the pace shouldn't be too slow, especially if there's an imminent threat or challenge.

I'm not an expert in education. Designing tests and assignments that prioritize analysis over memorization is a challenge best left to professionals in that field. Same goes for making part of those test the fostering of genuine team collaboration plus the other traits I've mentioned above.

However, I'd like to propose certain fundamental school subjects that are often overlooked but are crucial for a modern prosperous society:

- *Nutrition and Exercise*: Understanding how to maintain or manipulate our body in a healthy way.

- *Goal Planning*: An overview of setting and achieving objectives short, medium and long-term, often requiring the latter ones a necessary focus on the engineers way of thinking due to their complexity.

- *Personal Financial Planning*: Grasping personal finance, understanding money's mechanics, and familiarizing oneself with local taxation laws.

- *Power Dynamics*: Delving into the essence of politics and understanding the constant fight for power, irrespective of the resource distribution protocol in place. Different techniques for aggregating power like the empty signifier etc.

- *Philosophical Foundations*: Grasping the philosophical principles that build the society an individual lives in. Promote inside this subject the understanding of other philosophical approaches that other societies might work upon. Specially the neighboring ones to foster understanding and international diplomacy.

- *Mastery of statistics*: In this era mathematics, specially statistics, are essential so as to understand the big data we are exposed to and that all studies we carry out are based on. Misinterpretations on statistics concepts are often a source for sensationalism which affects on the acknowledgment of illogical conclusions.

From my perspective, which is influenced by the Spanish mandatory part of the public educational system, these subjects are often left as optional or they do not exist at all. In contrast, they should be as central to the curriculum as   learning to speak.

To ensure a thriving society, there should be a greater emphasis on these areas of knowledge. Critical thinking should be at the forefront of educational assessments. Don't dismiss memorization, it is also useful and necessary yet its main influence must be reduced. An example of a good use of memorization was given at the very beginning, the engineers' way of thinking can be carried out quicker with some optimizations based on memorization.

To integrate these changes into the educational system, I propose a phased approach. Once the new evaluation methods are designed, they can be introduced gradually. For instance, the weight of these new concepts and techniques could increase by 10% each year. This gradual increase ensures that students can adapt without feeling overwhelmed.

While I said a 10% increase, it's essential to note that different age groups might have varying levels of adaptability. Experts, familiar with the intricacies of human minds' learning, should determine the

appropriate rate of change for each age group. The overarching principle is to balance the pace of change for each nation's demographics.

Lastly, for adults keen on changing which are the population that can struggle with change the most, it would be beneficial to offer free tutorials tailored to their age, psychological profile, and cultural background. These resources can guide them in embracing this new approach to life and allow them to make a greater impact on the construction of this better society.

You don't need to wait for someone else to create these resources. If you feel like it and have the time to create these free resources on your own for the age group you represent, for the life-situations you might be familiar with, like a video, a book, a meeting on your neighborhood... whatever free resource you can come up with, what are you waiting for? This is a mission in which we all can put our little grain of sand to build a mountain. I encourage you to do so.

And indeed, this is what will eventually bring cheerful people to this world, a great big common goal created and made reality by our small combined strengths. The goal being to achieve long term sustainable happiness for all based on principles abstracted away from any ideology, any religion, any gender, any skin color, any belief, just based on what makes all of us happy humans.

Conclusion (Chapters 5,6)

We have explored the dilemma of resource distribution, how traditional protocols confront them and then contrasted their viability in the current modern world.

Then I've explained why I think a cheerful libertarianism is what we should aim for, for now. Due to their efficiency and synergy while being based on basic human nature, specially the nature of adaptation and exploration that has led to our survival through all human history.

Later I've explored ideas on how to transition from where we are now to this better future I envision. And then I explained possible consequences on the applications of such philosophy.

As from here I hope you found this thoughts interesting and made you rethink parts of life you didn't think of or helped you see a bigger picture or different point of thought and view.

Using awareness and constant improvement with our neighbors and friends is the way to go. And if everyone takes this action, we all can have something in common, brotherhood, an intrinsic human friendship that who knows, maybe eliminates severe conflicts or at least a great part of them. Making the world reach the greatest amount of peace ever achieved.

Transition from Chapter 6 to Chapter 7

Alright now that everything has been explained I can relax and conclude this book.

7.- My absurd desires.

If for any reason Cheerfulism ends up being known all over the world and a lot of people end up reading these words, here are some absurd proposals for all human kind I find funny:

- Make the world's anthem *Can Can* by *Jacques Offenbach*. If you are reading this in my era here is a YouTube video with the song: *https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=4Diu2N8TGKA*

If I think of more nonsense I will keep updating this part of the book over time. (:D)

8.- Acknowledgments.

I've arrived to these conclusions not only thinking but also researching. Thanks to all people whose free-to-consume material on the internet made this text possible. Sharing free knowledge is a form of empathy and it kinda makes you a little hero.

For example the people who helped me understand what I've been doing my whole life when I was studying were: Benjamin Keep and Justin Sung. You can find them on YouTube.

Disclaimer: I only watched a total of 3 videos from them to sharpen the engineers' way of thinking chapter. I cannot completely assure their complete professional reliability so do your own research on them. They seemed like logical people on those 3 videos and what they explained made enough sense to me and to my life experience and thoughts on human nature so far so as to link them to the text.

Sure there are way more people that I've learned from, but naming them all is impossible and for sure I would forget about someone.

Yet thanks to all of them and thanks to all historic figures that laid-out the knowledge.

I kind of lied, I was not fully alone, multiple people, even if they don't know it thanks to the power of internet, were there with me at diverse times.

It is the human nature to build with each other, to share our knowledge and points of view. Millions have lived and died, suffered and enjoyed in order for this text to become a reality.

Thanks for reading this far, let's work on ourselves but with each other at the same time to keep improving this world.

9.- Conclusion.

My name is Carlos Alegre Urquizú, this is how I think about life, this is so far what I will teach my children. And these thoughts are part of what has driven my life to be a successful and happy one.

Acknowledging the benefits and challenges of change, while abstracting them from the classic meanings of good and evil and instead seeing them as the consequences of our natural instinct of boredom after granted survival, has lead me to have a more empathetic and pretty cheerful energy towards life. Hope it does the same for you too.

Now it is your time, read this text again if you feel like, think about it, give it a try on your life, whatever. I just want to party with happier people. (:D)

Again, good luck to everyone whatever you decide to do and I wish you a great happy life.