World Peace from a Cure for Disease and Renewable Energy

By Colin Pace

Norm-Referenced Tests

Test	Year	Grade	Age	Subject	National Percentile Rank	Grade Equivalence
Stanford Early School Achievement Test (SESAT)	1992	K	5	Environment	99	3.5
				Reading	97	1.2
				Math	95	1.2
				Listening	95	2.0
				Basic Battery	98	1.2
				Complete Battery	98	1.3
Metropolitan Readiness Tests (MRT)	1993	K	6	Visual	92	n/a
				Language	97	
				Composite (with others not listed)	95	
Iowa Test of Basic Skills (ITBS)	1995	2	8	Reading Total	92	
				Math Total	92	
ITBS	1996	3	9	Advanced Math	99	
				Math Total	99	
				Advanced Reading	99	
				Reading Total	97	

Graduate Record Examinations (GRE) – taken in 2009 for graduate school at age 22

Subject	Percentile Rank	Estimated Percentile Rank for Age Range in National Population
Verbal Reasoning	96	98-99
Analytical Writing	96	98-99

Criterion-Referenced Tests

Texas Assessment of Academic Skills (TAAS)

Year	Grade	Age	Subject	Items Correct / Number of Items
1996	3	9	Reading	36 / 36
			Math	42 / 44
2001	8	14	Reading	47 / 48
			Math	59 / 60
			Science	39 / 40
			Writing	38 / 40

Table of Contents

Logical Thesis: World Peace from a Cure for Disease and Renewable Energy

By curing disease and using renewable energy for most of society, international peace can be achieved and maintained, during a time of crisis with geopolitics, health, and safety. As the smartest person in human history, I have theorized a cure for disease using genetic engineering and am geopolitically discussing the transition of energy systems to renewables, to mitigate the defensive crisis of nuclear reactors and also climate change. I am in the process of updating the book and social media, writing more chapters soon. I apologize if some links have become inactive. I will make an effort to be attentive to the resources I provide. Thank you for your consideration.

Introduction: The Campaign to Become President of The United States of America

I am campaigning to become the next president of the United States of America. What most distinguishes me from other candidates is my testing profile. My testing profile might be globally and historically unprecedented and indicate I have superlative cognitive intelligence.

My testing profile contains score reports with 17 national percentile ranks (NPRs) from standardized tests that I took for school from ages 5–22. The NPRs are at or above the 92nd percentile, with 4 NPRs in the 99th percentile and 9 NPRs at or above the 97th percentile. In addition to the NPRs, I have 6 scores on criterion-referenced tests that are either perfect or close to perfect. The scores can be viewed on my portfolio website, on the CV page in the testing profile section.

Here's a link to my portfolio website: https://colin-pace.github.io/Portfolio/

With my intellectual ability, I have multiple goals that I plan to accomplish as president. Among them, a prominent goal is to develop a treatment for cancer and other diseases. I plan to develop a treatment by working with scientists, engineers, and medical doctors to transform genetic engineering into a common palliative for disease.

CRISPR is a recent and important instrument of genetic engineering that enables the editing of DNA. CRISPR could be utilized on diseases, whether on diseased cells for correction or apoptosis or on immune cells for enhancements, as is currently being done by CRISPR for cancer with some success. The disease that I focus on is cancer because it accounts for a large amount of deaths in the United States, over 600,000 deaths per year, and I believe cancer could be treated with genetic engineering by deactivating the replicative genes of cancerous cells with multiplexed CRISPR.

There is potential for multiple types of disease to be treated by genetic engineering. Genetic engineering might treat diseases in the following categories: autoimmune diseases, degenerative / cellular dysfunction disorders, and perhaps even genetic, fibrotic, and inflammatory diseases. With more academic research and consultation with laboratories, I would be able to give estimations of difficulty and timeframes.

A second prominent goal is to negotiate geopolitically for world peace with the medical advancements that could be accomplished through genetic engineering. The conflicts described in the online application of the Global Conflict Tracker by the Council on Foreign Relations might be concluded and peace achieved if the countries were to gain the medical advancements that could be realized through genetic engineering.

A third goal is to effect a green energy transition to renewable sources like solar. Creating a renewable energy system for the U.S. would cost between $800 billion and $4 trillion, according to the National Renewable Energy Laboratory and also Yale, and renewables are already the economic optimum for energy, according to the United Nations. Since the energy sector could earn a good profit in renewables, and since the energy sector earns approximately $1 trillion per year in profits from petroleum, as a presidential candidate, I would encourage the energy sector to invest in creating a renewable-energy system for the U.S.

In addition to the goals, as a presidential candidate, I would encourage reform in education and health through diet and exercise.

I would encourage education in science, technology, engineering, mathematics, and the liberal arts. I would promote a multimodal curriculum that through artificial intelligence could provide individualized learning paths as an educational method.

I would encourage plant-based diets and health with exercise.

In summary of the chapter so far, I have a possibly unprecedented profile of NPRs and a good theory for genetic engineering that could be used in geopolitics to negotiate for world peace, with some other important goals and ideas about reform.

Before I outline my personal strengths, I will describe the challenges to become the president of the United States.

According to the Constitution, there are 3 criteria for becoming the president:

1. A person has to be a natural-born U.S. citizen.
2. A person has to be at least 35 years old.
3. A person has to have been a legal resident in the U.S. for at least 14 years.

I am a U.S. citizen who is 38 years old, and although I have lived internationally in France and India for months and even years since 2008, I believe I qualify as having been a legal resident of the U.S. for at least 14 years.

Additionally, there are criteria for campaigning as a candidate for a political party. Filing and registration, participating in primaries and caucasus, and fundraising are examples.

Since I became political in the early 2000s, I have aligned with the Democratic Party Platform. I am currently trying to connect with the Democrats to see if I might be able to become a Democratic presidential candidate, first among primary candidates for the Democratic nomination and then as the Democratic candidate for the 2028 election. If that is a possibility, I will file and register and raise funds mostly online as an evening and weekend political enterprise.

I anticipate that many voters will think I am young and inexperienced in governance. If you have such a hesitation, please consider my perhaps globally and historically unprecedented testing profile, combined with 2 decades of international travel and study about history, geopolitics, natural science, and coding.

I also have the following experience:

I have 2 years of professional work experience as a Research Engineering Scientist for the Applied Research Laboratories and as an Information Processing Specialist for Tata Consultancy Services at Apple.

I have independently studied coding for 8 years. I have written a textbook on coding that is available for free in the Appendix 1: Links. There is also a free game called Gem Search in the code section of my portfolio website.

I have 10 years of independently studying the natural sciences of physics, chemistry, biology, geology, and astronomy and the history of the natural sciences. I have written a series of good articles about science on the website Medium.

I also have theorized a treatment for cancer using CRISPR, an instrument of genetic engineering, and I have considered how genetic engineering could become a common treatment.

My potentially unprecedented ability is combined with experience in multiple domains, making my age at 38 a concern, but perhaps a concern that can be negotiated in the context of my formidable strengths of ability and experience.

I encourage people to read this autobiography, as I write it and post updates, to learn more about my life and ideas about my campaign to become the next president of the U.S.

Chapter 1: The Structure and Function of Deoxyribonucleic Acid (DNA)

I learned about my potentially globally and historically unprecedented testing profile of 17 national percentile ranks (NPRs) sometime around 2021. I knew I had scored well on some tests and was able to read difficult books, but I hadn't imagined my profile might be unprecedented. I was greatly moved by the realization.

Learning about my testing profile coincided with several intellectual projects on which I was working, with the foremost project my theorization of genetic engineering as a treatment for cancer. As mentioned in the introduction to the autobiography, cancer is a significant cause of death in the United States of America, and I am determined to develop genetic engineering into a treatment for the disease. As president, I would focus on multiple projects, leading the effort to treat cancer while consulting with other projects that consider genetic engineering for other diseases.

In this chapter, I'll discuss the biology of cancer so that the reader might gain an understanding of how genetic engineering could treat the disease.

Cancer is a disease of proliferating cells. The cells proliferate and form neoplasms or tumors. The cells proliferate because of a mutation in their DNA. Located in the nucleus of a cell, DNA is a molecule that has a distinctive shape and structure: a double helix of sequences of base pairs between the helices. There is all sorts of interesting biological information about DNA, the code of information in the base pairs in the double helix, and the cell, including the number of base pairs and genes, the functions of genes, the structures on which DNA aggregates or chromosomes, and much more.

While the molecule is significant, including complex and repetitive configurations of elements like carbon, hydrogen, oxygen, nitrogen, and phosphorous, the biologically paramount

point for my theory is that the base pairs in the double helix of DNA encode information as genes that proteins read to synthesize new structures for a cell and new proteins to create and maintain the cell.

DNA encodes genes that direct a cell about replication or the creation of a new cell from the existing cell.

There is also a distinctive process of DNA replication, so a reader might keep the idea in mind that both DNA and also cells replicate.

When a mutation adversely affects the genes for cellular replication, prompting an increased rate uncontrolled by normal cellular defenses (such as apoptotic signaling), a cell begins to divide as a cancerous cell.

Because of the way cells proliferate or divide, in a process called mitosis (and also meiosis for a subset of cells), which involves the replication or duplication of DNA and separation of the replicated DNA so that each section of the dividing cell becomes a new cell with DNA, the mutation that causes a cell to divide as a cancerous cell is distributed to the new cell and maintained by the progenerative cell, and both cells continue to replicate or divide as do the new cells created in replication.

The context is significantly more complex than what I've described above, and an excellent synopsis of the context is found in a pair of articles by the American biologists Douglas Hanahan and Robert Weinberg, published in the years 2000 and 2011. The first article is called "The Hallmarks of Cancer," and the second article, which elaborates on the first with updates, is called "The Hallmarks of Cancer: The Next Generation." Both articles are availble online, and I've provided links to them at the end of my autobiography in Appendix 1: Links.

Insight from Hanahan and Weinberg that is particularly interesting for my theory of a treatment for cancer with genetic engineering is that the mutations that cause cancer can happen not just in the DNA of genes that enact replication but also in the DNA of genes that can indirectly cause replication through signaling in what are called signal cascade networks.

Part of the power of my theory comes from its versatility, and in the context of signal cascade networks, my theory demonstrates significant versatility by addressing the types of signal cascade networks with a focus on the genes that enact mitosis. The resolved focus has the advantages of avoiding intervention in complex signal cascade networks and also of preventing alternate or subsequent mutations from catalyzing cancerous proliferation.

The focus on the deactivation of genes for cellular replication is a key insight of the theory. I independently theorized the utilization of genetic engineering for replicative genes. Later, I learned that chemotherapy attempts the same effect, a deactivation through chemicals of genes for cellular replication.

The difference between chemotherapy and the technology in my theory is the instrument that achieves the deactivation of replicative genes.

Chemotherapeutics indiscriminately affect cells, cancerous and healthy cells, which results in many of the negative side effects of chemotherapy. Furthermore, chemotherapeutics, in comparison to the instrument of genetic engineering in my theory, are limited in the types of genes that the chemicals can simultaneously target, which is a vulnerability in the context of cancerous responses in repair for damaged DNA.

Genetic engineering with CRISPR has advantages over chemotherapeutics. An acronym for clustered regularly interspaced short palindromic repeats, CRISPR is a trait that evolved in bacteria as a response to invading viruses called bacteriophages, and in 2012, scientific researchers transformed CRISPR into an instrument of genetic engineering that is used on human DNA to edit genes, whether for activation, deactivation, or maybe even changing genetic function. The science and engineering involved in editing genes with CRISPR are vast and sophisticated, so I will only mention that a CRISPR editor is delivered to a cell where the editor then travels to the cellular nucleus and traverses DNA to find a locus or sequence where the editor then makes a genetic edit by severing a segment of the DNA at that location, which

prompts a natural repair mechanism that results in the reconstitution of the DNA and therefore gene, either activating or deactivating the gene.

For my theory, the first advantage that CRISPR has over chemotherapy is that viral vectors selectively deliver CRISPR to cells. As a treatment for cancer, CRISPR would be more precise, fairly reliably delivered to cancerous and not healthy cells. The delivery would result in fewer and less severe negative side effects than chemotherapy has.

A second advantage is that CRISPR can be multiplexed. Multiplexed CRISPR simultaneously targets multiple genes. So, multiple types of replicative genes could be targeted. For example, a CRISPR genetic editor could target genes that encode the proteins that create and direct the mitotic spindle or that enact cytokinesis. Other possible targets include the genes that encode proteins that enact the duplication and repair of DNA. Multiplexed CRISPR can target approximately 20 genes, and I suspect that a combination of genes from the different types mentioned (mitotic or replicative of DNA) would be most effective. Experimentation with different configurations of multiplexed CRISPR would be necessary.

That is the basic idea of my theory. As mentioned, the biology of cancer is more complex, as is the engineering of the instrument of a CRISPR editor. But the autobiographical chapter so far gives a scientifically useful and perhaps literarily accessible overview.

At this point, a reader might consider other utilizations of genetic engineering with the instrument of a CRISPR editor on other diseases. The diseases might rely on specific proteins that cause inimical consequences. CRISPR edits could deactivate the inimical genes in different types of diseased cells. The pathological biology and genetic engineering will be more complex in any specific context, but an abstracted principle is that CRISPR edits to inimical genes in diseased cells deactivate the genes or even cells in a process of programmed cellular death called apoptosis (pronounced a • puh • tow • sis).

Another approach is for CRISPR edits to enhance immune cells. But I will consider that topic in another chapter.

The ideas I have expressed in this chapter are nascent. Scientific, engineering, and medical literature contextualize the idea of the utilization of CRISPR to engineer genetically a treatment for cancer, but I am theorizing the medical advance. My potentially globally and historically unprecedented testing profile emboldens my resolve to develop CRISPR as an instrument of genetic engineering for cancer and for other diseases.

People across the world would want to have the resource as a medical treatment, and I hope to use the medical advance to negotiate for world peace. I will consider aspects of the idea of the exchange of a common treatment in CRISPR for world peace in the next chapter.

Chapter 2: Project Coordinated Science as a Foundational Pillar for World Peace

Genetic engineering might be able to treat most diseases and soon. With the ability to treat disease, I would negotiate with leaders of the world to achieve and maintain international peace.

Some diseases are recurring, while others are eradicable. Cancer, for example, occurs when DNA mutates and remains uncorrected. Smallpox has been completely eradicated, and polio and others have been eradicated in geographic areas. The recurrence of some diseases and the potential for them to change, in addition to the unlikely possibility of encountering new diseases, like COVID-19, indicates that an instrument of genetic engineering should be adaptable, able to achieve new types of treatments in short durations.

The geopolitics of the context is complex. Treatment by genetic engineering will be the leverage in negotiations, but humanitarian concerns also suggest that a fast and comprehensive distribution is important. The goal of negotiations is not regime change. I support democracy, but the loss of life, if I were to offer the treatment only to democratic nations, would be staggering. Withholding the treatment from uncooperative nations also would risk prompting societal instability at multiple places around the world.

There are several advantages of the treatment in geopolitical negotiations for international peace.

One is having another option to complement those the United States already has, like technological advancement.

Another advantage is that the U.S. would be able to restrict distribution in times of conflict.

A third advantage is that I am a citizen of the U.S., so there is a temporal advantage that adversaries do not have – we found it first and probably I am most capable of directing the development and implementation of a genetic engineering technology for disease.

A fourth advantage is that the U.S. is a democracy: Because the theorization and possible development and implementation of the treatment by genetic engineering for disease represent a concentration of power, it is a fortuitous fact that the concentration is in a democracy, and a strong democracy.

Could an authoritarian more quickly enact the process? Perhaps. But the U.S. makes rational, deliberate decisions that are advantageous for the progress of the planet, and an authoritarian might use the technology for inimical projects. The ethics of the technology, in addition to that of geopolitics based on the technology, is also complex. I will address the ethics of the technology in the next chapter.

In the following passages is a vision of what a first administration might look like with the technology of genetic engineering.

If I were to win the election in 2028 and become president of the United States in 2029, the first item on my agenda would be to express an interest in international peace and prosperity through mutually beneficial trade.

Following up on the interest, in the first year of my tenure as president and as part of achieving planetary peace with treatments for disease, I would orchestrate scientific and diplomatic projects, respectively, to develop the technology of genetic engineering and begin dialogue with the leaders of the nations of the world, learning their interests for cooperation in the development, implementation, and distribution of medical technology.

Let me address each of the topics, science and diplomacy, in order. There are many diseases, so to start, I would focus on the leading causes of death in the U.S. and in the world. I would create a project for each disease after a preliminary interpretation of feasibility for them. A project would be coordinated by a project manager who coordinates a team of scientists,

engineers, doctors, etc. The team members would have education and experience studying the disease of the project.

As discussed in the previous chapter, there are two aspects to the treatment:

1) Delivery of a genetic editor to the nucleus of a diseased cell

2) Editing the DNA at an appropriate location to achieve an effect on a cell

Depending on the state of the art of the knowledge and technology, which I would ascertain by consultation with a preliminary research team, I would decide whether each project should be bifurcated into delivery and editing components. It might be, however, that delivery is relatively uniform across editor types, so an editing team might be formed separately from each project, as its own project, and the delivery team would provide the transmission of the genetic editor to the cellular nucleus of diseased cells.

The projects focused on disease would initially identify a combination of genes that might achieve a cellular effect that discontinues a disease. Most likely, this will often involve inducing apoptosis, though perhaps other types of edits that, in essence, leave a diseased cell in limbo, unable to replicate and eventually deconstructed by apoptotic macrophages, might also work.

Probably, each disease will have a different combination of genes that are most effective in discontinuing the disease. Some diseases are internally variegated. Cancer, for example, has approximately 100 types, which might require variations in treatment. Teams on projects for diseases with such complexity would be larger and more sophisticated, appropriate to the scope of the project.

I anticipate that my theorized solution might be an advantageous starting point for the projects. Cellular division in mitosis and meiosis are essential processes for many diseases like cancer. Even viruses use cellular replicatory machinery to create virions.

I would play a number of roles in both the science and diplomatic spheres. Continuing with the scientific side, I would start with a schedule that allocates about half my time to work with the team on the project for treating cancer, studying both the delivery and editing aspects of the project. For the other half of my time with the science teams, I would consult with the project managers and participate and observe in team discussions about ideas, perhaps redirecting the project at points. I would be careful not to micromanage if progress is achieved.

Progress seems likely, as already genetic engineering is achieving successes. In 2025, National Public Radio ran a story about a young patient, KJ Muldoon, who received a successful treatment with CRISPR. In addition to being wonderful news, the treatment demonstrates that the number of genetic editors that can be currently implemented in the body of a patient is in the order of billions, about the number that is in an average sized tumor.

So, today, a treatment could potentially target a tumor. Delivery is probably going to be a difficulty, identifying and reaching only cancerous cells. But the example with Mr. Muldoon also indicates that targeting is becoming available.

In addition to participating solving the delivery of genetic editors to cancerous cells, I would also consider the combination of genes in different types of cancer that, targeted with multiplexed CRISPR, or a form of a genetic editor that can target up to dozens of genes simultaneously, might achieve the cessation of cellular division. In the previous chapter, I mentioned obvious targets to start investigating, like genes that synthesize proteins that create and direct mitotic spindles.

Once a viable combination of genes is identified, trials would start. As a plant-based person, I am hesitant to conduct animal trials. I would first experiment with cloned cells *ex vivo*. Once effective solutions are found in those contexts, mouse trails could start.

I have ambiguous ethical feelings about even mouse trials. But to the extent such trials can be ethical, I will ensure they will be, and I believe the benefit of the technology will be worth the animal trials, both for humans and animals. I will focus at first on developing and

implementing a treatment for disease for humans, but once that is achieved, I will also focus on creating one for animals.

In brief summary of the chapter so far, the idea is that after winning the 2028 presidential election, in 2029, I would set up laboratories with projects and teams of scientists to first preliminarily interpret and then develop and implement genetic engineering technology for diseases. I would participate in the process in different ways, both directing the process and also delving into research and discussion.

If all the bureaucracy and logistics can be achieved, even during the transition to the presidency, I anticipate that the time frame from preliminary interpretation of feasibility by each project team to an interpretation of the first trial results might be something like 6 months. Operation Warp Speed, by the first administration of President Trump, is an example that gives one an idea of how fast the process might go.

Once the trial results are interpreted, the teams will decide whether the project achieved a successful milestone. It is highly unlikely many teams will achieve success in the first trial, and even if they do, there will be refinements for efficacy and efficiency. Other teams might have to try a new combination of genes. Maybe there will be problems with the delivery of a particular genetic editor. As the director of the project, I will keep notes on the progress of project milestones and phases, intervening if timeline or scope considerations become untenable.

By the end of the first year, I anticipate most project teams will have a working prototype. At that point, we could decide whether another year or two of refinement would be optimal or instead whether the project should transition from research and development to implementation with the biotechnology industry. At the stage of industrial transition in a project, I would detach from the project, giving responsibility to industrial leaders and members of my administration.

Moving from the scientific sphere to the diplomatic sphere, I would start by making a speech at the United Nations about my intentions of developing and implementing a technology of genetic engineering to treat disease and of negotiating with the technology to achieve

planetary peace. After officially notifying the nations of the world about the goal, I would send ambassadors to each nation to find out what the leaders of the nations think. Would they want to participate in at least the distribution of the technology in their country? How might the contribution of medical technology encourage mutually prosperous trade?

For nations that are in conflict, I would still offer them medical technology, though I suspect that in many conflicts, distribution and administration of the technology are unrealistic. I would also use the contribution as an encouragement to achieve peace. The developed world developed in decades in the 20th century. The developing world could similarly develop in the 21st century.

With equal national opportunities across the globe, migration crises etc. would be solved and, optimistically, war ended. With climate change mitigated by renewable energy, another key aspect of my political program, the continents will continue to be habitable. With medical technology, people might be freed from the burden of disease. In centuries, perhaps, humanity will figure out how to lengthen telomeres. That might prolong life. The state of the art is far from that capability today, as far as I know, but achieving a panacea for disease might be possible today.

After the science projects transition to industrial production and the diplomatic projects achieve mutually beneficial trade agreements with the nations of the world, I will encourage all participants, in the U.S. and elsewhere, to create voluminous multi-modal media about the experience. This could be one of the great achievements of humanity, and understanding the diversity of perspectives would be invaluable as a scholastic and historical treasure trove.

Chapter 3: Chess Strategy

I learned chess from a young age, maybe 5–10 years old. As a child prodigy in cognitive ability, I probably displayed a considerable ability. Today, I play for fun against the computer. Here are 9 ideas I find useful when considering chess strategy.

1. Chess has a history in Asia and Europe: from Indian *chaturanga* (Sanskrit) and Persian *shatranj* (Persian) to European *ludus regum* (Latin).

2. Typical phases of a game are early, mid, and end, in 20 moves per phase for 60 moves per game.

3. Early-game logic: For the first 10 moves, consider the openings played by grandmasters: for example, the Italian Game.

4. The second half of the early game: Take the center four squares with a coordinated pawn structure and with a development of and targeting by first row pieces.

5. The first transition (from the early to the mid game): Gain position to develop attacks on the opponent’s rows.

6. Strong mid-game logic: Maintain piece balance and manage positional risk and tactics (triangulation, the pin, fork, skewer, discovered attack, deflection, etc.).

7. The crucial second transition (from mid to the end game): Gain advantage for the end game in position and pieces.

8. End-game logic: Replace pawns with first row pieces, coordinate an attack between at least two, but preferably three or more, first-row pieces to put the opponent's king in check.

9. Checkmate: Put the opponent's king in check so that in their next move, the king has to remain in check.

With these strategies, one can deduce advantageous tactics in different chess contexts.

Chess is more of an art than a science. The openings favor pieces and configurations, but after a few moves per side, the permutations become practically incalculable by a human. At best, a human might calculate a few lines into any possible move on the board, perhaps extending the interpretation for counter responses and subsequent moves by the player themselves. But the number of calculations quickly adds up. A *Schwerpunkt* is hypothesized and focused on, and some players are particularly good at the art.

A computer that calculates the lines can easily defeat a human at chess. The superiority of a computer in relation to a human at the game of chess indicates that the game is an art. Humans strategically guess at optimal regions and chance upon paths.

Chapter 4: An Education in the Sciences and Humanities

In addition to being the smartest person in human history, I'm arguably the best educated. Although because of office politics I wasn't awarded a doctorate of philosophy (PhD) from the University of Texas at Austin, I earned a PhD in terms of education and scholarship. I like to think of myself as a doctor of philosophy. I also legitimately have a masters degree (MA) and a bachelors (BA) degree. Approximately 5 percent of the nation has this set of degrees.

What further distinguishes me from others is my autodidacticism: I teach myself huge amounts of information. For example, to theorize a cure for disease using genetic engineering, I taught myself the knowledge bases of medicine and engineering. Or in another example, to learn coding, I taught myself object oriented programming.

In addition to learning specific data sets, I have focused on learning a balanced and compendious collection of knowledge. My education in science includes a college-level familiarity with the following subjects.

Discipline	**Main Idea**
Natural science:	
Physics	fundamental forces and elementary particles
Chemistry	the Periodic Table of Elements
Biology	evolution by natural selection and population genetics
Geology	uniformitarianism and plate tectonics
Astronomy	heliocentrism and the expanding universal horizon

Mathematics:	
Algebra	equations with variables
Geometry	visual representation of equations
Statistics	descriptions and inferences about likelihood
Calculus	rate of change on a slope and the area under a curve
Computer science	computation of data on machines
Social science:	
Anthropology	social relations (society) and deeply held beliefs (culture)
Economics	microeconomic purchases and macroeconomic GDP
Linguistics	morphology, grammar, etymology
Political science	the democracy versus authoritarianism scale
Psychology	the mind and its processes; logic and reason
Sociology	classes of people and statistical descriptions
Humanities:	
Music theory	musical modes and melody
History	the classic triptych of the classical, medieval, and modern

While studying the aforementioned 18 disciplines, I've studied the structure of a discourse (the historical formation of the knowledge) and the disciplinary epistemology, gaining an understanding of the sub-branches of a science, for example, genetics in biology, and also the types of claims that a methodology enables, the differentiation between primary and secondary sources in a historical monograph, for example.

An advantage of a structured education is the ability to categorize new information and methodology as either orthodox or unorthodox, reformist or revolutionary, and particular or general.

While the breadth of my knowledge is impressive, I also specialized, focusing on languages, both human languages (Spanish and Hindi, for example), and then the computer language of JavaScript. I am interested in grammar and find learning and working with grammatical patterns fascinating.

Chapter 5: In Geopolitics, a Tripartite Schema of Nationalism, Separatism, and Atavistic Revanchism

The 195 nations of the world each went through a nationalist movement, when people identified as a sovereign and limited community, distilling the essence of a national ideology in a constitution and other founding documents.

Often, with the early nations, ideas about ethnic differences (language, religion, culture, etc.) were important demarcations of nations: The French did *not* speak or write in German, for example.

Either because of political oppression or for cultural recognition, some nations separate from previous entities, creating separatist nationalist movements. The United States of America started that way, a break-away polity from the burgeoning English empire. Bangladesh and the Baltic states of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania are more recent examples.

Cultural narratives might differ about political similarity and difference, and the differing narratives might prompt political crises. For example, the Ukrainian nationalist story differs from the Russian nationalist story, importantly in that the latter nation considers Kiev and Ukraine to be part of early Russian history and therefore conquerable as a putatively specious separatist nationalism.

Israel appears to think the same way about Palestine, as the People's Republic of China does about Taiwan.

Without an abstract principle about what separatist nationalisms (the only kind anymore, as all the land on Earth is occupied) to support, the United States is caught in an awkward network of allies and adversaries, performing an opportunistic and haphazard Realpolitik: The

U.S. supports the longtime ally Israel in the conflict with Palestine, but the U.S. opposes the conquest of democratic Taiwan by authoritarian China, as the U.S. opposes the conquest of semi-democratic Ukraine by authoritarian Russia.

Why does the U.S. have this geopolitical stance, favoring revanchism in Israel but neither Ukraine nor Taiwan? The answer is historical contingency, the aforementioned Realipolitick.

Contingent Realpolitik is a disadvantageous geopolitical foreign policy. Inconsistent messages are sent through networks of allies and adversaries, weakening democratic connections and emboldening authoritarian ambitions. Civilians of the U.S. develop an inaccurate compartmentalized notion of justice and just war rather than of the universal principles the United States and United Nations fight to preserve. Probably worst about the context, new conflicts continually erupt and draw stable nations into unstable conflicts, costing investment in blood and treasure.

Take Israel, for example. In 2025, about a year ago, the U.S. launched Operation Midnight Hammer, an impressive long-range bombing mission by B-52's to destroy Iranian nuclear facilities that threatened Israel. The mission was a success, and the U.S. once again defended Israel against hostile adversaries in the region.

This year, in 2026, Israel again is encouraging the United States to go to war with Iran, to protect Israel from the aggressor. The U.S. would have to invest blood and treasure in the conflict, and for years, military strategists have suggested that a full-scale war with Iran might cost the U.S. approximately 80,000 casualties among soldiers and probably a few trillion dollars.

A war with Iran would be an enormous war. It would be a war we do not need to fight.

The United States should no longer fight religious wars. Religious wars are unjust wars, requiring a secular military to sacrifice for the spiritual beliefs of a subset of the population. If Israelis want to believe that Yahweh chose them specifically to lead a particular lifestyle in the

desert of the Middle East, no problem. But if Israel ends up fighting wars in the Middle East because of the idea, don't call-up soldiers from Texas to die for your beliefs.

Consider a tense standoff on a street between two gangs, collected in two groups some dozen feet from one another, a situation perhaps moving toward a street fight but neither yet one nor necessarily so ending. Imagine that, all of a sudden during a conversation between the two groups, a member of one group rushes at the members of the second group and simultaneously starts a different fight with multiple members of the second group.

What would members of the first group think?

Maybe they would similarly rush into the abyss of battle.

Or maybe the members of the first group would think, why did that person just singularly charge the members of the other group. They are outnumbered and now dependent on the rest of us to rescue them from overwhelming odds.

Continual Israeli preemptive belligerence against hostile nations in the region of the Middle East is like the strongheaded singular charge into the abyss, obliging allied nations like the United States to enter the fray for the sake of an ally.

As an ally, one is put in a severely disadvantageous geopolitical situation, obliged to fight.

The metaphor is simplified if not simplistic, and there are other conditions to consider. The history of Israel is important, as the nation was formed as a consequence of World War II and the Holocaust. Israel, like many nations (including the United States, via the cultural connection to the Roman Empire), has a territorial claim on the land of Palestine, further complicating the context.

But, essentially, modern Israeli nationalism was atavistically revanchist, and the current Israeli-Palestinian conflict, with 12 million Israelis in the state of Israel and 5 million Palestinians around the state of Israel in various communities, is a consequence of the territorial reclamation, as is the continual warfare that draws young men and women from Texas and the United States

into battle in the Middle East – so that Israelis can extend a mystical, pretentious, and hubristic belief in a special religious status.

Russian soldiers are dying for a similarly misconstrued and enchanted jingoistic notion of historical Russia, as Chinese soldiers might soon sacrifice themselves for a reclamation attempt on Taiwan. Religious in the first instance and historically mystical in the second two contexts, the conflicts that stem from separatism and atavistic revanchism continue to plague the modern world and show signs of increasing and elaborating rather than minimizing and simplifying.

What can the world do to achieve peace, amid such complex geopolitical contexts?

A continuation of the policy by the United Nations to support only those nationalisms that are legal and in response to oppression is a good first step, stymying possible and unnecessary destabilizations (one thinks of the precarious Pakistani state with separatistisms in places like Balochistan).

The United Nations Security Council might also develop an abstract principle that can be applied to geopolitical nationalist contexts, regardless of the Realpolitik of powerful nations. In what contexts is atavistic revanchism acceptable? For example, why did the UN recognize Israel in the 1940s or why does the UN today recognize Ukraine but not Taiwan?

A theory started with legality, oppression, and uniformity as aspects for guidance, the tripartite schema of nationalism, separatism, and atavistic revanchism is an idea that the international community might take, rework, and rename, to forestall possible wars – like in Taiwan or among separatists in India, for example – and to provide uniformly logical justifications for networks of allies: like those against Russia and for Israel and Taiwan.

The death and destruction from illogical and unnecessary wars of religion and mystical nationalism could be avoided in the future with the right type of forethought now.

Appendix 1: Links to My Social Media

My portfolio website with national percentile ranks (NPRs) on the CV page in the testing profile section: https://colinpace1987.github.io/portfolio/

1. YouTube channel: https://www.youtube.com/@ColinPace1987
2. Facebook page: https://www.facebook.com/profile.php?id=61580997774035
3. X page: https://x.com/pace_colin1987
4. Medium page with science articles: https://medium.com/@colinpace1987
5. Coding book “Algorithms and Programs”: https://colinpace1987.github.io/portfolio/aap.pdf
6. CRISPR success in 2025: https://www.npr.org/sections/shots-health-news/2025/05/15/nx-s1-5389620/gene-editing-treatment-crispr-inherited
7. The Global Conflict Tracker by the Council on Foreign Relations: https://www.cfr.org/global-conflict-tracker
8. The cost of a transition to renewable energy according to the National Renewable Energy Laboratory(NREL): https://www.nrel.gov/analysis/100-percent-clean-electricity-by-2035-study
9. The cost of a transition to renewable energy according to Yale: https://e360.yale.edu/digest/shifting-u-s-to-100-percent-renewables-would-cost-4-5-trillion-analysis-finds
10. The profits made by the energy industry with petroleum: https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2022/jul/21/revealed-oil-sectors-staggering-profits-last-50-years
11. The United Nations on the economic optimum for energy in renewables: https://www.un.org/en/climatechange/raising-ambition/renewable-energy

12. The Hallmarks of Cancer: https://id.elsevier.com/as/authorization.oauth2?platSite=LT%2Fcell&response_type=code&client_id=JBS&additionalPlatSites=LT%2Fjbs%2CSD%2Fscience%2CLT%2Fthelancet%2CLT%2Fgeneric&site=cell-site&scope=openid+profile+address+email+els_auth_info+els_analytics_info+urn%3Acom%3Aelsevier%3Aidp%3Apolicy%3Aproduct%3Aindv_identity&claims=%7B%7D&redirect_uri=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.cell.com%2Fcallback%3Fred_uri%3D%252Ffulltext%252FS0092-8674%252800%252981683-9&state=16388001583&authType=SINGLE_SIGN_IN&client_name=Cell+Press&prompt=none
13. The Next Generation of the Hallmarks of Cancer: https://www.cell.com/fulltext/S0092-8674(11)00127-9
14. Statistics about American billionaires donating in the 2024 federal election cycle: https://www.pbs.org/newshour/show/how-the-new-class-of-billionaires-solidified-outsized-political-influence
15. Statistics about the federal budget
    a. 2023: https://www.cbo.gov/publication/59727
    b. 2017: https://www.cbo.gov/publication/53624

Appendix 2: A Timeline of My Life

1987: I was born in Denver, Colorado. My father was a petroleum geophysicist.

1989: My family moved to Dallas, Texas, where my father found employment with Brigham Oil and Gas.

1992: I began taking standardized tests in school.

1996: In my most impressive testing performance, I scored 3 NPRs in the 99th percentile in the subject tests of Advanced Math, Math Total, and Advanced Reading on the Iowa Test of Basic Skills, a reputable achievement test for students across the U.S. I also placed in the 97th percentile in Reading Total.

1997: Brigham Oil and Gas moved to Austin, and our family followed.

2002: My father passed away from cancer.

2005: I graduated from high school, and I took my first international trip, going to Europe to visit England, France, Italy, and other nations. After I returned to the U.S., I started college at the University of North Texas, where I wanted to become a musician.

2006: I transferred to UT Austin and began to study sociocultural anthropology with the protege of the iconic anthropologist Victor Turner.

2007: I saw former President Obama give a stump speech in Austin during his first presidential run. I was impressed by former President Obama's speech and later by his books.

2008: I traveled to several European nations for the second time. I went with the Normandy Scholars Program, an undergraduate history program about World War II.

2009: I took the Graduate Record Examinations (GRE) in preparation for my application to graduate school. It is the last standardized test in my testing profile.

2010: I began taking courses about the Indian language Hindi with the Director of the now closed Hindi Urdu Flagship at UT Austin. I also traveled for the first time to India, a country I returned to 2 or 3 times during the decade, to study Hindi.

2011: I graduated from UT Austin with a Bachelor of Arts in Anthropology.

2012: I began graduate school at UT Austin.

2013: I won a Graduate Research Fellowship from the U.S. National Science Foundation (NSF) and a Foreign Language and Area Studies (FLAS) Fellowship from the South Asia Institute at UT Austin.

2014: I graduated from an MA program with a degree in Asian Cultures and Languages from the Department of Asian Studies. I wrote an MA Report that was co-supervised by the Director of the Hindi Urdu Flagship. I began an MA/PhD program in the Department of Anthropology at UT Austin.

2015: I bought 5 textbooks about the natural sciences of physics, chemistry, biology, geology, and astronomy. I read them, taking extensive notes.

2017: I left UT Austin (without a PhD) and began to study coding. I also visited India for a few months.

2019: I theorized a treatment for cancer with CRISPR, an instrument of genetic engineering.

2020: I found my first professional employment as a Research Engineering Scientist at the Applied Research Laboratories in Austin. I also became interested in the history of the natural sciences. I researched the history of the natural sciences and wrote an article called “A History of the Natural Sciences,” which is available on Medium.

2021: I completed a coding boot camp at UT Austin. I also started to learn about my testing profile, after having discovered a file with the score reports.

2022: I wrote an introductory textbook about coding. The book is titled “Algorithms and Programs” and is available for free on my portfolio website.

2024: I worked for Tata Consultancy Services (TCS) at Apple.

Appendix 3: A Matrix of My Test Scores

Norm-Referenced Tests

Test	Year	Grade	Age	Subject	National Percentile Rank	Grade Equivalence
Stanford Early School Achievement Test (SESAT)	1992	K	5	Environment	99	3.5
				Reading	97	1.2
				Math	95	1.2
				Listening	95	2.0
				Basic Battery	98	1.2
				Complete Battery	98	1.3
Metropolitan Readiness Tests (MRT)	1993	K	6	Visual	92	n/a
				Language	97	
				Composite (with others not listed)	95	
Iowa Test of Basic Skills (ITBS)	1995	2	8	Reading Total	92	
				Math Total	92	
ITBS	1996	3	9	Advanced Math	99	
				Math Total	99	
				Advanced Reading	99	
				Reading Total	97	

Graduate Record Examinations (GRE) – taken in 2009 for graduate school at age 22

Subject	Percentile Rank	Estimated Percentile Rank for Age Range in National Population
Verbal Reasoning	96	98-99
Analytical Writing	96	98-99

Criterion-Referenced Tests

Texas Assessment of Academic Skills (TAAS)

Year	Grade	Age	Subject	Items Correct / Number of Items
1996	3	9	Reading	36 / 36
			Math	42 / 44
2001	8	14	Reading	47 / 48
			Math	59 / 60
			Science	39 / 40
			Writing	38 / 40

I believe there are 9 elements of my cognitive intelligence that make my mind unique:

1. Speed	faster input, processing, and output
2. Accuracy	correct answers and interpretive orthodoxy
3. Precision or discernment of complexity	finer distinctions or analysis
4. Creativity	sophisticated combination or synthesis

5. Pattern recognition	identification of a coherent subset
6. Abstraction and generalization	relevant comparison and contrast
7. Metacognition	awareness of one's own mental state
8. Memory	recollection of magnitude with precision
9. Stamina	endurance in the intellectual abilities

Four aspects of the testing profile suggest an unprecedented or superlative cognitive intelligence:

1) The number of national percentile ranks: 17
2) The number of high placements: 9 at the 97th percentile or above and 4 in the 99th percentile
3) The number of subjects (reading or language, mathematics, environment or visual, science, and writing) I've tested well in: 5
4) The timespan and development stages I've tested well during: ages 5 – 22.

The citation of standardized tests is an orthodox method in psychology: Dr. Deborah Ruf writes that "achievement test scores" are used to identify gifted or hyper intelligent people (pps. 30, 35).

Some psychologists or psychiatrists might critique my testing profile for being without an I.Q. or intelligence quotient. An I.Q. test is the definitive measurement of cognitive intelligence. I suspect that I have taken 2 or 3 I.Q. tests in my life and that they are classified as top secret. I will return to this point in a later chapter. For now, however, please know that even with the critique of a "missing" I.Q., my profile still is more impressive than any other I have seen in books of tables with gifted people.

I take what such psychologists and psychiatrists have to say with a grain of salt: If the standard instrument of measurement for cognitive intelligence, WAIS, has the same types of logical reasoning questions (analogies and antonyms, *inter alia*) as did the Verbal Reasoning section of the Graduate Record Examinations (2009), when I took the GRE in 2009, then impressionistic claims about the comparative legitimacy of measurement instruments, when unsubstantiated without reference to validity or reliability, mean little to me.

My superlative cognitive intelligence is attested by the collection of national percentile ranks. I lead the world in mathematics, reading and writing, science, and visual interpretation.

Appendix 4: References

Ruf, Deborah L. (2009). *5 Levels of Gifted*. Great Potential Press, Inc.