

The Animosity and
Difference Between
Liberalism &
Conservatism and Other
Sociopolitical
Philosophies that Govern
the Human Way of Life

Sankar Harikrishnan

Preface

In the short life that I have had the privilege to experience and relish, I have had a chance to observe people and politics in such a manner that countless others have not had. I do not know the reason for this; maybe they are not as interested in the subject as I am; they probably did not have the luxury of having as good an education; they might also have more important things to do - get something to eat, send their children to school, earn some money to buy proper clothes for their family - it all exists in this *phenomenal* and *astounding* world.

Many might think that I am making a mountain out of a molehill, but no, this is the melancholy reality that many fortunate souls have not had to endure. I am no less. I was serendipitous to have been born into an upper-middle-class family in which both my parents were progressive enthusiasts.

But, despite the fact that there are lots of rich and otherwise not-poor people, there remain millions, if not billions of people on our Earth, who regrettably, lay their hands on next to no food whatsoever. They cannot feed their families; they cannot clothe them, and they cannot afford to send them to school.

This is why, and not to be a boasting cynic, I have a deep love for the less privileged amongst us; that even though they are human, they do not have what most of us consider fundamental human rights and privileges and consequently mistake that it is a part of the fundamental truths and principles that govern and dictate the terms that make modern *developed* human life possible, and therefore, lots of people, including me, often take its ostensible verisimilitude for granted.

Can anybody say that they are more imperative, more exceptionable, more superior compared to other fellow beings? Of course, one can say this, but that is naught but an outrageous and preposterous grandiloquence - a grandiloquence that profits nobody.

One may be more efficient or capable at accomplishing a particular undertaking, but it is judiciously insurmountable to say that one man is better than another in a wholly unmitigated, as well as dignified sense. No person is competent or proficient enough to be able to scrupulously accomplish the sempiternal existence of roles and jobs that are latent in even the most uncomplicated of human societies and civilizations.

It is also unfortunate and disheartening to know that most of us reading this paper, including myself, often take for granted the freedom that our ancestors and predecessors may have struggled to consummate. It remains our amaranthine obligation, to hand over a world made better than the one we

received, to our posterity, for it is that very determination and disposition in human beings that has allowed the human race to come to where it contemporaneously is. We must maintain and live up to the responsibility that was vested in us by our forefather or risk running into an abyss from which escaping will not prove to be a painless and straightforward path. That will be a task that demands *de trop* of us, and only in the accomplishment of that task will we emerge from that vast crevasse, and even then to be fugitives in our abodes.

As I will recant later on in this paper, it is more of a necessity than a question of whether one should ignore a crisis or not. When you are presented with an impediment, try not to dodge it, instead learn to remove it from your path, for is that not for what we have persistently been trying to accomplish? Is that not the very idea that has accomplished to drive humanity so far ahead in a world where most natural biological beings cannot even contemplate the slightest fiction.

Please also note that anything I say here are my personal ideas, and I do not mean to discriminate against anyone. A community may be used in a broad sense as an example or otherwise, but it is purely for a better understanding of political and social concepts and actions that happen to be present in our environment.

An Introduction

Governance and methods of ruling are some of the most debated issues in all of human history. Several people have addressed their ideas and doctrines, and there have been wars over such ideas, but these pieces of paper mean to do nothing like that. In this paper, I will discuss already existing ideas and philosophies, for I am a bit too young, and have seen far too less of this world to write a manifesto that stands to gain anything in an already hyper-argumentative and generally oppressive world. Of course, no good political philosopher writes because of what she stands to gain in her short life; instead, she writes because there is merit to her thought.

This is the reason that we need to understand the desideratum of politics, not only for the essential and interminable presence of it in our lives but also so that we can control and establish what *our* government does for *us* - and not what *we* do for *our* government alone.

This manuscript is not intended to be prolix, but obviously, a good argumentative presentation cannot entirely be uncomplicated. Also, I do not intend to look at matters in great detail, but nor do I wholly look at these issues with summative lassitude either. It mostly debates already existing political and social philosophies - in my perspective - and is meant to compile

some of the most important features of a sociopolitical atmosphere. I have always wanted to read something like this, but either there were no really similar documents available, or they were very protracted and uneasy to read and understand (Not that this paper will be too easy, either.). I apologize if you feel that this paper employs sesquipedalianism, but it would have been close to impossible for me to write this without such phrasing.

In order for such papers to become more common in an atmosphere, several people have to write or talk about such issues and their fundamental moral and sociopolitical values. Only when a societal awareness grows does it become possible for such education and understanding to take place. I, therefore, felt it a part of my obligation to the world to write something that may help other people in their lives - to help them to not be left as obsolete and disoriented as I was in issues pertaining to the integrity, dignity and the general prosperousness of this world and its inestimable and indispensable inhabitants.

So, let us begin our voyage into the knowns and unknowns that await us further on in this analysis.

Liberalism versus Conservatism

There exist two major ideas on how the human social and political world should function; and while all human beings and conceptions are agathokakological, some of us, and some of these notions, tend to be more exemplary and honorable than the other. It debates and confabulates the merits that are the offspring of adhering to each of those political methods, notions, and ideals.

These two ideologies are Liberalism and Conservatism. Now, without further ado, let us discuss them.

Liberalism is not as many believe a means to accomplish a greater good for all beings or path to greater human liberation; instead, it is the very notion that audaciously states that we recognize and respect all people and that there is a reason that someone is the way he is, be it right for the community in general or not. It states we are *for* all the people that we are *of* all the people and that we care about *all* the people.

There are a great many who believe that Liberalism will be the end of all of us.

Such persons deem that we are on a treacherously narrow path that is encompassed on two sides by a vast, deep trench of carnage and destruction and that the liberal ideology will toss us into that void, disintegrating the very base and structure of the entire human society. These benighted thoughts are exceedingly harbored by a few that call

themselves the Conservatives. Egocentrically looking at these beliefs, it seems to be that these well-off constituents of our astonishingly diverse human society are trying to carve their way further into societal importance. Their nonchalant attitude towards the weaker and marginalized sections of human civilization is ostensible at best, and also goes to show that they possess limited amounts of feelings of sadness and responsibility for the superlative development of a community and social camaraderie in a broad sense - one that is of imperative importance in the modern society. It seems as though such characters are trying to cleave the various segments of an already partisan human civilization into components that become easier for them to manage according to their wants and eager demand for privileges; that they do not care about our largely imperfect populace.

Liberalism is nothing but the very ideal etched into the Declaration of Independence; its most notable lines chivalrously asserting that "*We hold these truths to be self-evident that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.*" How is it conceivable that today, *that very nation* has a considerably large population that believes in repudiating the equal rights and station of those people who are more adversely affected than their better-off counterparts both in

times of crisis and not? Has the moral ideal used in the founding of that glorious land come toppling to its knees?

Of course, there are fallacious Liberals as well, refuting that would be holding my own argument in a chokehold, but how frequently does one chance upon a genuinely altruistic Conservative (Not to say that there are none, but they appear to be a bit more sparse than delusory Liberals)?

To explicate why the Liberal-Progressive philosophies are preferable to that of the Conservatives, we will have to annotate the discrepancies and similarities in their respective doctrines.

In a comprehensive general sense, Liberalism is a political and moral philosophy that has been built upon many ideals that comprise, but are not confined to:

1. Liberty;
2. Fraternity;
3. The acquiescence and acceptance of those governed;
4. Equality before the law;
5. Human socioeconomic and sociopolitical equality; and
6. Integration of distinct sections of society into one consolidated one.

Liberalism yearns to break free of the shackles of subservience and acceptance of the divine rights of the rich and powerful. It feels an inherent

obligation to serve the impuissant regions of a multidimensional and intricate society. The idea strives to warrant those particular demands that become a necessity to create a greater global equanimity, that encompass, but are not constrained to the following:

1. Gender equality;
2. Secularism;
3. Racial equality;
4. Political equality;
5. Liberation from the locks of the absolute Right of the prosperous and authoritative personages;
6. Civil and individual rights;
7. Freedom of Speech;
8. Freedom of the Press; and
9. Democracy.

Leftism is a political and social order in which all elements of a multicultural, multiethnic, multigenerational society are part of the greater community, a population that is prepared to fight for overall social equilibrium and tranquility. Liberals feel a need to move away from the traditional peculiarities of most societies to have a social hierarchy. The very idea that one person can be superior to another is the maxima of senselessness. Ultimately, we are all *Homo sapiens*; we all have an individual mind and conscience, which unquestionably has its multifariousness from the thoughts of others, given the dissimilarity of the human societal structure. So, what makes one person more important than another? Is it that one had a better brain than another, or

is it that he is physically stronger? Is one better at writing while the other is more proficient at reading? So, while one may be better at wielding a weapon, it is not a given that he shall also be superior to the other person at writing an essay or a story.

We need to understand and accept this difference and move on. It is, after all, these very distinguishing factors that make the human race so unique and diverse in its existence - further implying that Liberalism is the best manner by which the organic dissimilarities in a natural society can be managed without having to resort to unnecessary and unwanted violence and bloodshed; something that will only still increase the hatred that one party will have for another. This therefore goes to show that the floccinaucinihilipilification of minorities or any other part of an organic social construct is not good, and that it will almost certainly end in the breach of the general peace and tranquility.

Conservatism is also a political and social philosophy, but it is one that demands that we all accept the dominance of a 'Greater' few, but this does not mean that they are necessarily bad. They believe that even modern society must be based on traditionalist and conventionalist ideas and practices. It advocates for promoting traditional social establishments in the background of civilization and the general cultural institutions. It holds dear some of the following tenets:

1. Tradition;
2. Hierarchy; and
3. Organic society.

Although most people may be familiar with the earlier two concepts (Being [a]Tradition and [b]Hierarchy), most people tend not to understand the latter one. Organic society is a concept developed by French sociologist David Émile Durkheim. It states that in complex societies, all people are dependent on other people for certain parts of their livelihoods. To give an example of that, suppose that Character-1 works in a company that works on information technology (IT). She develops software that is used by a supermarket from where she then buys her groceries. So it is discernible that the supermarket is working because of what she does and that she can work because she can buy groceries from that supermarket. Does that make any sense? Conservatism, therefore, ensures that a complex society is interdependent on the various cogs that effectively run the mechanism of that very society. So, even if one would want to live without an overdependence on the convoluted society in which we live, it would most definitely be insurmountable to do so. However, this would be much easier to effectuate in a more liberal society as one would not be under the absolute constraints of having to be at the mercy of the remarkably complicated nature of modern human civilization.

Because of the complicated nature of contemporary society and its exceedingly significant influence on our daily lives, we need to make sure that we are not overexploited by the same kind of composition of that society. Conservatism can therefore be labeled an unintended and unfortunate defense of general social, economic, and political inequalities that exist in hugely rudimentary and abecedarian human society.

Another disturbing aspect of traditional Conservatism is its tendency not to accept non-heterosexually oriented peoples. It claims that these types of sexual orientations are not 'Natural.' However, if not 'Natural,' then from where did such sexual orientation begin? Did it magically blossom in some randomly selected person; or did some mad scientists use CRISPR to edit genes? Of course, it was not the latter, as we have heard about non-heterosexually oriented people throughout human history (Please pardon the irony.). It probably started as an aberration in a failed process of genetic mutation. Nature has always had its oddities; and it is only when the human brain does not accept a minority to be 'Natural' does the ostracization and exploitation of such communities engender.

The 'Un-Natural' argument, therefore, has no precedent or worthiness and should not be considered an acceptable argument in such a case. In conclusion, I must say that although everyone

reserves a right to apologia, their defense may still not be acceptable to the majority of the general population.

Notwithstanding anything aforementioned, it is also absolutely vital for the security of a nation, and to prevent from its disintegration, to hold on to some general values. Global trade today happens like this because lots of people believe in trade, the U.S. Dollar, the banks, the courts, and other organizations and concepts that govern trading. This concept of having some establishments for the general security and wellbeing is called establishmentarianism.

People need to believe in something that unites them, whether that is supporting Bayern Munich in the Bundesliga, or supporting Russia in its annexation of Crimea.

What I am trying to say here is that if people stop believing in something, or there is opposition to stop believing in something, such as is the case with antidisestablishmentarianism, and there is no quick and acceptable solution to the problem at hand, the situations tend to escalate, culminating in unwanted and vehement violence and liquidation. Such a possible violent result of this should be avoided at all costs.

Honorificabilitudinitatibus is not something that someone gets without true attempts for it. We need to acknowledge that peace is the best means for greater development, be it

the creation of a life lengthening elixir, or a way for the humans to inhabit Mars.

What is the Cost of Greater Human Advancements?

Yet, I have heard many people say that today's human society has nature that does not fit into the jigsaw puzzle into which we were originally engraved. Contemporary human civilization seems to be one that is fast losing its gregariousness. The transition from being a heavily communal yet elementary form of culture to being an individualistic yet comprehensive modern society has not come without its costs.

The world seems to be losing the '*human-nature*' of it. We all love artificial intelligence, virtual reality, and the computerization of available intelligence, but in the process of doing so, we are employing millions of *humans* across this world of ours. Sadly, it seems to be something that we are willing to lose in order for the greater development of the general sense of humanity and the human endeavor on Earth. But we cannot entirely be oblivious of the change in the order of the world around us. So, even if we do move forward in technological counts, for whom and for what purpose are we doing that if there will be no humans left to use that technology in whose pursuit we have decimated millions and billions of lives? Can you give a number that righteously

classifies and gives value to life? Not really.

While I am not opposed to human development, I do care about those whom that development destroys. We all should. What is the greater good in obliterating the very source and cause that keeps us on the road for the seeking of helping humanity through technological means? There is none. Lots of us reading this article would have watched Spider-Man® - and I wonder if we remember the extremely famous motto of the movies - "*With great power comes great responsibility.*"

Thus we should ask ourselves this - "What is the price that we are ready to pay for the development of a more technologically advanced society?"

It is of an absolute vitality that *ad altiora tendo* be one of the governing mottos of humanity, for, without a will to strive for the greater good, humanity is left like a body without a soul, and a body without a soul is not something that we seem to strive forward to, is it?

Continuingly, it becomes pretty clear and veracious that forethoughtfulness is a virtue that cannot and should not be compromised or abandoned for light or transient causes - for they are such important characteristics that led to abstemiousness - and for a good reason.

Democracy?

We have all learned about dictators, monarchs, and countless other types of individual governance that always seemed to favor the rich and the powerful. Even if the people did not like their ruler, there was little they could do about it. Then, over time various communities started moving away from traditional methods of administration - paving the road for the rise of democracy.

This is because the older forms of decision-making valued lesser time taken in the making of the decision over the quality of the decision itself. However, today, we prize the quality of the decision over the time taken to make it. So, we shifted our form of decision-making. We now have democracy being the most common form of governance. Nevertheless, is democracy the best form of governance? Not really. Let us come to this in a minute. Let us first look at what democracy even means.

The earlier definition of a democracy was that it was a form of government in which people elected the rulers. But which people? Are we only talking about the rich and the well-off people, or do we also include the poor and deprived people in that list of voters? This is what the first constitution of France decreed: Only male citizens above twenty-five years of age and paid taxes equal to at least three days of a laborers' wage could vote. The population that could vote in France based on this system of voting eligibility was about four million

out of a total population of twenty-eight million. What sort of democracy was this? Could this be called a democracy at all? Not really.

So, over time people came up with a few precepts that would help resolve what a form of government needed for it to be called a democracy. Some of these rules are laid down below.

1. In a democratic system of governance, the people elect the rulers.
2. In a democratic system of governance, there are no hereditary posts.
3. In a democratic system of governance, those elected by the people need to have the final say on matters that concern the people.
4. In a democratic system of governance, each adult citizen needs to have one vote, and all ballots need to have the same importance.
5. In a democratic system of governance, the acquiescence of the governed is of utmost significance.
6. In a democratic system of governance, all elections necessitate being based on nonpartisan, sovereign, and candid methods.
7. In a democratic system of governance, there should be no room for corruption or bribery.

8. In a democratic system of governance, there needs to be equality before the law.
9. In a democratic system of governance, the same laws must apply to all those in the country.
10. In a democratic system of governance, there should be no bigotry based on class, economic power, race, gender, religion, or any of them.

Another essential characteristic of a democracy is that it ensures to all its citizens' certain inviolable rights. Among these rights are :

1. Freedom of Speech and Expression;
2. Right and liberty of Press;
3. Right to oppose the activities of the administration;
4. Right against Exploitation;
5. Human Rights; and
6. Right to life and freedom.

If any of these rights are violated, all of us maintain a right to approach courts. It is the inviolable duty of these courts to ensure that the laws set down in that nation are followed. If the Judiciary stops functioning in the manner that it is supposed to, then that nation will unquestionably descend into unprecedented and inconceivable chaos.

Is Democracy the Best Form of governance?

Now, if you rightly remember, I had said that I would come back to the topic of democracy, not being the best form of political administration. Well, I have come back.

Despite democracy being a very effective and of-the-people type of administrative arrangement, it is not really a great form of governance. It is a given that democracy is a better form of administration than dictatorship, majoritarianism, or outright anarchy, but is it the best that the human mind can achieve? Although some say yes, I believe that that is a very pessimistic thought. As little as four centuries ago, would you have even imagined that forty decades later people would be flying in metal cylinders in the sky, or traveling in metal cylinders through the oceans or that we would have explosives capable of blowing up a third of Europe? Not really.

In a similar fashion, I anticipate that a millennium from now democracy will be a thing of the past. We will have a new form of administration that will be inconceivable as of today, for is it not the eternal persistence for amelioration that drives the human spirit of discovery and invention forward? The moment when humanity gives up the pursuit of that betterment and amelioration is when we lose our till-now-persisting characteristic of ambitious augmentation.

Humanity, as I have repeatedly said, has an adroitness, ingenuity, and proficiency and improving existing or

creating presently-not-existing goods and services. So, will we not be able to carve out a more efficient and better form of government?

Democracy is a form of government in which fifty-one percent of the population can superintendence the other forty-nine percent. But it also protects minority rights, which together seems, even though it may seem like a paradox to my argument, to be contradictory to both expostulations.

So if we can develop a form of political management in which a larger share of the general population can be satisfied, then that will be a tremendous accomplishment.

Although at present, all we can say about this panglossian utopian idea is that it does not seem viable, it is not completely inconceivable that we will not be able to do so in the future.

We find it an irrefutable necessity that a system of administration in which the people have a better say, and people are generally happier comes into play. If we ever manage to implement such a utopian doctrine and it is viable thereof, then we no longer require a government. In such a civilization, society takes care of itself. No person needs to depend on a governing body for her subsistence. Each and every person is happy with the judgments and measures that the entire community takes, and there is absolutely no social, economic, political, or other forms of inequalities. Of course, like I have said

time after time, the attainableness of the idea itself then comes into question. In conclusion, we have to acknowledge the relatively overwhelming contingency of humanity changing its *status quo* of the accepted method of governance. It is no longer a probability question of will the present form of political administration evolve, for it most certainly will, rather it is a question of when, where, and how it will happen. Pessimistically speaking, there is a significant chance that we will revert to the simplicity of a dictatorship or another absolutist form of government, or it is also possible that we may descend into greater anarchy. Both these prospects do not seem overly encouraging, but it is yet another truth that we have to accept and move on. Denying the possibility of shifting back to a currently unorthodox form of political governance is a considerably more significant threat than that very possibility itself. As Nelson Mandela put it, "Nothing is more dangerous than sincere ignorance". I agree with him to the entirety of the unmentioned limits of his quote, and while I will you to do the same, it is a force that I cannot control and is also against the very principles that I am laying down here.

Federalism versus Unitarianism

Federalism and Unitarianism are two concepts of the dissemination of political

power within a nation to different tiers. While both of them manifest their own different positives and negatives, they are ultimately for different types of political governance. While federalism is preferable to Unitarianism in a democracy, there are several democratic nations that follow unitarian principles.

Federalism dictates that there be two or more tiers of general public governance, while Unitarianism tries to incorporate all the governing into a single level of governance.

Unitarianism is clearly visible in most monarchies or aristocracies in which there is a single level of political decision making; that of the monarch or the aristocrats. They do not divide power into regional or operative segments and rather consolidate power with the leader at a national standard and level of administration.

The reason I say that federalism is preferable to Unitarianism in a democracy is that one of the most important features of a democracy is its adherent necessity to keep from the consolidation of political power into the hands of a few.

In most places, there subsist social discrepancies, such as religion, race, or economic status; and there exists an inherent tendency to and for the usurpation of such peoples - one that is in all its entirety unacceptable and grievous. In order to handle such regional strains of social differences, the necessity for the formation of a territorial

government becomes apparent. Therefore there exists a moral and social rationale for the creation of such a local government.

There are two main types of federations, being a '*coming together federation*' and a '*holding together federation*.' In the prior classification of a federalist state, several smaller regions come together to form a nation. These provinces then hold together and form a federation that we classify as a *coming together federation*. The United States, Russia, and Australia are all examples of *coming together federations*.

In *holding together federations*, the federationization is to have regional governments that will take care of their respective jurisdictions while the central federal government will take care of the issues that concern the entire nation or all the nationals of the country. India, Belgium, and Spain are all *holding together federations*.

Some federations distribute the work of each level of governance into lists. Some activities like Foreign Affairs and Defence are carried out by the federal government while Education, Sanitation are done by the provincial government.

Unitarian governments have a more centralized approach to handling domestic issues. They generally occur in countries that do not have much diversity or are small, sometimes both. It sometimes seems to be against a regional presence of minorities but not in all cases. Most European countries

like the Netherlands and France are officially unitarian governments, but they do have provincial administrative governments that maintain a certain capaciousness and extent to use and manage regional affairs. Of course, people in many of these nations have wanted to become a fully-fledged federation but have been met with a stone face from the national administrative government.

Sri Lanka is an example of a unitarian government that most people do not appreciate. The Official Language Act Number 33 of 1956, commonly referred to as the Sinhala Only Act, entrenched Sinhala as the *only* official language of the small island nation, disregarding the minority language of Tamil with that same. It was met with fierce opposition by the non-Sinhala speakers and even some Sinhala speakers because it unacknowledged the prominent existence of Tamil. When the government refused to relent, the Tamils created a rogue pseudo-terror organization that targeted the government and its allies. Known as the Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam (LTTE), they demanded the creation of a separate Tamil Eelam (state). A long civil war ensued, and in the end, the Sri Lankan forces, with the help of the Government of India, defeated the LTTE.

Because of such reasons which make it untroublesome for a central government to inconsiderably and effectively ignore, marginalize and deprecate the

minorities, Unitarianism has often been met with a stupendous and tenacious antagonism and hostility. But despite all the efforts, Unitarianism remains the most prevailing and continuous form of governance today.

The Dangers of an Absolutist Form of Government

Absolutism is a form of government that has long existed. I am not sure if it can be called a form of government, considering that nobody exclusive of a single leader of the state exercises much influence. Of course, aristocratic absolutist governments do materialize from time to time, but they are predominantly inexperienced in general, as well as anomalous.

As the appellation itself insinuates, an absolutist bureaucracy is one in which an undemocratic totalitarian has absolute control and power of his underlings and in his or her prerogative jurisdiction.

Totalitarians do not, in an ecumenical sense, adhere to any fundamental characteristics of democracy - many of which we take for granted in our democratic nations. They do not allow the freedom of the Press, right to unionize, freedom of speech and expression, to name a few. All publications must go through the censorship department of the harbinger, and if any work criticizes or subjects the

regime, then it is not allowed for public release, and the author of the work is tortured and exterminated; and although the word 'exterminated' may sound a bit too harsh for the case in question - some may even say that it does not fit - it is the reality. Extermination is the best way to describe it without the usage of gore.

When pivotal human rights and privileges are attacked in such a manner, it presents a considerably substantial disincentive to the general public and the vision of global democracy.

A tyrannical leader can easily overthrow human rights, and reinstate horrendous acts like excruciation and torture.

Although this does incentivize people not to commit a crime, it inevitably violates human rights and human dignity.

While physical pain is, to an extent, sufferable by all people, the mental ramifications are too much for most people to impede. If you were locked up in a cell so small that you could not even move, you had to stand-up all the time, you had to excrete in that very, infinitesimal enclosure, how would you handle it? If you were put in a coffin and buried alive for a few days, how would you take it?

And if you think that I am exaggerating, then I must tell you, you have not even seen the entire tip of the iceberg yet, but I have no intention of writing a torture manual here.

We all have some dignity, even if there may only be a shred of it, but all of us take it as our unquestionable obligation to protect and safeguard that dignity. But if left powerless, unable to chaperon that sense, then anybody will lose it. No man can remain sane and think straight if he is continuously scared, humiliated, and left helpless. This is the ultimate goal of torture, and even if not tortured, it is what totalitarianism, absolutism, and arbitrary governance all do.

Protection of the Equal Rights and Station of Minorities

Minorities have almost always been exploited and victimized by a more omnipotent majority. The chicanery and generally violent means used to subjugate such groupuscules are too onerous and disconsolate even to conceptualize without experiencing an inherent commiseration for those tormented beings.

It is as if the very humanity that governs the human way of alimentation and subsistence had been expunged from their life and experiences. Is it not that fundamental wherewithal that endures in the humanistic social conscience that allows us to move forward and develop without letting our souls lag behind that? If so, then why do we treat the poor, the illiterate, the physically or mentally disabled in a wholly different and repulsive manner? Are they not human?

If they are, then why treat them in an inhumane fashion? If they are not, then what are they? Were they born to do work that the privileged consider menial? Do they not deserve an education? Do they not warrant good healthcare, nutrition, and humane behavior? Are they *really* sub-human? Consider yourself in their shoes. What kind of comportment, savoir-faire, and savoir-vivre would you anticipate? Would you like to be treated like scum or with dignity and compassionate adroitness?

All of us want to be treated in an eleemosynary, philanthropic, and compassionate way. Then why do so many 'Homo sapiens' refute the equal rights and station of those lamentable souls? The reason, in most cases, is that people want to see themselves in a better and more distinguished and superlative light. Because they themselves are not more peerless than others, they portray the others in a bad light; so as to cast themselves into the spot-light of the prosperous and influential. This is, of course, a very melodramatic performance to move a mantilla to cover their immoral, abominable, and reprehensible actions. The erection of analogous insurrections by a few authoritative and dominant people is in the most straightforward and politest terms: deleterious. It so becomes the inarguable and indubitable accountability and answerability of the state to protect these inalienable human rights. That

whenever the state meets waterloo in such respects, it is a capitulation of state machinery and structure. If the courts neglect or fail to deliver the appropriate resolutions, there needs to be a serious consideration of the appropriateness and endowment of the mechanisms that *allow the seamless functioning of government.*

Like the American Declaration of Independence coherently states, "*That to secure these Rights, Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just Powers from the Consent of the Governed, that whenever any Form of Government becomes destructive of these Ends, it is the Right of the People to alter or to abolish it, and to institute new Government, laying its Foundation on such Principles, and organizing its Powers in such Form, as to them shall seem most likely to affect their Safely and Happiness.*"

The above statement also says that a government should derive its just powers from the consent of the governed. Now arises a question - "Whom do they govern?" Are they all the citizens - irrespective of race, religion, creed, or gender - or does it only include the rich and powerful? This remains a question that still needs to be answered by several governments, and only an answer that recognizes the equal rights and station of all its citizens, inattentive of other social and political factors, is one that can be genuinely accepted.

Fundamentalism and the Protection of Fundamentalists

All human societies tend to have some radicalized members in it, along with the more moderate thinkers. It is a reality that seems to transpire and exist in a cataclysmic order in all cultures and communities.

Fundamentalists contemplate other cultures, nations, or people in a manner that may seem profoundly racist, xenophobic, or uncomplimentary and defamatory. Although in their psychology, they may seem to have an exoneration for their illegitimate demeanor, most of their arguments seem to be without much substantiation. Nevertheless, the liberal ideals in all its glory and conspicuousness supersede the palpableness that dictates that fundamentalists are violent, unlawful creatures; that they do not deserve our pity and humane treatment. Ultimately it always boils down to the same question - are they sub-human?

I have said countless times that the very acceptability of the conception of sub-humaneness is beyond organic human reckoning. It is a black blot on the white sheet of humaneness and natural social equality to say that a particular race, peoples or nation is below the line of that marks the equal station of all humanity. Condemning anybody to the chains and shackles of a non-magnanimous society or tradition is

a violation of those same rights for which our ancestors and predecessors have long fought. It is taking for granted their work without a single sigh of thankfulness. It is not a murder; it is a massacre - a massacre of everything the free world stands for, a massacre of fundamental human rights, a massacre of the founding values of humanity, and a massacre of a populace itself! It is an unbearable thought. And while killing and robbing people of their values, their life, their loves, and their families are not acceptable either, must we lower ourselves to a level of unprecedented pandemonium and anarchy?

Cutting ourselves loose from our causative and root values is not a responsible decision to make at such times; instead, it is cacophonous and disharmonic. It is not the road we want to take, even by misapprehension or misinterpretation. It is an absolute necessity that we make the appropriate decision at an appropriate time, and to err at such time would indeed prove catastrophes.

We always need to think of the greater good and what would help us achieve that greater good, be it for humanity or nature in general, for we need to make the right choices so that we can live up to those very principles that governed our creation and advancement; and our posterity will judge us by the decisions that we choose to make. And while we cannot regulate or command which of the judgments we made will prove to be for the better, it remains a necessity for

us to do our best and hope for the nonpareil. That is our responsibility.

When do Rights become an Obsession?

There is a limit to everything, after which it becomes too much. Food is essential, but too much would make you fat; water is good, but drink too much, and you would lose a lot of vitamins and minerals from your body, right? Similarly, Rights are significant, but when do we have too many Rights?

We all need Rights like *Right to Privacy*, *Right to Freedom*, *Right to Equality*, among others, but there exist several Rights that have no basis for existence. The most outrageous of these is the *Right to Own and Carry Arms*.

People say that this is to protect their interests, homes, and families, but is it all that necessary? Not really. If no is allowed a gun, then you do not need a weapon to defend yourself. If you are talking about a terrorist attack, then that is an entirely different story, but what would most civilians be able to do against heavily armed terrorists? Very little.

Moreover, it is clearly visible that nations in which carrying arms are allowed to have a higher crime rate than those countries that do not permit this. The United States has, for example, a pretty high crime rate because of the Second Amendment, which allows citizens the right to own and bear arms. We have

seen that the United States very often has shootouts, which proves my point that countries that empower their citizens to carry weapons have a crime rate that exceeds that of countries that do not allow this.

There, of course, maybe several other Rights vested in people that do not need existence, and there are several, but who is to judge what Right one shall need. Almost nobody knows what the wants and needs of another person are. The reason that those wants and needs exist is because of the very existence of our species. And such requirements and wants not reserved for humans - all creatures have needs and dispositions. But this following contention seems to challenge the very prerequisite necessity for the presence of the original argument. Yes, it does question the need for the existence of the first case, but it also provides for the allowance of the viability of the theory that not all people vested these other Rights actually need them. This is why I presented the second argument.

Let us now also look at a few other elements that constitute a political atmosphere.

Ancient versus Contemporary Political Philosophy

Confucius quoted that, *"The Superior Man governs Men according to their*

Nature, with what is Proper to them, and as soon as they Change, He Stops." Is this true? The doctrine seems to be akin to a utopian notion, rather than what can be done. This is only feasible if the 'Superior Man' is not greedy. Besides, why will he not be? It has been shown throughout history that once someone comes to a position of power, any goodness in that person – provided that that person had some morality – is very likely to deteriorate. He will use that power for his good, as he is not answerable to the People.

Let us also try to speculate about why he would stop. If you had immeasurable and unquestionable power, would you check them? If you could perpetually keep giving the excuse that someone has not yet changed onto the 'correct' path and keep them enthralled, secondary to you, why would you give up that perk ('Perk' being a very subtle means to describe this.) Why would you want to be held culpable for your actions, mainly if it were to be against the dispositions of the people? But also note that this is only for most cases and that there certainly may be exemptions. I would also like to examine the notion of a 'Superior Man.' What does it mean? Looking at it from the perspective of modern-day democracy, it may be a wrong approach to governance. How is one person superior to another? Ultimately, we are all human beings. Yes, one can be more competent, more energetic, better at speaking, but does all of this make that person 'Superior' to

other human beings? Possibly in one or two particular things, but can one indeed be better than all others in all fields of life?

The advice that Confucius is genuinely trying to present is that in an ideal world, there should only be one decision-maker and that he is responsible for making those decisions. But how is that possible? Do you think that your boss, your teacher, your parents are invariably right in their judgments? Are they immune to making faults? Do they not have their hamartia? However, before we accept it to be accurate, should we not make our own opinions on it? I feel Confucius erred in writing this. How is it possible that you can trust all the judgments of a monarch? You cannot ever be entirely sure about the instincts of a human being. We all make mistakes; do we not. What will provide for that the 'Superior Man' will not make a ghastly mistake, or even perpetrate an unpardonable evil? Even computers make mistakes. Is it that hard for a *mere* human to naught make a misjudgment?

Sun Tzu quoted that, "*A Leader Leads by Example, not Force.*" I find this much more apt to what a leader should be. Now, let us cross-examine it to the statement, "*Political Power Grows out of the Barrel of the Gun.*" How is this possible? Are these statements not opposing ones? Not entirely.

The Sun Tzu quote says that a leader who leads people not only by preaching good but also by doing that good, which

he so teaches in a dignified manner, without the use of force or violence, is good.

The following quote says that to have political power, one must use violence, generate fear, and be intimidating. It means that no one will have political power if that person is not ready to fight for it.

So, what we need to understand is that for one to be a good leader, one needs to act on human interests, compassion, and by providing a model for the leader's subjects. Yet this is not adequate. One necessitates being ready to fight for that power so that he can act compassionately, to be a model to his people. If you do not even have that power, how will you do good? But what is that level of control that we have to ascend to, to do good for the people? Do we have to be violent to achieve that position of power? Had this been an ideal world, then no, we would not have to, but realistically speaking, if you are not ready to crush and you enter the fight for power, you will be broken.

Historically we have seen that societies in which there is fear perform better in matters where following rules and orders have importance. But these societies are not always the best. Would you like to live in a community or country that enforces laws and lines on you or a culture that allows free thinking and is liberal? Would you want to live somewhere that tells you what and how to think, what to do, and how to live?

Most people do not like this. This proves

another one of our points, *"One needs the Freedom to have and do what One wants and needs along with a Leader who allows them to do this without Fear of Force being used on them or their Leader not setting a Good example."*

Righteousness

There exists no one definition for righteousness, for it is dependent on the beliefs and faith from whose perspective we are looking at the subject in question, but there is a widely maintained social understanding and acceptance of what it is and ought to be. Benevolence is one of the infinities of characteristics that happen to be identified and associated with righteousness by human society, and while it is not accepted by all cultures, faiths, and understandings of this world, in all its diverse multitudes, it is found to be the benchmark in nearly all 'good' cultures and ideologies (Please do forgive my recantations and thus far inability to immaculately and unquestionably establish what righteousness exactly is.).

Righteousness - apart from its dictionary definition of being a virtuous moral right doing - is also a consummation or cerebation that is justifiable to one's conscience.

Like I also stated at the beginning of this section, the validity of what righteousness is, is not a singular, absolutely accepted belief - its

understanding and theorization do vary from person to person. But general righteousness is taken to be what a majority of traditions and beliefs say - it is a morally legitimate action or cogitation that is justifiable in a 'good' way to one's conscience.

The righteousness in political and social governance is good or bad based on the intention and aim of that deed of the government.

The obligatory and necessitarian duty of a government is to take care of and provide for its subjects. In the particular exemplification of democracy, the elected government is one of the people, by the government and for the people - thus aggrandizing the quintessential amenableness of a government to take care of its people. Also, it is not really the responsibility of a democratic political superintendence to take care of its citizens or denizens; alternatively, it is their moral duty and obligation to humanity that generates this urge and responsibility of caring for its subjects. Furthermore, considering that a government exists only because of its inhabitants - or at least that is the fundamental reason for its existence - it becomes the unquestionable institutionalization and responsibility of the government to support and help the people - the people who happen to be the sunlight, carbon dioxide, water, nutrients as well as chlorophyll of the tree of democratic governance that provides for the government to

synthesize, to and for, better outcomes that inevitably to purer and more abundant resources that will result in that tree blooming and flourishing and soon creating a forest.

In a like manner, any action or decision that a government may have taken that may have directly or indirectly led to arbitrary despotism anywhere in its jurisdiction is a failure of state machinery - ostensibly portraying a lack of efficiency or a greedy or corrupt system of administration.

Arbitrariness has no validity or Right to exist in a democracy, for it is a violation and shows impassiveness to the founding principles of the same, while also maintaining a capability to perpetrate counterproductive and disadvantageous opposition to democracy - thus effectively vilipending the greater good that the still juvenile and even fragmentary and incomplete form of political governance can achieve.

Nor does individual political power matter in a democracy. The individual personage of a politician is nothing but a means to empower the people and run a sustainable and *ad hoc* system of administration. While this may not yet be a reality, it is a feature of a democracy that we should all pursue and try to achieve - but right now, the idea may be utopian.

Righteousness in Sexuality

This is a subsection of the Righteousness section of this paper. It

will discuss how human sexuality is looked upon by humans themselves and will be compared to the biological necessities and appearances that one sees in nature. This reason that I include this is because sexuality and sexuality-related subjects often are taboo in most human societies, and they also often discriminate against specific individuals or broader and larger communities and the aspects that concern their day-to-day lives.

If this is not something that you want to read or feel uneasy or apprehensive at this point, please feel free to move to the next section.

With that, let us begin.

In most, if not all, societies, sex, and sex-related subjects can be highly taboo and sensitive. Most people don't like to discuss such things with other people, often because they feel uncomfortable doing so. While this is not wrong, it is not natural either.

I inarguably concede to the point that no known animal except *Homo sapiens* has a method of communication that is as effective and valuable as humans do. Our innate ability to voice our thoughts and discuss matters that concern people other than themselves is a boon like no other, and this is what has allowed the human race to come to the juncture that we stand at today.

Imagine for a moment that none of us spoke a proper language (i.e., a language that has grammatical rules and orders in which words are placed in

a sentence.). How would we effectively communicate what we think? Albert Einstein may have developed the Theory of Relativity still, but how would he tell others and convince them to acknowledge and accept what he has to say? Supposing, a monkey found a perfectly feasible way to develop a machine that would take her to the sun, how would he tell others? Will he design the whole the transport module by himself, or would he use crude gestures to effectively communicate and calculate the distance between the sun and the Earth, how much fuel was needed to travel back-and-forth, how much food there should be, or whether it would travel without a being in it, and if so, what would energize the animal and would the creature be able to exit the module and take samples from the atmosphere close to the sun?

Clearly, even if a monkey had managed to think of all this, he would have a hard time conveying his thoughts. This human ability to communicate through languages like English, Spanish, Malayalam, and Japanese has allowed our species to think successfully of, try, invent, and make lots of things better in our environments.

Similarly, we need to use this intercommunication and dialogue that we have been so blessed with to talk about the continuance of the human species.

From what I understand, sex is not bad; and neither is it destructive or in violation of nature's laws. It is something

that all species do, and something that unquestionably proves a connection between the creature that became a god and its so-called, lesser, long-lost cousins.

Masturbation is not wrong; it even has some positive effects on our bodies, but as I have said earlier, anything in excess is a sort of poison.

There are bisexuals, homosexuals, and lots of other types of sexual orientations, but nothing in this is wrong or outside the box. In fact, none of these sexual orientations were thought of as inherently different from a heterosexual one until more recent times. In ancient Rome and Greece, nonheterosexual relationships were not considered immoral or unnatural. Alexander the Great was a bisexual, Julius Caesar was a bisexual, the Greek hero Achilles slept with his love Patoculus, and nobody even thought of objecting to this. In all reality and veracity, it is modern religion that is at the root of contemporary hatred towards nonheterosexually oriented people and gives rise to heterocentrism, heterosexism, and the like. It is an abhorrent manifestation of the human need to see some people and good and some others as corrupt, evil, and immoral; and the truth is this - we need to accept that such thoughts and ideas exist in our environment and that we owe it to all those people who were killed because they did not agree with most of the populations on how to have sex. We

need to seriously think about what we are doing and whether that is right or not.

Let people decide what they want to do in bed, for it is their life, and they deserve the same freedom that heterosexuals get in modern human society.

We also need to acknowledge that things like pornography and prostitution are not necessarily wrong or bad. As long as people recognize that the people involved in such activities are no less human than you are, and you understand that that is not reality, and you do not hurt them, it is perfectly okay to do such stuff, the morality notwithstanding anything I said here. Life is what it is; we cannot change it; but let us try everything so that life and everything in life is better than what it was when we first knocked on its doors.

Scribit Vere Victor Sui

Another topic I would like to talk about is what I call '*Scribit Vere Victor Sui*' (*Writes the Winner of his Spring*).

According to this concept, the truth is written by the victors. They do not accurately portray the whole story, leaving out the bits that show the *protagonist* in bad light. Whatever transpired seems to be about the greatness of the conquering side, the more civilized manners of the conquering side, the technological

superiority that the conquering side enjoyed. Let us use an example to demonstrate this.

Adolf Hitler. We all say that he was a bad man, but was he actually bad? I thought he was barking mad until I read his autobiography – the *Mein Kampf*. Yes, he had some eccentric ideas, most of them downright ludicrous and disagreeable and even deeply troubling, but do not all of us have some or the other flaws as well? In that perspective, the fatal flaw that infected Hitler was patriotism and the love for the culture of his nation. He did not want anything more than a Great Germany. He found the Treaty of Versailles, which was created at the end of the First World War, to be highly discriminatory, and harbored an intense dislike for anybody or anything that fought against Germany and German values. Can you find fault with that? I most certainly cannot. I love my country, do you not?

But what about the concentration camps? Surely they were not good. I agree, they were most unquestionably not sustained, but Hitler genuinely felt that his fatherland was being corrupted. So he did what he felt would be in the best interests of his homeland. Now you might wonder if I were a Nazi. I assure you that that idea is preposterous. I am no more a Nazi than Churchill was. I do not like the Nazi ideology, but yet, if you look at it with the objectively, you will find that most of us do not judge or talk about the evils and atrocities that the Spanish Empire committed, and out of

the blue, we use to judge the Carthagian Empire, you find that it is not all bad.

There is some good in even the most evil man in the world and even in the most evil atrocities committed.

We keep saying that what Hitler did was appalling, that it was a crime against humanity. Yes, it was, I do not object.

But if you were asked to name some of the war crimes perpetrated by the Allies, most of us would be tongue-tied. No, it is not your fault, or my fault, it is the fault of those who won that long war. They did not want to portray themselves as bad people, violators of basic human necessities, and rights. No, only the people who lost did that, right? If you notice, then it seems that it is always the side that loses that is bad for the world.

We furthermore deem the power that miscarries to be evil. Is this the right?

The British Empire - one of the several nations part of the Allied Forces in the World Wars - has done more damage than what Germany did in both those wars combined. Do you know what they did? Of course not. Colonization is barely taught in schools in England now, or in any school of that matter. If that country has not been colonized, then there is a little chance that the periods of European colonization get more than a chapter in the entire school curriculum.

The British Empire extirpated livelihoods, wasted populations, and erased dreams of innocent people, people who did not understand international statesmanship, from the very face of this planet. If one fought to

liberate *his* nation, *his* motherland, then he was called a traitor, not by the people of that land, but by some white people who had *their* houses halfway across the world. They tortured the indigenous peoples of the subcontinent; they stole cotton and silk and spices from traditional weavers and straightforward people who grew some crops to ensure their livelihood, and carved the road to the deindustrialization of India. When the British first came in about 1700 AD, India contributed about 24.4% of the global gross domestic product (GDP), and when they left, that number had dwindled down all the way to 4.2% in 1950. The average life expectancy had fallen to 27, the literacy rate to 19%, the percentage of the population that lived under the poverty line to close to 90%, all of them unprecedented and unacceptable both in terms of modern thought and general human morality and humanitarianism.

They did not even care what became of those locals. All this selfishness, greed, lack of compassion led to lots of locals committing suicide, killing each other as an act of kindness, amongst others. The Bengal Famine, one of the worst famines in the antiquity of the world, left between two and three million people dead. Is that not an act against humanity? Does that not violate the consecrated relationship between humans?

So, is Hitler the only bad man? Do you now agree that history is penned down by the people who win a struggle, be it

emotional, corporeal, economical, or theoretical? If you do, then you understand what this is all about.

On Judiciary

Judiciary is the technical term for the system of courts and bodies that make decisions on disputes or grievances. Over time we have seen various forms of the Judiciary, but three aspects are always important when gauging the quality of such organizations.

1. The Independence of Judiciary;
2. The Method of Electing the Judiciary; and
3. The Rightness of the Rulings of the Judiciary.

How will it help a nation if those charged with correcting a wrong are not able to execute their responsibility? I can hardly think of a way in which that can happen. If those with such obligations are not given help, even coerced to do what bureaucrats desire to do, then how will we prevent a majoritarian state, an aristocratic nation, a home of the rich and powerful? Therefore, a country must have a judicial system that is capable of helping the ones in need, the poor, the marginalized sections of our society.

Another critical aspect of the Judiciary one must acknowledge is the method that is used to elect people to the positions of those who make decisions in such organizations. It does not help if the head of a government can choose

who will be the judicial members. Such a means is not very democratic by any means. All affiliates of Judicial conformity need to either be elected by the general public - which is democratic but not adequately reasonable - or need to be selected by another elected body. This is fine in the case of the Judiciary but is not a healthy choice when selecting constituents to a Legislature or Executive. It is next to impossible to have a fair system of laws and measures if the organizations that deliver those verdicts are not independent of other organizations of a similar statute.

In times of a monarchy or other forms of a ruling by the elite, the rich and powerful, times of aristocracies in general, verdicts were often given in manners that would today constitute a clear and unobjectionable crime of discrimination. Such a judicial system is not one in which the general public can vest their confidence. Would you trust a system of unfair, discriminatory practices if you were not a part of the elite? I absolutely would not, for there is no better way - other than physical brute force - to render people weak, unhelpable, pitiful, and most importantly driven out of hope for a better tomorrow, a hope that there is goodness in man, a hope that there is a light at the end of the long tunnel of oppression, persecution, and abuse.

To a large and diverse population, this is a sad and unacceptable feeling of despair that threatens to break the very

chains of hope and happiness that need to inhabit our lives, our planet, and our society.

We need to have a good system that enforces the law, and when those rules that govern the entire society are broken, we need an institution that is both willing and powerful enough so as to right that wrong and fix the error, punish the person or people that erred and regain the trust of the general public.

The most important thing that a political organism needs to do is to have a good public perception and track record. Even if a court is doing its job, but if its oeuvre is not one of great appeal; rather, it is one of failure and lack of support for the cause of the institution, then it crumbles. There is no need for such an establishment. This is what I want to say, is the most important characteristic of a political body, does it stand for a cause, does it do the Right concerning its motive, and is it responsible, credible, honest and dependable?

Misogyny

Misogyny is a sadder aspect of most human civilizations - if *civilizations* is the right term to use here, considering that the term civilization was coined to show that humans had become more civil, i.e., morally and culturally developed. It inevitably shows up in almost all human societies. It is a concept according to which females (In a general sense) are

inferior to their male counterparts. Even though the idea is irrational, ludicrous, and preposterous, there remains a prodigious number of people who believe in it. Although nobody seems to have a reason for its appearance in human cultures, nearly all cultures in which misogyny exists has a story behind it.

Having been brought up in India, let me present the tale as told in Hinduism.

Indra - the king of the Indian pantheon - had committed a terrible crime, and this had jeopardized the realm of heaven. To make things right, Indra had to be caught. Scared for his life, Indra flees and travels far and wide, seeking asylum. Finally, he finds a woman and asks her to take his sin; otherwise, there will be widespread death and destruction. In all her kindness, the woman agrees to take his sins, so she is forever impure, always carrying the burden of his crimes.

This narrative clearly contradistinguished the equal Right and station of women in ancient Indian society. It further said that periods that occur in women is a discharge of the transgressions and immoralities that they had inherited from a god. Such an argument, despite its possible cultural necessity, fails to meet the standards that set a common faith in human righteousness and morality. It is grievous disheartening to know that even after ages have gone by since the creation of such a myth, it continues to

endure in the minds and beliefs of several fellow human beings. Refuting the sphere of equality on a materialistic nature or physical characteristics is not a practice of good faith. It highlights the human necessity of creating a hierarchy in our understanding and acceptance. Most of contemporary humanity holds a grudge or hatred of somebody, someplace or something else on one or another basis. Sometimes such echelons are not really significant - like the preferring of a particular flavor of ice-cream over another, but sometimes it can have a seriously significant impact on the way in which a community or society lives and acts. Despite misogyny not having a real necessity to endure, it continues to do so. It continues to do so despite misogyny not having a practical need to manipulate the minds of ordinary humans. Despite misogyny being a cog in the negatives of the human societal structure, on which deserves to be concluded forever, it continues to live; and will continue to live till all humans look at it in its eye and say, "Enough is enough. Get the heck out of our way of life and never, ever come back to torture the peace and prosperity out of us." If we stand up for the equal station of humanity and everything that it encompasses, then we can change the world, as Barack Obama said, "One voice can change a room, and if one voice can change a room, then it can change a city, and if it can change a city, it can change a state, and if it

change a state, it can change a nation, and if it can change a nation, it can change the world. Your voice can change the world."

But it does not entirely stop there either; women have been widely admonished for wanting to go to school, learning how to drive, and often about working - but this is not everywhere. However, in almost every place on this planet, misogyny subsists in one form or another, and this has to stop. The inferior and often subhuman treatment of women has to stop. Women and girls also have the right to be educated, and anyone stating otherwise has to stop. Misogyny, or any form of gender discrimination for that matter, has to stop! And although it is eternities too overdue, it has to stop forthwith!

A Conclusion

Ultimately we are all human beings, inhabiting the same one planet on which we were all born. We all have differences, be them physical, mental, social, economic, or political, but it is not those differences that have the Right to govern us, it is the similarities in all of us that give rise to the notion that we are all equal, and that the best method by which we can ensure that all people are treated equal, and genuinely are identical in human values is the concept of democracy. Only a utopian vision of a form of government can precede the quality of governance than what is

assured to people in democracy at this point in human political reasoning. And what is that utopian vision? It is an apperception in which there is no requirement of a government, a society in which all the people can govern themselves, be a fair judge of themselves, and make rules for themselves that will influence in creating a utopian system seem un-utopian. But, of course, this remains a utopian vision for a reason.

All systems of governance have flaws, just like all civilizations and cultures have their flaws. In a democracy, fifty-one percent of the population gets to overrule the rest forty-nine percent. Is this fair? Not by far. But unfortunately, there seems to be no other form of governance in which all people can be respected unless you go back to the prior concept of a perfect style of governing, which, like it says there itself, is an idealistic concept for a reason. Most people cannot even agree on which flavor of ice-cream is best, much less decide what is in their best interests at a national level.

Although no one likes others making decisions on their behalf, we have to understand and respect the necessities that sometimes occur, demanding that more experienced individuals take the call.

For example, when trying to catch a spy, intelligence or other government agencies should do so rather than the mob because telling the people unquestionably scares the spy, and it

becomes so much more difficult to apprehend him.

Accordingly, and notwithstanding anything else in this analysis, I recommend that all people understand and accept the cultural differences that inevitably subsist in our imperfect human fellowship. Let us brave these differences and make those differences the reason for greater societal unification and development; and to say that this is admittedly what makes us who we are.

And like the Declaration of Independence contemptuously states, "And for the support of this Declaration, with a firm Reliance on the Protection of divine Providence, we mutually pledge to each other our Lives, our Fortunes, and our sacred Honor."

Post Scriptum

There, of course, are an uncountable number of issues that I did not cover in this rather short but heady article. Even if I had the luxury of giving you such a prolix piece, you probably would have been quite bored by the time you finished reading it, that is *if* you would have managed to finish reading the whole paper.

I might not have gotten bored if I was the one reading such an article, and I know some people who also might not have gotten tired of doing so, but the point in question remains if it is of any worth writing something like that, and of

course, I have tried not to make this paper too mundane. Of course, it would most definitely help me in honing some writing skills, but is it worth writing for people who do not entirely understand its value? If one would like to read more about such writing, it would greatly help her and human society in general. With a firm reliance on the general goodwill of humankind, thank you, and godspeed!

Thank you all for reading this paper. Hopefully, you understood it, and it will help you in your respective lives. Please contact me if you have any doubts. I will only be more than happy to help resolve them. All you have to do is email me at harikrishnansankar1776@gmail.com.

I also urge all of you not to use any information given in this, including examples, without citation, as I have worked hard on this.

Thanking you,

Yours sincerely,

Sankar Harikrishnan

Notes:

