

**Muammar Al
Qathafi**

**The
Green
Book**

Part Three

**The
Social Basis**

**of the Third
Universal Theory**

324
Q-10
2. Hayhoo...
N 96
Page

Muammar Al Qathafi

THE GREEN BOOK

8442

Part Three

The
Social Basis

of the Third
Universal Theory

THE SOCIAL BASIS OF THE THIRD UNIVERSAL THEORY

The social, i.e. national, factor is the driving force of human history. The social bond which binds together each human group, from the family through the tribe to the nation, is the basis for the movement of history.

Heroes in history are persons who have made sacrifices for causes. But for what causes? They have made sacrifices for others. But which others? They are those who have a relationship with them. The relationship between an individual and a group is a social relationship, i.e. the relationship between the members of a nation. For nations are founded on nationalism. Those causes, therefore, are national causes and national relationship is the social relationship. The social relationship is derived from society, i.e. the relationship between the members of a society, just as nationalism is derived from the nation, i.e. the relationship between the mem-

bers of a nation. The social relationship is, accordingly, the national relationship and the national relationship is the social relationship. For the group is a nation and the nation is a group even if they differ in number, leaving aside the extended definition of the group which means the provisional group regardless of the national relations of its members. What is meant by the group here is the group which is permanent by virtue of its own national relations.

Besides, historical movements are mass movements, i.e. group movements for its own interests . . . for its independence from a different group. Each group has its own social structure which binds it together. Group movements are always movements for independence in order that subjugated or oppressed groups may attain self-realisation. As for the struggle for power, it occurs within the group itself down to the family level, as expounded in Part One of the *Green Book*, which deals with the Political Basis of the Third Universal Theory. A group movement is a nation's movement for

its own interests. By virtue of its national structure, each group has common social needs which must be collectively satisfied. These needs are in no way individualistic. They are collective needs, rights, demands, or objectives of a nation which is bound by a single nationalism. That is why these movements are called national movements. Contemporary national liberation movements are themselves social movements. They will not come to an end before every group is liberated from the domination of another group, i.e. the world is now passing through one of the regular cycles of the movement of history, namely, the national struggle in support of nationalism.

In the world of man, this is the historical reality, as it is a social reality. That means that the national struggle — the social struggle — is the basis of the movement of history, because it is stronger than all other factors since it is the origin . . . the basis . . . it is in the nature of the human group . . . the nature of the nation. It is the nature of life itself. Other animals, apart from man, live in groups. Indeed, the group

is the basis for the survival of all groups within the animal kingdom. So nationalism is the basis for the survival of nations.

Nations whose nationalism is destroyed are subject to ruin. Minorities, which are one of the main political problems in the world, are the outcome of a social cause. They are nations whose nationalism has been destroyed and torn apart. The social factor is, therefore, a factor of life . . . a factor of survival. It is the nation's natural innate momentum for survival.

Nationalism in the world of man and group instinct in the animal kingdom are like gravity in the domain of mineral and celestial bodies. If the mass of the sun were smashed so that it lost its gravity, the gases would blow away and its unity would no longer exist. Accordingly, the unity is the basis for its survival. The factor of unity in any group is a social factor, i.e. nationalism. For this reason a group struggles for its own national unity, because its survival lies in that.

The national factor, which is the social bond, works automatically to

impel the nation towards survival, in the same way that the gravity of an object works to keep it as one mass around the nucleus. The diffusion and dispersion of atoms in the atomic bomb are the result of the explosion of the nucleus which is the focus of gravitation for the atoms around it. When the factor of unity in those components is broken into pieces and gravity is lost, every atom is dispersed. This is the nature of matter. It is an established law of nature. To disregard it or collide with it is damaging to life. Thus man's life is damaged when he begins to disregard nationalism . . . the social factor . . . the gravity of the group . . . the secret of its survival. There is no rival to the social factor in influencing the unity of one group except the religious factor, which may divide the national group or unite groups with different nationalisms. However, the social factor will eventually gain sway. This has been the case throughout the ages. Originally, each nation had one religion. This was harmony. In fact, however, differences arose which became a genuine cause of conflict and

instability in the life of the peoples throughout the ages.

The sound rule is that every nation should have a religion. The contrary to that is the abnormal. Such an abnormality creates an unsound situation which becomes a real cause for disputes within a national group. There is no other solution but to be in harmony with the natural rule that each nation has one religion. When the social factor is compatible with the religious factor, harmony is achieved and the life of groups becomes stable and strong and develops soundly.

Marriage is a process that exercises negative and positive effects on the social factor though both man and woman are free to accept whom they want and reject whom they do not want as a natural rule of freedom. Marriage within a group, by its very nature, strengthens its unity and brings about collective growth in conformity with the social factor.

THE FAMILY

To the individual man the family is of more importance than the state. Mankind acknowledges the individual man and the individual man acknowledges the family which is his cradle, his origin and his social 'umbrella'. Mankind, as a matter of fact, is the individual and the family, not the state. The state is an artificial economic and political system, sometimes a military system, with which mankind has no relationship and has nothing to do. The family is exactly like an individual plant in nature which is composed of branches, leaves and blossoms. However, adapting the natural environment with farms and gardens, and the like is an artificial procedure which has nothing to do with the actual nature of the plant. The fact is that political, economic or military factors have organized groups of families into a state which has nothing to do with mankind. Equally any position, condition or measure resulting in the

dispersal, decline or loss of the family is inhuman and unnatural. Indeed, it is an arbitrary condition, exactly like any action, condition or measure which leads to the destruction of the plant, the breaking of its branches, the fading of its blossoms and leaves.

Societies in which the existence and unity of the family are threatened, in any circumstances, are similar to fields whose plants are in danger of being swept away or threatened by drought or fire, or of withering away. The blossoming garden or field is that whose plants grow, blossom, pollinate and root naturally. The same holds true for human society.

The flourishing society is that in which the individual grows naturally within the family and the family itself flourishes in the society. The individual is linked to the larger family of mankind like the leaf to the branch or the branch to the tree. They have no value or life if separated. The same is the case for the individual if he is separated from the family, i.e. the individual without a family has no value or social life. If human society

reached the stage where man existed without a family, it would become a society of tramps, without roots; like artificial plants.

THE TRIBE

A tribe is a family which has grown as a result of procreation. It follows that a tribe is a big family. Equally a nation is a tribe which has grown through procreation. The nation, then, is a big tribe. So the world is a nation which has been ramified into various nations. The world, then, is a big nation. The relationship which binds the family is that which binds the tribe, the nation and the world. However, it weakens with the increase in number. The concept of man is that of the nation, the concept of nation is that of the tribe, and the concept of the tribe is that of the family. However, the degree of warmth involved diminishes as the relationship moves from the smaller level to the larger one. This is a social fact only denied by those who are ignorant of it.

The social bond, cohesiveness, unity, intimacy and love are stronger at the family level than at the tribal level . . . stronger at the tribal level than at that

of the nation, and stronger at the level of the nation than at that of the world.

The advantages, privileges, values and ideals, which are based on social bonds, exist where those bonds are natural and undoubtedly strong, i.e. they are stronger at the family level than at that of the tribe, stronger at the tribal level than that of the nation and stronger at nation's level than that of the world. Thus these social bonds and the benefits, advantages and ideals associated with them are lost wherever the family, the tribe, nation or mankind vanish or are lost. *It is, therefore, of great importance for human society to maintain the cohesiveness of the family, the tribe, the nation and the world in order to benefit from the advantages, privileges, values and ideals yielded by the solidarity, cohesiveness, unity, intimacy and love of the family, tribe, nation and humanity.*

In social terms, the family society is better than that of the tribe, the tribal society is better than that of the nation and the society of the nation is better than world society as regards fellowship, affection, solidarity and benefit.

MERITS OF THE TRIBE

Since the tribe is a large family, it provides its members with the same material benefits and social advantages the family provides for its members. For the tribe is a secondary family. What needs to be emphasized is that the individual might sometimes act in a disgraceful manner which he would not dare to do in front of his family. But since the family is smaller in size he can escape from its supervision, unlike the tribe whose supervision is felt by all its members. In view of these considerations the tribe forms a behaviour pattern for its members which will be transformed into a social education which is better and more human than any school education. The tribe is a social school where its members are brought up from childhood to absorb high ideals which are transformed into a behaviour pattern for life. These become automatically rooted as the human being grows, unlike education with its curricula, formally dictated and gradually lost with the growth of the individual. This

is so because it is formal and ruled by tests and because the individual is aware of the fact that it is dictated to him.

The tribe is a natural social 'umbrella' for social security. By virtue of social tribal traditions, the tribe provides for its members collective payment of ransom, collective fines, collective revenge and collective defence, i.e. social protection.

Blood is the prime factor in the formation of the tribe but it is not the only factor because affiliation is also a factor in the formation of the tribe. With the passage of time the difference between the factors of blood and affiliation disappears, leaving the tribe as one social and physical unit. But it is a unit of blood and origin more than any other.

THE NATION

The nation is the individual's national political 'umbrella' and it is wider than the social 'umbrella' provided by the tribe to its members. Tribalism damages nationalism because tribal allegiance weakens national loyalty and flourishes at its expense. In the same way loyalty to the family flourishes at the expense of tribal loyalty and weakens it. National fanaticism is essential to the nation but at the same time it is a threat to humanity.

The nation in the world community is similar to the family in the tribe. The more the families of one tribe quarrel and become fanatic, the more the tribe is threatened. Equally if the members of one family quarrel and each of them seeks only his personal interests, the family is threatened, and if the tribes of a nation quarrel and seek their own interests, that nation is threatened. National fanaticism, the use of national force against weak nations, or the national progress which is the outcome

of plundering from other nations, are evil and harmful to humanity. However, the powerful individual who respects himself and is aware of his own responsibilities is important and useful to the family, just as a strong respectable family, which is aware of its importance, is socially and materially useful to the tribe. Equally useful to the whole world is the progressive, productive and civilized nation. The national political structure is damaged when it descends to the lower social level, namely the family and tribe, and attempts to act in their manner and to adopt their views.

The nation is a large family which has passed through the stage of the tribe and also through the ramifications of the tribes that have branched out of one origin; it includes as well those members who affiliated themselves with its destiny. The family, likewise, grows into a nation only after passing through the stages of the tribe and its ramifications, as well as through the stage of affiliation which comes about as a result of various types of a social mixture. Inevitably

this is achieved over long periods of time. Although the passage of time creates nations, it also helps to fragment old ones. However, the common origin and shared destiny through affiliation are two historic bases for any nation, though origin ranks first and affiliation second. A nation is not defined only by origin, even though origin is its basis and beginning. In addition to that a nation is formed by human accumulations through the course of history which induce a group of people to live in one area of land, make a common history, form one heritage and face the same destiny. Finally, the nation, regardless of blood bond, is the sense of belonging and a common destiny.

But why has the map of the earth witnessed great nations that disappeared to be replaced by other nations and vice versa? Is the reason political only, without any relationship to the social aspect of the Third Universal Theory? Or is it social and properly the concern of this part of the *Green Book*? Let us see: The family is indisputably a social structure, rather

than political. The same applies to the tribe because it is a family which has reproduced, procreated and become many families. Equally the nation is a tribe, after it has grown and its branches have multiplied and become transformed into clans, then into tribes.

The nation is also a social structure whose bond is nationalism, the tribe is a social structure whose bond is tribalism, the family is a social structure whose bond is family ties; and the nations of the world are social structures whose bond is humanity. These are self evident facts. Then there is the political structure of states which form the political map of the world. But why does the map of the world keep changing from one age to another? The reason is that the political structure may, or may not, be consistent with the social structure. When it is consistent in a nation, it lasts and does not change. If the change is forced by external colonialism or internal collapse, it reappears under the emblem of national struggle, national revival or national unity. When the political

structure embraces more than one nation, its map will be torn up by each nation gaining independence under the emblem of nationalism. Thus, the maps of the empires, which the world has witnessed, have been torn up because they were made up of a number of nations. When every nation clings fanatically to its nationalism and seeks independence, the political empire is torn up and its components go back to their social origins. The evidence is crystal clear in the history of the world if we review all its ages.

But why were those empires made up of different nations? The answer is that the state is not only a social structure like the family, the tribe and the nation, but rather a political entity created by several factors, the simplest and foremost of which is nationalism. The national state is the only political form which is consistent with the natural social structure. Its existence lasts, unless it becomes subject to the tyranny of another stronger nationalism, or unless its political structure, as a state, is affected by its social

structure in the form of tribes, clans and families. It is damaging to the political structure if it is subjected to the family, tribal, or sectarian social structure and adopts its characteristics.

However, religious, economic and military factors also contribute to form a state which differs from the simple state, the national state.

A common religion, the requirements of economics or military conquests may constitute a state embracing several nationalisms. Thus, in one age the world witnesses a state or an empire which it sees disappear in another age. When the spirit of nationalism emerges stronger than the religious spirit and conflict flares up between different nationalisms which were brought together, for example, by one religion, each nation becomes independent and recovers its social structure. That empire, then, disappears. The role of religion reappears when the religious spirit emerges stronger than the spirit of nationalism. Consequently the various nationalisms are unified under the banner of religion

until the national role appears once again and so on.

All the states which are composed of several nationalisms for various reasons — whether of religious, economics, military power or of man-made ideologies — will be torn up by the national conflict until each nationalism is independent, i.e. the social factor will inevitably triumph over the political factor.

Therefore, despite political factors which necessitate the establishment of the state, the basis for the life of individuals is the family, the tribe, then the nation, extending eventually to all humanity. The essential factor is the social factor. It is the permanent factor, namely nationalism. Stress should be laid on social reality and family care in order to bring up the integrated well-educated man. Care should then be given to the tribe as a social 'umbrella' and natural social school which brings up man at the post-family stage. Then comes the nation. The individual learns social values only from the family and the tribe which form a natural social struc-

ture engineered by no particular individual. Taking care of the family is for the sake of the individual just as the care of the tribe is in the interest of the family, the individual and the nation, i.e. nationalism. The social factor, namely the national factor, is the genuine and permanent driving force of history.

To disregard the national bond of human groups and to establish a political system contradictory to social reality sets up a temporary structure which will be destroyed by the movement of the social factor of those groups, i.e. the national movement of each nation.

All these realities are innate in the life of man and are not rational conjunctures. Every individual in the world should be aware of these realities and work accordingly, so that his action may be worthwhile. It is necessary to know these proven realities in order to avoid deviation, disorder and damage in the life of human groups which are the result of a lack of understanding and respect for these principles of human life.

WOMAN

It is an undisputed fact that both man and woman are human beings. It follows as a self-evident fact that woman and man are equal as human beings. Discrimination between man and woman is a flagrant act of oppression without any justification. For woman eats and drinks as man eats and drinks . . . Woman loves and hates as man loves and hates . . . Woman thinks, learns and understands as man thinks, learns and understands . . . Woman, like man, needs shelter, clothing and vehicles . . . Woman feels hunger and thirst as man feels hunger and thirst . . . Woman lives and dies as man lives and dies.

But why are there man and woman? Indeed, human society is composed neither of man alone nor of woman alone. It is made up naturally of man and woman. Why were not only men created? Why were not only women created? After all, what is the difference between man and woman? Why was it necessary to create man and

woman? There must be a natural necessity for the existence of man and woman, rather than man only or woman only. It follows that neither of them is exactly the other, and the fact that a natural difference exists between man and woman is proved by the created existence of man and woman. This means, as a matter of fact, that there is a role for each one of them, matching the difference between them. Accordingly, there must be different prevailing conditions for each one to live and perform their naturally different roles. To comprehend this role, we must understand the differences in the nature of man and woman, namely the natural differences between them:

Woman is a female and man is a male. According to a gynaecologist, woman menstruates or suffers feebleness every month, while man, being a male, does not menstruate and he is not subject to the monthly period which is a bleeding. A woman, being a female, is naturally subject to monthly bleeding. When a woman does not menstruate, she is pregnant. If she is

pregnant she becomes, due to pregnancy, feeble for about a year, which means that all her natural activities are seriously reduced until she delivers her baby. When she delivers her baby or has had a miscarriage, she suffers puerperium, a feebleness attendant on delivery or miscarriage. As the man does not get pregnant, he is not liable to the feebleness which woman, being a female, suffers. Afterwards woman breast-feeds the baby she bore. Breast-feeding continues for about two years. Breast-feeding means that a woman is so inseparable from her baby that her activity is seriously reduced. She becomes directly responsible for another person whom she helps to carry out his biological functions, without which it would die. The man, on the other hand, neither conceives nor breast-feeds.

All these innate characteristics form differences because of which man and woman cannot be equal. These, in themselves, are the realities that necessitate the distinction between male and female, i.e. man and woman; they assign to each of them a different

role or function in life. This means that man cannot replace woman in carrying out these functions. It is worthy of consideration that these biological functions are a heavy burden, causing woman great effort and suffering. However, without these functions which woman performs, human life would come to an end. It follows that it is a natural function which is neither voluntary nor compulsory. It is an essential function, whose sole alternative is that human life would come to a complete standstill.

There is a deliberate intervention against conception which is the alternative to human life. In addition to that there is a partial deliberate intervention against conception, as well as against breast-feeding. All these are links in a chain of actions against natural life, culminating in murder, i.e. for a woman to kill herself in order not to conceive, deliver and breast-feed, is within the realm of deliberate interventions against the nature of life embodied in conception, breast-feeding, maternity and marriage, though they differ only in degree.

To dispense with the natural role of woman in maternity — i.e. nurseries replacing mothers — is a start in dispensing with the human society and transforming it into a biological society with an artificial way of life. To separate children from their mothers and to cram them into nurseries is a process by which they are transformed into something very close to chicks, for nurseries are similar to poultry farms in which chicks are crammed after they are hatched. Nothing else would be appropriate for man's nature, and would suit his dignity, except natural motherhood, (i.e. the child is raised by his mother . . .) *in a family where the true principles of motherhood, fatherhood and brotherhood prevail*, rather than in a centre similar to a poultry breeding farm. Poultry, like the rest of the members of the animal kingdom, needs motherhood as a natural phase. Therefore, breeding them on farms similar to nurseries is against their natural growth. Even their meat is closer to synthetic meat than natural meat. Meat from mechanized poultry farms is not tasty and may not be

nourishing because the chicks are not naturally bred, i.e. they are not raised in the protective shade of natural motherhood. The meat of wild birds is more tasty and nourishing because they grow naturally and are naturally fed. As for children who have neither family nor shelter, society is their guardian, only for them should society establish nurseries and the like. It is better for those to be taken care of by society rather than by individuals who are not their parents.

If a test were carried out to discover the natural propensity of the child towards his mother and the nursery, the child would opt for his mother and not the nursery. Since the natural tendency of a child is towards his mother, she is the natural and proper person to give the child the protection of nursing. Sending a child to a nursery in place of his mother is coercion and oppression against its free natural propensity.

The natural growth for all living things is free sound growth. To substitute a nursery for a mother is coercive action against free sound growth. Children who are driven to a nursery are

driven compulsorily or by exploitation and simple-mindedness. They are driven to nurseries purely by materialistic and not social considerations. If coercion and childish simple-mindedness were removed, they would certainly reject the nursery and cling to their mother. The only justification for such an unnatural and inhuman process is the fact that the woman is in a position unsuitable to her nature, i.e. she is compelled to perform duties which are unsocial and anti-motherhood.

The woman, whose nature has assigned to her a natural role different from that of man, must be in an appropriate position to perform her natural role.

Motherhood is the female's function, not the male's. Consequently, it is unnatural to separate children from their mother. Any attempt to take children away from their mother is coercion, oppression and dictatorship. The mother who abandons her maternity contradicts her natural role in life. She must be provided with her rights and conditions which are appropriate,

non-coercive and unoppressive. Thus she can carry out her natural role under natural conditions. Anything else is a self-contradictory situation. If the woman is forced to abandon her natural role as regards conception and maternity, she falls victim to coercion and dictatorship. A woman who needs work that renders her unable to perform her natural function is not free and is compelled to do that by need, **for in need freedom is latent.**

Among suitable and even essential conditions which enable the woman to perform her natural role, which differs from that of man, are those very conditions which are proper to a human being who is sick and burdened with pregnancy, i.e. bearing another human being in her womb, which renders her physically incapacitated. It is unjust to place such a woman in this stage of maternity into circumstances of physical work incompatible with her condition. Such work is a punishment of woman for her betrayal of maternity and of mankind. It is also a tax she pays for entering the realm of men who are not, of course, of her sex.

The belief, including the woman's own belief, that the woman carries out physical labour of her own accord, is not, in fact, true. For she performs the physical work only because the harsh materialistic society has placed her, without her being directly aware, in coercive circumstances. She has no alternative but to submit to the conditions of that society while she thinks that she works of her own accord. However, the rule that 'there is no difference between man and woman in every thing' deprives her of her freedom.

The phrase 'in every thing' is a monstrous deception of woman. This idea will destroy the appropriate and necessary conditions which constitute the privilege which woman ought to enjoy apart from man in accordance with her nature on which a natural role in life is based.

To demand equality between man and woman in carrying heavy weights while the woman is pregnant is unjust and cruel. To demand equality between them in fasting and hardship, while she is breast-feeding, is unjust

and cruel. To demand equality between them in any dirty work, which stains her beauty and detracts from her femininity, is unjust and cruel. Education that leads to work unsuitable for her nature is unjust and cruel as well.

There is no difference between man and woman in all that concerns humanity. None of them can marry the other against his or her will, or divorce without a just trial. Neither the woman nor the man can remarry without a previous agreement on divorce. The woman is the owner of the house because it is one of the suitable and necessary conditions for a woman who menstruates, conceives, and cares for her children. The woman is the owner of the maternity shelter, which is the house. Even in the animal world, which differs in many ways from that of man, and where maternity is also a duty according to nature, it is coercion to deprive the young of their mother or deprive the female of her shelter.

A woman is but a female. Being female means that she has a biological nature different from that of man. The

female's biological nature differing, as it does, from that of the male, has imparted to a woman characteristics different from those of a man in form and essence. A woman's anatomy is different from that of a man just as the female in plants and animals are different from the male. This is a natural and incontrovertible fact. In the animal and plant kingdoms the male is naturally created strong and tough, while the female is created beautiful and gentle. These are natural and eternal characteristics innate in these living creatures, whether called human beings, animals or plants.

In view of his different nature and in line with the laws of nature, the male has played the role of the strong and tough without compulsion but simply because he is created in that way. The female has played the role of the beautiful and the gentle, not because she wanted to, but because she is created so. This natural rule is just, partly because it is natural, and partly because it is the basic rule for freedom. For all living creatures are created free and any interference with

that freedom is coercion. Non-commitment to these natural roles and a lack of concern towards their roles amount to an act of negligence and destruction of the values of life itself. Nature has thus been designed in harmony with the inevitability of life from what is being to what will become. The living creature is a being who inevitably lives until he is dead. Existence between the beginning and the end is based on a natural law, without choice or compulsion. It is natural. It is natural freedom.

In the animal, plant and human kingdoms there must be a male and a female for life to occur from its beginning to its end. They do not only exist but they have to play, with absolute efficiency, the natural role for which they have been created. If their role is not efficiently performed there must be some defect in the course of life caused by certain circumstances. This is the case of societies nowadays almost everywhere in the world as a result of confusing the roles of man and woman, i.e. as a result of endeavours to transform a woman into a man. In

harmony with their nature and its purpose they must be creative within their respective roles. For the opposite is retrogressive. It is a trend against nature, which is as destructive to the rule of freedom, as it is hostile to both life and survival. Men and women must perform, not abandon the role for which they are created. Abandoning the role or even a part of it only occurs as a result of coercive conditions, i.e. under abnormal conditions. The woman who rejects pregnancy, marriage, make up and femininity for reasons of health, abandons her natural role in life under these coercive conditions of health. The woman who rejects marriage, pregnancy or motherhood etc., because of work, abandons her natural role under the same coercive conditions. The woman who rejects marriage, pregnancy or maternity etc., without any concrete cause, abandons her natural role as a result of a coercive condition which is a moral deviation from the norm. Thus, abandoning the natural role of female and male in life can only occur under unnatural conditions which are con-

trary to nature and a threat to survival. Consequently, there must be a world revolution which puts an end to all materialistic conditions hindering woman from performing her natural role in life and driving her to carry out man's duties in order to be equal in rights. Such a revolution will inevitably take place, particularly in the industrial societies, as a response by the instinct of survival, even without any instigator of revolution such as the *Green Book*.

All societies nowadays look upon woman as no more than an article of merchandise. The East regards her as a commodity for buying and selling, while the West does not recognise her femininity.

Driving woman to do man's work is unjust aggression against the femininity with which she is naturally provided for a natural purpose essential to life. For man's work disguises the woman's beautiful features which are created for female roles. They are exactly like blossoms which are created to attract pollen and to produce seeds. If we did away with the blos-

soms, the role of plants in life would come to an end. It is the natural embellishment in butterflies and birds as well as the rest of animal females which is created for that natural vital goal. If a woman carries out man's work, she will be transformed into a man abandoning her role and her beauty. A woman has full rights to live without being forced to change into a man and to give up her femininity.

The physical structure, which is naturally different between man and woman, leads to differences in the functions of their different organs which lead in turn to differences in the psyche, mood, nerves and physical appearance. A woman is tender. A woman is pretty. A woman weeps easily. A woman is easily frightened. In general woman is gentle and man is tough by virtue of their inbred nature.

To ignore natural differences between man and woman and mix their roles is an absolutely uncivilized attitude, hostile to the laws of nature, destructive to human life, and a genuine cause for the wretchedness of human social life.

Modern industrial societies, which have made woman adapt to the same physical work as man at the expense of her femininity and her natural role in terms of beauty, maternity and peace of mind — those societies are uncivilized. They are materialistic, uncivilized societies. It is as stupid as it is dangerous to civilization and humanity to copy them.

The question, then, is not whether the woman works or does not work. For it is a ridiculous materialistic presentation. Work should be provided by the society to all able members — men and women — who need work, but on condition that each individual should work in the field that suits him, and not be forced to carry out unsuitable work.

For the children to find themselves under adult working conditions is injustice and dictatorship. Equally it is injustice and dictatorship for woman to find herself under the working conditions of man.

Freedom means that every human being gets that education which qualifies him for work which is appropriate to him. Dictatorship means that a

human being learns what is not suitable for him. That leads him to work which is not suitable for him. Work which is appropriate to man is not always appropriate to woman, and the knowledge that is proper for the child is not suitable for the adult.

There is no difference in human rights between man and woman, the child and the adult. But there is no absolute equality between them as regards their duties.

MINORITIES

What is a minority? What are its pros and cons? How can the problem of minorities be solved in accordance with the solution presented by the *Third Universal Theory* to various human problems?

There are only two types of minorities. One of them belongs to a nation which provides it with a social framework, while the other has no nation and forms its own social framework. The latter is the one that forms one of the historic accumulations which eventually constitute a nation by virtue of a sense of belonging and a common destiny.

It is clear now that such a minority has its own social rights. Any encroachment on these rights by any majority is an act of injustice. The social characteristic is personal and is not to be given or taken away. Its political and economic problems can only be solved by the masses in whose hands power, wealth and arms should

be placed. Viewing the minority as a political and economic minority is dictatorship and injustice.

THE BLACKS

THE BLACKS WILL PREVAIL IN THE WORLD

The latest age of slavery is the white race's enslavement of the black race. The black man will not forget this until he has achieved rehabilitation.

This tragic and historic event, the resulting bitter feeling, and the search for satisfaction derived from rehabilitating a whole race, constitute a psychological motivation in the movement of the black race to vengeance and domination, which cannot be disregarded. Added to that is the inevitability of the social historical cycles including the yellow race's domination of the world when it marched from Asia against the rest of the continents. Then came the role of the white race, when it carried out a wide-ranging colonialist movement covering all the continents of the world. Now comes the black race's turn to prevail.

The black race is now in a very backward social situation. But such

backwardness helps to bring about numerical superiority of the blacks because their low standard of living has protected them from getting to know the means and ways of birth control and family planning. Also their backward social traditions are a reason why there is no limit to marriage, leading to their unlimited growth, while the population of other races has decreased because of birth control, restrictions on marriage and continuous occupation in work, unlike the blacks who are sluggish in a climate which is always hot.

EDUCATION

Education, or learning, is not necessarily that methodized curriculum and those classified subjects in text books which youth are forced to learn during specified hours while sitting on rows of desks. This type of education, now prevailing all over the world, is against human freedom. Compulsory education, of which countries of the world boast whenever they are able to force it on their youth, is one of the methods which suppresses freedom. It is a compulsory obliteration of a human being's talents as well as a forcible direction of a human being's choices. It is an act of dictatorship damaging to freedom because it deprives man of free choice, creativity and brilliance. To force a human being to learn according to a set curriculum is a dictatorial act. To impose certain subjects upon people is a dictatorial act.

Compulsory and methodized education is in fact a forced stultification of the masses. All countries which set courses of education in terms of formal

curricula and force pupils to learn them, coerce their citizens. All methods of education prevailing in the world should be done away with through a worldwide cultural revolution to emancipate man's mind from curricula of fanaticism and from the process of deliberate adaptation of man's taste, his ability to form concepts and his mentality.

This does not mean that schools are to be closed and that people should turn their backs on education, as it may seem to superficial readers. On the contrary, it means that society should provide all types of education, giving people the chance to choose freely any subjects they wish to learn. This requires a sufficient number of schools for all types of education. Insufficient schools restrict man's freedom of choice forcing him to learn the subjects available, while depriving him of natural right of choice because of the lack of availability of other subjects. Societies which ban and monopolize knowledge are reactionary societies biased towards ignorance and hostile to freedom. Thus societies which pro-

hibit the teaching of religion as it actually is, are reactionary societies, biased towards ignorance and hostile to freedom. Societies which monopolize religious education are reactionary societies; biased towards ignorance and hostile to freedom. Equally reactionary and biased towards ignorance and hostile to freedom are the societies which distort the religions, civilizations and behaviour of others in the process of teaching those subjects. Societies which consider materialistic knowledge as taboo are reactionary societies biased towards ignorance and hostile to freedom. Knowledge is a natural right of every human being which nobody has the right to deprive him of under any pretext except in a case where a person himself does something which deprives him of that right.

Ignorance will come to an end when everything is presented as it actually is and when knowledge about everything is available to each person in the manner that suits him.

MELODIES AND ARTS

Man is still backward because he is unable to speak one common language. Until he attains this human aspiration, which seems impossible, the expression of joy and sorrow, what is good and bad, beauty and ugliness, comfort and misery, mortality and eternity, love and hatred, the description of colours, sentiments, tastes and moods — all will be according to the language each people speaks automatically. Behaviour itself will remain based on the reaction produced by the feeling the language creates in the speaker's mind.

Learning one language, whatever it may be, is not the solution for the time being. It is a problem that will inevitably remain without solution until the process of the unification of languages has passed through various generations and epochs, provided that the hereditary factor comes to an end in those generations through the passage of enough time. For the sentiment, taste and mood of the forefathers and

fathers form those of sons and grandsons. If those forefathers spoke various languages and the grandsons speak one language, the grandsons will not necessarily share a common taste by virtue of speaking one language. Such a common taste can only be achieved when the new language imparts the taste and the sense which are transmitted by inheritance from one generation to another.

If a group of people wear white clothes in mourning and another group put on black ones, the sentiment of each group will be adjusted according to these two colours, i.e. one group hates the black colour while the other one likes it, and vice versa. Such a sentiment leaves its physical effect on the cells as well as on the genes in the body. This adaptation will be transmitted by inheritance. The inheritor automatically hates the colour hated by the legator as a result of inheriting the sentiment of his legator. Consequently, people are only harmonious with their own arts and heritages. They are not harmonious with the arts of others because of heredity, even though those

people, who differ in heritage, speak one common language.

Such a difference emerges between the groups of one people even if it is on a small scale.

To learn one language is not a problem and to understand others' arts as a result of learning their language is also not a problem. The problem is the impossibility of a real intuitional adaptation to the language of others.

This will remain impossible until the effect of heredity, which is transmitted in the human body, comes to an end.

Mankind is really still backward because man does not speak with his brother one common language which is inherited and not learned. However, it is only a matter of time for mankind to achieve that goal unless civilization should relapse.

SPORT, HORSEMANSHIP AND SHOWS

Sport is either private, like the prayer which man performs alone by himself even inside a closed room, or public, practised collectively in open places, like the prayer which is practised collectively in places of worship. The first type of sport concerns the individual himself, while the second type is of concern to all people. It must be practised by all people and should not be left to anybody to practise on their behalf. It is unreasonable for crowds to enter places of worship just to view a person or a group of people praying without taking part. It is equally unreasonable for crowds to enter playgrounds and arenas to watch a player or a team without participating themselves.

Sport is like praying, eating, and the feeling of warmth and coolness. It is stupid for crowds to enter a restaurant just to look at a person or a group of

persons eating; it is stupid for people to let a person or a group of persons get warmed or enjoy ventilation on their behalf. It is equally illogical for the society to allow an individual or a team to monopolize sports while the people as a whole pay the costs of such a monopoly for the benefit of one person or a team. In the same way people should not democratically allow an individual or a group, whether party, class, sect, tribe or parliament, to replace them in deciding their destiny and in defining their needs.

Private sport is of concern only to those who practise it on their own and at their own expense. Public sport is a public need and the people should not be represented in its practice either physically or democratically. Physically, the representative cannot transmit to others how his body and morale benefited from sport. Democratically, no individual or team has the right to monopolize sport, power, wealth or arms for themselves. Sporting clubs are the basic organizational means of traditional sport in the world today. They get hold of all expenditures and

public facilities allocated to sport in every state. These institutions are only social monopolistic instruments like all dictatorial political instruments which monopolize authority, economic instruments which monopolize wealth, and traditional military instruments which monopolize arms. As the era of the masses does away with the instruments monopolizing power, wealth and arms, it will, inevitably, destroy the monopoly of social activity such as sports, horsemanship and so forth. The masses who queue to vote for a candidate to represent them in deciding their destiny act on the impossible assumption that he will represent them and embody, on their behalf, their dignity, sovereignty and point of view. However those masses, who are robbed of their will and dignity, are reduced to mere spectators, watching another person performing what they should, naturally, be doing themselves.

The same holds true of the crowds which fail to practise sport by themselves and for themselves because of their ignorance. They are fooled by

monopolistic instruments which endeavour to stupefy them and divert them to indulging in laughter and applause instead. Sport, as a social activity, must be for the masses, just as power, wealth and arms should be in the hands of the people.

Public sport is for all the masses. It is a right of all the people for its health and recreational benefits. It is mere stupidity to leave its benefits to certain individuals and teams who monopolize them while the masses provide the facilities and pay the expenses for the establishment of public sports. The thousands who crowd stadiums to view, applaud and laugh are those foolish people who have failed to carry out the activity themselves. They line up on the shelves of the sports grounds, practising lethargy, and applauding those heroes who wrest from them the initiative, dominate the field and control the sport, exploiting the facilities the masses provide. Originally, the public grandstands were designed to demarcate the masses from the playing fields and grounds, i.e. to prevent the masses from having access to the

playing fields. When the masses march and play sport in the centre of the playing fields and the open spaces, stadiums will be vacated and destroyed. That will take place when the masses become aware of the fact that sport is a public activity which must be practised rather than watched. The opposite, which would be a helpless apathetic minority that watch, would be more reasonable.

The grandstand will disappear when no one is there to occupy it. Those who are unable to perform the roles of heroism in life, who are ignorant of the events of history, who fall short of envisaging the future and who are not serious enough in their lives, are the trivial persons who fill the seats of the theatres and cinemas to watch the events of life and to learn their course. They are like pupils who occupy school desks because they are not only uneducated but also illiterate.

Those who direct the course of life for themselves do not need to watch it working through actors on the stage or in the cinemas. Likewise, horsemen who hold the reins of their horses have

no seat in the grandstands at the race course. If every person has a horse, no one will be there to watch and applaud. The sitting spectators are only those who are too helpless to perform this kind of activity because they are not horsemen.

Equally, the bedouin peoples show no interest in theatres and shows because they are very serious and hard working. As they have created a serious life, they ridicule acting. Bedouin societies also do not watch performers, but perform games and take part in joyful ceremonies because they naturally recognize the need for these activities and practise them automatically.

Different types of boxing and wrestling are evidence that mankind has not got rid of all savage behaviour. Inevitably they will come to an end when man ascends the ladder of civilization. Human sacrifice and pistol duels were familiar practices in different stages of human evolution. However, those savage practices came to an end years ago. Man now laughs at himself and regrets such acts. That will be the fate

of boxing and wrestling after tens or hundreds of years. However, the more the people are civilized and sophisticated, the more they are able to ward off both the performance and the encouragement of these practices.

The thinker Muammar Qathafi does not present his thought for simple amusement or pleasure. Nor is it for those who regard ideas as puzzles for the entertainment of empty-minded people standing on the margin of life.

Qathafi's ideas interpret life as it erupts from the heart of the tormented, the oppressed, the deprived and the grief-stricken. It flows from the ever-developing and conflicting reality in search of whatever is best and most beautiful.

Part One of *The Green Book* heralded the start of the era of the Jamahiriya (state of the masses). Part Two inaugurated an international economic revolution which does away with the old economic structures and brings them down on the heads of the exploiters.

Part Three of *The Green Book* launches the social revolution. It presents the genuine interpretation of history, the solution of man's struggle in life and the unsolved problem of man and woman. Equally it tackles the problem of the minorities and the blacks in order to lay down the sound principles of social life for all mankind.

The living philosophy is inseparable from life itself and erupts from its essence. It is the philosophy of Muammar Qathafi.

The publisher