

# THE WRITING ON THE WALL

The ramifications of dismantling the  
United States after WW2

Is the World in the Midst  
of a Social Revolution?

Salim Maloof, Ph.D.

Copyright 2021 by Salim Maloof

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise without permission of the author

No commercial use could be made of this book and no part thereof should be translated into any language. This book should not be circulated in any binding form by anyone, including an acquirer.

Suggested Citation:

Maloof S., *Is the World in the Midst of a Social Revolution*, 2021

This is a work of non-fiction.

Salim Maloof  
IS THE WORLD IN THE MIDST OF A SCIAL REVOLUTION?  
The Writing on the Wall

For more information on reproducing section of this book or sales of this book,  
go to:  
Center for Modernity Planning and Assessment  
[www.centermpa.com](http://www.centermpa.com)

In memory of my beloved parents  
with special dedication to my late uncle Nehme Maloof

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

Motive that propelled the author to prepare this work  
Special Note to All UN Member States  
Special Note to All Staff Members of the United Nations  
Special Note to All People of Faith  
Special Note to All Readers  
Special Note to the People of Lebanon and People of Egypt  
Special Note on the meaning of the term “United States”  
Definitions

## PREFACE

PART ONE: In the Eye of the Storm: Correlation Breakdown

1. In the Eye of the Storm
2. The United States: A healthy social culture
3. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights: the end of the line
4. The rise of Individualism
5. Making changes in an ever changing world
6. Importance of doing things right to minimize threats
7. The future of the idea of freedom unknown
8. Could the world be in the midst of a global counterculture?
9. Price to avoid a zero net sum game
10. Conviction and courage are two innate ferocious abilities

PART TWO: Political Correlation Breakdown

11. Good pollination versus bad pollination
12. Unconventional approach to maximize happiness and well-being
13. Odd idiosyncratic behavior of man
14. Man’s eccentric habits not compatible with societal norms

### PART THREE: A wandering World

15. Importance of fear and faithfulness for the success of any movement
16. Danger of trapping the idea of freedom in a mangle
17. Are people living in an Age of ignorance?
18. Are people chasing after wind?
19. Are humans wandering as Moses and his people were doing in antiquity?
20. What can Moses's decision to listen to the advice of his father in law teach us
21. Is the international rule based postwar order a philosophy that constantly course-correct itself?
22. The threats that are weakening the idea of Freedom

### PART FOUR: The Dismantling of the World Political Order

23. The political security problem

### PART FIVE: The Character Assassination of the United States

24. A look into how human imagination is threatening the idea of Freedom
25. The mind and Newton's 2nd Law of Motion
26. The Character Assassination of the United States

### PART SIX: Is the World in the Midst of a Social Revolution?

27. Can mankind limit the abomination and desolation that the victors of WW2 compelled worldwide?
28. Did people stop to write the same history together
29. Is the world engulfed in a class conflict?
30. The threats Challenging the Anglosphere
31. A man reaps what he sows

# **Motive that propelled the author to prepare this work**

In 2013, a US national was working for UNOPS (a subsidiary organization of the general international intergovernmental organization named United Nations) in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC). He expressed reservation against UNOPS approving a project in the DRC which UNOPS negotiated directly with the Prime Minister.

The government of the Democratic of the Congo was going to finance the general organization named United Nations (UNOPS) to implement on its behalf a project worth \$25 million. After the money of the government of the Democratic Republic of the Congo gets deposited in the UN bank account, the United Nations would withdraw its administrative fee, then the United Nations would use its procurement rulers to justify waving open competition, and recruit a line ministry within the government of the Democratic Republic of the Congo to implement the same project back (redeposit the money back in the bank account of the DRC government minus the UN fee). The DRC government does not have to justify in its own financial books how this money was spent, because it was converted into a non-audit item. Afterwards, the government line ministry who received the money becomes accountable to the United Nations. And since each UN agency run its own legal and auditing house, it is easy to fix the paper works to make everything become legally clean. The project involved opening 2000kms of roads with bridges and culverts in 2 years in the eastern Congo (a war zone area).

When the US national signaled the presence of irregularities on this project to his supervisors, he was told by his supervisors that the organization was going to review and take action. Then his supervisors gave him two choices: wait until his contract expires to go home, or accept to temporarily relocate to Sudan. He was also told by his supervisor(s) that if in Sudan he succeeds in growing the Sudan Office, the organization would help him to achieve his career goal of becoming a UN Resident Coordinator. UNOPS signed the project with the government of the DRC as negotiated after his departure to Sudan.

However, few months later, the project was cancelled, and the United Nations returned the money back to the government.

In Sudan, the US national committed the same mistake he did in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. This mistake was prioritizing the work program of the founding fathers of the UN over his self-interests. He objected the decision of the Department for International Development (Dfid) [now called Foreign Commonwealth & Development Office] of the British government to finance a project in Darfur worth 10 Million Euro, and in which Dfid (the British government) wanted to bluntly violate the UN financial rules and regulations.

To avoid the financial loss that the United Nations (UNOPS) was going to incur in terms of administrative fee after Dfid (the British) made it clear that it was not going to finance this project unless the conditions it was asking for are met, the supervisors of this US national placed him on administrative leave in 2015 to investigate a claim that they said was launched against him by one of his staffs.

While on administrative leave and before UNOPS telling this US national what were the charges leveled against him or by whom, his supervisors informed him that the organization was restructuring, and that it was not going to be using his services when his contract expires. However, in the same contract termination letter, the United Nations (UNOPS) invited this US national to apply to fill for the position he was temporarily filling in Sudan, which was downgraded. Next, the United Nations (UNOPS) administrators (i.e., his supervisors) sent the US national a letter informing him that the organization cancelled the investigation. The United Nations did not tell the US national what were the charges leveled against him, who filed a claim against him, interviewed him, or followed any of the UN rules and regulations in cases of misconduct while he was on administrative leave.

When the US national lost all hopes to make his supervisors reconsider, he filed an application in the United Nations courts seeking damages for libel and not for his termination. At the start of the legal proceeding, the UN judge asked the United Nations (UNOPS) to resolve this case with the US national outside the UN court. The United Nations (UNOPS)

made an offer to the US national which also included regulating outstanding issues related to his pensions, health insurance, including offering him a new two-years retainer contract.

The US national refused the offer of the United Nations (UNOPS), because it did not include assisting him to pursue his career goal of becoming a UN Resident Coordinator as was initially agreed. The court hearing proceeded. Surprisingly, the United Nations court system after hearing all the details of the case, dismissed the filed application in 2017. The reason for the dismissal was justified on the basis of a rule that require that any staff who rejects any decision taken by the United Nations to submit his objection within 60 days.

To put it differently, the United Nations court dismissed the application of the US national because he did not put into question within 60 days the decision of the organization named United Nations placing him on administrative leave, and waited until his supervisors inform him that they cancelled the investigation to question his rights, he was denied right to any claim! Said differently, the mistake this US national made was his decision to practice tolerance as the preamble of the UN Charter counsel, and not use his legal right to put into question why the organization named United Nations was placing him on administrative leave! That is to say that, had this US national exercised his legal rights (practiced intolerance), his chances to secure his rights would have been higher! In other words, the United Nations want people to stop being tolerant to have any right and want them to be intolerant!

The victors of WW2 granted the United Nations immunities. No UN staff and no person who the United Nations victimizes him [her] can have his [her] case heard in a civilian court. All cases are heard in UN courts. This US national can go nowhere to claim his right for as long as the victors of WW2 do not amend the UN charter!

Throughout history, the people with considerable power have been denying the weak right, and so, the way the intergovernmental organization named United Nations, and in particular, the judges of the UN courts handled this case is not new. What is new, though, is that this case confirms once again that the search for shared values through tasking a formal intergovernmental organization to play the custodian

of morality and human rights while its administrators are seeking to realize the full development of their personality at the same time is elusive. Throughout history, kings or kingdoms were reverted to simpler form when they allowed false teachers to manipulate institutions or whenever those false teachers did not get the outcome that they liked.

If everything is relative, the victors of WW2 should be aligned to face the same end that the US national had to yield to on the hands of the United Nations (organization) in the course of time and things. In other words, if the decision of the US national to prioritize the philosophical ideas that the victors of WW2 laid out at the end of this global war over his self-interests led to his reversal to a simpler form by the United Nations (organization), this then signify that this organization should be reverting the United States and the victors of WW2 to face the same end in the course of time and things.

The purpose of this work is to establish if the families/dynasties who control the United States (the custodian of the idea of freedom) and the families/dynasties who won WW2 (the custodian of the Anglosphere) could continue to transform the conditions and outcomes that matters to them while the administrators of the United Nations (organization) have converted this global council into a market to buy and sell that is not any different than the one Jesus found was taken place when he visited a temple. Alternatively, if those afore mentioned powerful families/dynasties should amend the UN charter thus granting any person who the general organization named United Nations victimized right to have his case be heard in civil courts, and in this way avoid that the United Nations (organization) continue to disintegrate their power until a new authority absorb them and start to build on top of their civilizing mission.

# Special Note to All UN Member States

This work is a treatise. It is an inquiry into the potential causes that triggered the apparent failure of UN member states to prevent conflicts, and to make future wars impossible after World War Two (WW2).

This work was not prepared to criticize the social order that ensued on the aftermath of WW2, or any government that came to power on the aftermath of this global war. This work is also not intended to provide any UN member states ideas on what its leaders, thinkers or its populace should be doing or not be doing to prevent conflicts, or to strengthen peace. Likewise, the purpose of this work is not to share a view on how to social engineer the world to give best results, nor it was prepared to suggest what leaders or nations should do or not do to maintain their strength and stability.

The victors of WW2 (the families/dynasties who control the international order or the money supply of the world) granted right to the international intergovernmental organization named United Nations (UN) to be an economic operator and to provide economic, political, social and cultural solutions in UN member states while UN employees are enjoying immunities and privileges.

This work was prepared for the sole purpose of understanding whether or not the international intergovernmental organization named United Nations could revert to a simpler form the victors of WW2 in the same way the Catholic Church managed to revert the rulers of the Roman Empire to one. The main aim is to understand whether or not the victors of WW2 would be able to continue to solidify their power while the staffs of the organization named United Nations are plundering, abusing their authority, denying people rights, and most importantly, violating the fundamental principles that this organization was created to help protect.

I am, therefore, trying to form an opinion on whether or not the families/dynasties who won WW2 could continue to maintain their strength and stability, while UN systems' are feeding part of their decision making process, or if the strategies that the UN systems' are determining and implementing on their behalf in UN member states

could result in their resizing. Specifically, I want to know if the heirs of the families/dynasties who won WW2 could consolidate their wealth, power, and status while the international intergovernmental organization named United Nations (along with international aid organizations, NGOs, charities, and all those who believe that they should dedicate themselves to the service of their neighbor are using their awareness to put into question how natural and legal rights should be distributed, instead of doing what the founding fathers of the UN suggested and that was to let governments provide parameters for every day behavior only. The implications of letting the intergovernmental organization named United Nations promote that it was going to end poverty and injustice in all its form by 2030 (or at any later date in the future), and most importantly, letting this authority be in charge of such dossier on the maintenance of the families/dynasties who won WW2 is also studied.

As the afore shows, this work was prepared for the sole benefit of the victors of WW2 (the families/dynasties who control the international order or the money supply of the world) and their heirs, and its content should not be interpreted to mean that it was prepared for the attention of any person, society, government, monarch or nation, or for the intention of criticizing anyone.

Furthermore, one should, while reading this book, bear in mind that the intentions of the author are not to discredit, appraise or criticize any UN member state. Nor the intentions of the author are to criticize the performance of any UN member state, regime, government, ideology, including who governments decide should live or die, or whether mankind should go back to adopt pre 1945 political dogmas or continue to strengthen democracy.

In addition, it is very important that readers keep in mind while reading this book that the reason why certain regimes, or certain countries are mentioned and others are not, has nothing to do with the intention of the author to criticize the referenced or analyzed countries. The only reason why certain countries (regimes) are mentioned and others are not is due to the author perceiving that the way the political, economic, social, and cultural culture of those mentioned countries captures better the issues and ideas that he (the author) wants to build his arguments upon.

The author goal is to show, as I said above, a view that could have a bearing on the reason for the failure of the victors of WW2 (the families/dynasties who control the international order or the money supply of the world) to prevent wars between nations including failure to make people surrender freedom to cooperate based on the work program that was specified in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. The main aim being to provide to those powerful families/dynasties (and not the nations who won WW2 or UN member states) constructive criticism that in the opinion of the author they should not ignore if they do not want the fate that happened to the rulers of the Roman Empire happens to them (i.e., their heirs).

The views expressed here are those of the author only, and should not be interpreted as those of any organization that the author was affiliated with before or today.

# Special Note to All Staff Members of the United Nations

An idea is not made of matter. Ideas are visualizations. However, an organization is a legal entity (an artificial person) that real humans operate.

All references to the word “*United Nations*” in this study could mean (i) the idea that the victor(s) of WW2 came up with during World War Two to “unite” existing nations to maintain collective peace and security; and (ii) the formal general intergovernmental international organization named United Nations (UN) who the different UN member states created on the aftermath of WW2, and tasked with coordinating the work included in the UN Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

This work is a treatise. In this present work, the author is trying to understand if the United Nations (as an idea and a class action) or the United Nations (as a legal entity or an organization) are threatening the capacity of the victors of WW2 (the families/dynasties who control the international order or the money supply of the world), and is preventing them from maintaining their strength and stability as Judaism, Christianity, Islam, Hinduism, and others did on the kings of the earth, the princes, the generals, the rich, the mighty, and everyone else, or not.

One should, while reading this book, bear in mind that the author recognize that many UN staffs are wholeheartedly working at the United Nations (herein the organization) to attain the goals specified in the UN Charter, and that their efforts have made lots of constructive contribution to deepen peace and security in the world. The progress the United Nations (herein the organization) made to contribute to human development are impressive. The purpose of the author is not to discredit the efforts or achievements of the UN staffs, and henceforth the results they achieved to secure the goals stipulated in the preamble of the UN Charter.

On the other hand, it is important that UN staffs also know that after the victors of WW2 (the families/dynasties who control the international

order or the money supply of the world) approved that the United Nations (the organization) become an economic operator, that its administrators are taking advantage of the idea of good to plunder, steal, launder money, accuse people erroneously, deny people rights, and most importantly, use the UN courts to destroy people's livelihood just as Ferdinand II, King of Aragon and his wife Queen Isabella I of Castile were doing in the late 15<sup>th</sup> century / early 16<sup>th</sup> century in western Europe. Those bad apples at the UN (supervisors) are not able to balance their interests against the interests of the common good, because they are not working in their roles to satisfy the best interests of society only but to deepen their own. The disregard and contempt that UN supervisors and UN judges are prompting could compel people to lose faith in this institution, thus deepening fear and want including justifying why we need to go back to cooperating based on pre 1945 political doctrines.

The purpose of this work is to understand if the victors of WW2 (the families/dynasties who control the international order or the money supply of the world) could prevent their collapse after they allowed the United Nations (herein the organization) to be operated in the same way people, on the outside of the UN fence, do.

# Special Note to All People of Faith

This work is a treatise. It is an inquiry into the continuous denial of man of the ideas that are included in the biblical scriptures (which are different than the question of whether God created the universe or not), and man's on-going search to explore new methods to improve connectedness, when in theory all the ideas that newborns are coming up with are nothing but a different way of saying what is in the religious scriptures already.

The present work is exploring the impact of man's ongoing conviction that it is possible to rely on the ideas prescribed in the religious scriptures, and at the same time, let human imagination convince human ingenuity that it could escape from the danger that the scriptures says would happen to the person who thinks that he or she is exempt from the appeal that such scriptures tax. Said differently, the work is exploring the impact of man formulating continuously work programs that prioritizes the idea of good, and then thinking that the idea of good could be used to solidify ones' own power without the person who is relying on such an idea having to enforce them on him (her) first.

Specifically, the work is looking into the impact of man's decision (i.e., human imagination) to diminish the role of religiosity as a tool to control behavior on the aftermath of World War 2 in order to let technology (machinery) do the lion share. In this regard, and if we are to consider that in theory there is no difference between having a machine deny a person right or if a real person does it (i.e., enforce the law); the author is trying to understand if the moral degradation that the world would be knowing consequent to man stopping to use human reason as a principal interlocutor to improve well-being, would help the families/dynasties who control the international order or the money supply of the world (i.e., the victors of World War 2) to maintain their strength and stability, or if it would revert them to a simpler form. In other words, the author is trying to understand if the decision of the victors of WW2 to undermine the values that are included in the religious scriptures, could help them to get their ways despite the resistance of others.

One should, while reading this book, bear in mind that the intention of the author is not to discredit or criticize any religion or faith, disprove

any faith, tell readers to have faith or not to have faith in a particular religion over another, or putting into question any fact presented in any religion or any religious book. Likewise, I am not trying to tell what the ideas or prophecies that are included in the biblical scripture should mean to you or in your particular faith and/or if you should believe in them or not. All the biblical references I picked or I analyzed were solely used, because I felt contain ideas that can aid me to comprehend better if the decision of the victors of World War 2 (i.e., the families/dynasties who control the international order or the money supply of the world) to act contrary to what those chosen scripture counsels is smart to help them maintain their strength and stability or not.

In publications in which the Prophet Muhammad (upon him be peace and blessings) is mentioned, Muslim writers follow his name by the phrase ‘upon him be peace and blessings.’ This phrase is not included in this work whenever the name of the Prophet Muhammad (upon him be peace and Blessings) is mentioned. Readers who adhere to Muslim faith should understand that it is assumed and that no disrespect is intended.

# Special Note to All Readers

All people are plugged in life (i.e., reality). After birth, all newborns find the world inhabited by existing people, and all the social space is either frozen by living or dead people. In other words, the social space is partitioned and different people declare proprietary ownership over the partitioned social or void space. Hence there is no free social space (including a sea or air space) today on earth that no person or no nation who does not claim right to it, we can say that no newborn is free today to dispose of any natural resource that exist in this prevailing space according to his own personal power and conscience. Furthermore, hence law and political order are not natural but human creations, and all the people depend on the idea of government to legitimize natural and legal rights, it is evident that the governments who amass the most wealth and who invest the most to develop militarily are the ones who wield the most power.

Furthermore, hence a government is a legal entity formed by a group of individuals to engage in leading and in protecting members from “each other,” and all the people whose wealth, status or power is vaster, must logically then wield the vastest power.

Moreover, because status or power need time under normal conditions to wield class (i.e., wealth), but class (wealth) can wield status or power in no time, we can then say that the people who possess class (wealth) possess more power than people who possess status (prestige, social honor, popular) or power, which they gain from engaging in social change or a government job.

In addition, since a person's class (i.e., economic position in a society), is based on birth and individual achievement, we can say that because humans delegate the wealth and the social space that they freeze hereditarily or to individuals who they themselves designate, this means that any individual or a legal entity that is capable to preserve its class the longest, this entity (family, dynasty, religion, race, organization, etc.) must be possessing the largest slice of power. To give an example, all people die but the idea of God lives forever. This means that the people (organizations, associations, etc.) who use the idea of God or religion as a tool to solidify their wealth, power, and status, must be the

most affluent among all the people, because they are able to change through the religious institutions that they build the history of the world as they please.

Moreover, because there are two ways that any entity (family, dynasty, religion, race, organization, etc.) can solidify its power: one of which is through the idea of good, and the other is through the idea of evil which people reject, this means that the families, dynasties, religions, race, organizations, etc. who promote itself as being a force for good, or as being a force for good but oppressed must be wielding power more than other families, dynasties, religions, race, organizations, etc. who just use their wealth to increase their domination.

Additionally, because the individuals or legal entities who promote themselves as a force for good cannot be promulgating that they are dedicating their life to serving all other living beings, and at the same time working on increasing their wealth, status, power, or happiness, this means that the only way to do it (serve their self-interests) is if they increase their power with limited involvement.

For example, the Protestant church could be the authority who provide the legitimacy of the British monarch. The British monarch is just a tool that enforces the spheres of the Protestant church. Likewise, the other way around could be the case. The British monarch could be the authority who provide protection to the Protestant church. The job of the protestant church is to provide the legitimacy of the British monarch. The two authorities could also be partners. Also, because the Protestant church or the British Monarch are not as old as the Christian church, Roman Empire, Greek Empire, or the Jewish Empire, there is a good chance that the world could still be controlled to this day by the religious institutions who survived from those four authorities especially that all four have been involved in politics and business to this day but under a different nomenclature.

This means that world affairs (be it politics or business) can be concentrated in the hands of specific power-houses (families/dynasties, institutions, organization, a club, an association, a religious faith, etc.) who keep limited involvement. This also means that the elected officials who administer governments may not be the ones who the buck stops

with them, but rather it is the families/dynasties who control the international order or the money supply of the world who take all ultimate decisions. In other words, elected officials (Kings, Presidents, Ministers, Parliament members, governors, etc.) play role exactly as law enforcement officer, judges, etc. do. For example, the people who work in law enforcement (government jobs) wield considerable power, but the buck does not stop with them on when to effectuate a reset of the political, economic and social order of the world.

That is also to say that it is highly likely that the United States, for example, is not the country who decide which country is to be engulfed in a civil war, and which country is to remain peaceful as some people think, but another group of men with much higher authority who do it. The global policemen of the world role that the United States is playing as of 1945 could only be a functional role that was delegated to this country to fulfil by the families/dynasties who control the international order or the money supply of the world (the real victors of WW2). The United States is just fronting for the group of men who regard themselves the deputy of God on earth.

This work was prepared for the sole attention of the group of men who regard themselves as the deputy of God on earth. They are the ones who all the nations and peoples of every language dreads and fears them, due to their power to spare or put to death any ruler or king, or promote or humble any ruler or king, as King Nebuchadnezzar greatness and splendor covered. [Daniel 5:18].

In this spirit, it is very important that readers note that all the families/dynasties, institutions, organization, clubs, associations, religious faith, etc., mentioned by name in this work are only used due to the relevance of their historicity and their relevance to permit me to draw conclusions or to move forward. In other words, it is not my intention to discredit those mentioned, institutions, organization, clubs, associations, nations, kingdoms, families/dynasties or the people of those nations, or the leaders of those nations past or present.

# Special Note to the People of Lebanon and People of Egypt

This work is a treatise. It is an inquiry into the cause of the failure of UN member states to prevent conflicts between nations and to make future wars impossible. This work was prepared for the sole attention of the victors of WW2 (the families/dynasties who control the international order or the money supply of the world). The goal of this work is to understand if the victors of WW2 could continue to play the deputy of God role, after they approved that the intergovernmental organization named United Nations (UN) become an economic operator who buys and sells as most people on the outside of the UN fence do.

Presently, the world is composed of 193 UN member states. This signify there is today 193 different political (and economic) systems whose architecture does not resemble the other. In principle, all the UN member states are supposed to be strengthening democracy and the rule of law using the liberal interventionism or the self-determination philosophy that was prescribed in the international rule based postwar world order that was laid out at the end of WW2, but no nation is doing it including the United States (the principal custodian of those two philosophies).

A pendulum is a weight suspended from a pivot so that it can swing freely. A political spectrum is a pendulum. A pendulum is like a compass. When the weight (the bob) is not in motion, this is called the rest position or the mean position. Let the international rule based postwar world order that was laid out at the end of WW2 to be the rest position or the mean position of the weight. Ideally, all the nations should have their political status either aligned with the mean position, or positioned on either side but not too far from it. The furthest position the weight oscillates in either direction from the mean position is called extreme. The goal is to avoid that the weight (the international order) oscillates toward the extreme position. When the international order tilt toward either extreme, this means that the power and status of the victors of WW2 (the custodians of the liberal interventionism or the self-determination philosophy) is weakening. Let one extreme refer to a

chaotic state (or a democratic state) and the other to a stable state (or repressive state).

After careful considerations, I picked the social order that exist in Lebanon to represent the chaotic/democratic state. In my opinion, Lebanon is chaotic, because it is the most democratic and free country that exist today. That is to say that any country whose political system is not polarized cannot be a democratic and its people cannot be free country! For example, the United States is polarized because it is a democratic country and its people are free. I picked Egypt for the second extreme, i.e., stable/repressive. Egypt was not my first choice for this extreme, because there are many “many” countries that its regimes are a lot more repressive, and by a big distance. For example, I consider the political system in the Scandinavian countries which the United Nations (the intergovernmental organization) classify as the most democratic since the UN started to make such surveys as the total opposite or the least democratic. That is to say, any country that its people cooperate using a hierarchical political system (constitutional or absolute monarchy) do not know what democracy is. In other words, the maturity that the Scandinavians show is not the outcome of democratic awareness, but the result of many years of repressiveness blended in wealth (i.e., the way horses are tamed). If the people in the Scandinavian countries were truly (naturally) democratic or free, the state of the political situation in those countries, would not be any different than the case that exist in Lebanon (chaotic), Egypt (no freedom of expression), the United States (partially chaotic), etc.,

However, I picked Egypt because the citizens of this country believed that they deserve to cooperate with one another based on the principle of equal rights (2011 Egyptian revolution), but instead of the families/dynasties who won WW2 (the owner of the international postwar world order) standing up with the people of Egypt to see that their wish gets honored as the international rule based postwar world order call for, they (the victors of WW2) decided to let the military complex return back to power. The way the victors of WW2 (the owner of the international postwar world order) handled the Egyptian up rise is not any different in complexity and contradiction than the way they have handled the annexation of Russia of Crimea in 2014. Those two afore mentioned events are two blunt violations of the international rule

based world order. If they remain uncorrected, this signify that the victors of WW2 could be building for destruction. This is because if those two events are not corrected, there is a good chance that mankind could be working toward building the political status that the Pharaoh erected, and not the one that the founding fathers of the UN suggested. We already know how the fate of the Pharaohs ended.

The goal from the idea of having nations come together on the aftermath to promote collective security on the aftermath of WW2 was not to replace the oppression of the French government in Lebanon with local chieftains who would convert this country into becoming a chaotic state, nor the idea was to replace the oppression of the British monarch in Egypt, with local chieftains who would rebuild the history of the Pharaoh. The goal was to have the Lebanese, the Egyptian, the French and the British cooperate in accordance with the work program stipulated in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights in order for all of them to develop, in the course of time and things, the understanding or happiness that the Americans managed to achieve by 1945.

It is very important that readers from Lebanon, Egypt, or any other country mentioned in this book to always keep in mind while reading this work, that it is not the intention of the author to discredit your countries, the people of those two countries, the past or present leaders, or the past or present politics adopted.

As I said before, the goal of this work is to understand if the victors of WW2 could prevent their collapse after they decided to deviate away from the work program that the founding fathers of the UN counselled them to remain faithful to its principle to solidify their power and ensure lasting peace (i.e., which was to let governments develop their own political status and their own solutions for as long as they respect democracy and the rule of law) in favor of letting the intergovernmental organization named United Nations along with human development organizations interfere in the social order, and to begin to teach people democracy, human rights, rule of law, while their staffs are pursuing the full realization of their personality (i.e., toppling the work of governments).

# **Special Note on the meaning of the term “United States”**

All references to the word “United States” in this book could mean (i) the United States as a philosophical idea as penned in the US constitution about how “all men having been created equal” by the founding fathers of this country which they named United States; and (ii) the territory located in North America, which is known as United States, and which its inhabitants depend on the idea “of all men having been created equal” to get their ways despite the resistance of others.

This idea that the founders of the United States penned about “all men having been created equal” is the final axiom in man’s ongoing search to enhance morality. Its power to help mankind to strengthen the idea of good was incomparable from 1776 to 1945. This idea enabled the American people to develop an understanding of themselves unprecedented in the history of the world.

Then again, it is not possible to know if this mindfulness to improve freedom that the American people are depending on to get their ways despite the resistance of others as of 1945 is motivated to deepen the idea of good in the world as their predecessors did, or to enable them to do exactly what the rest of the people around the world are to this day still doing, and that is to designate themselves as the deputy of God on earth, but while regarding themselves exempt from the appeal to obey the principles that are legitimized. This is because the people who are living in this country (the US) as of 1945 are new people, and the attitude that leaders and political class are showing does not resemble the one that the founding fathers of this country have shown. As of 1945, the leaders and political class are behaving in a manner that is not any different than the one the leaders and political class in all UN member states are depending on to solidify their power. The US leaders and political class are legitimizing their personal power and conscience instead of legitimizing the working program that the founding fathers of the UN specified in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and counselled them to obey.

Many reasons could be compelling the new people who are living in the United States to use force as of 1945 to get their ways despite the resistance of others, instead of using the Universal Declaration of Human Rights to achieve the same end. I do not believe that greed is precipitating the abnormal political choices that US leaders and political class are taking as of 1945. To the contrary, I believe that the American people are confronting the same circumstances that the native Americans underwent when those indigenous people were conquered by the European settlers.

To put it differently, when the European settlers conquered the Americas, they waged wars against the native Americans, removed them from their land, discriminated against them, and even tried to assimilate them by force. Today, the case of the native Americans (values, wealth, power, traditions, etc.) is not any different than the case of any endangered species.

That is to say, it is highly likely that the American people are confronting the same challenges as of 1945 that the native Americans confronted after the Ottoman Empire made it difficult for the European settlers in the middle of the second millennium to go to Asia on overland routes and they began migrating to the Americas. In other words, the Americans and the rest of the existing societies are entangled in the same circumstances that appear in American Western film, where native Americans were waging wars to prevent the European settlers and Mexican armies from stripping them from their values and land and vice versa. The only difference this time around is that the wars that UN member states are waging against the United States and vice versa are not centered on acquiescing material gains but philosophical gains. At the center of those philosophical gains stand whether or not the idea of freedom should get dismantled or not. In other words, whether or not all men should continue to be regarded as equal.

If UN member states continue to be in favor of letting the American values to continue to precipitously decline, and/or to let the behavior of the American people fragment, which mankind invested thousands of years to cultivate, then our successors could relive the same difficulties that the Native Americans and the European settlers were clashing with one another to determine who would get his ways despite the resistance

of the other. The only difference is that the assimilation would not be to deepen the idea of freedom, as the settlers were claiming their reliance on their personal power and conscience was doing to the native Americans, but to shrink it. This is because when freedom is curtailed, mankind would be throwing away the American culture which was acquired in the course of generations through individual and group striving, in order to embrace a human life that is “solitary, poor, nasty, brutish, and short” as the case has been like since 1945.

Hence without the American culture, later generations could not prosper, it is incumbent on every member of the human family to protect the American people to ensure that they do not become an endangered species. This is because if mankind does not preserve the American values and the American people later generations would become incapable to preserve the idea of good that everyone at the end of WW2 agreed to keep in mind and to work to strengthen. When the idea of good shrink, it would not be possible to prevent people from being devoted to pursuing their own self-interest. Thus compelling our successors to live the same circumstances that occurred on earth after we decided to build a tower that reaches to the heavens, and then stopped to speak the same language.

In this spirit, it is very important that readers keep in mind that all the fear that I express to ensure that the “United States” does not become destabilized or reverted to a simpler form, shall not be construed to mean that I am promoting nationalistic ideas intended to deepen the hegemony of this country over the international order, rather to avoid that the understanding that the American people have gained of themselves as compared to other societies around the world does not get lost. This is because it is this understanding (awareness) what led them to be in favor that the WW2 war aims be about securing that all people live free from fear and want, instead of being in favor of extending domination.

# Definitions

*The victors of WW2 (or powerful families, or most powerful families, or families/dynasties who won WW2, or families/dynasties who control the international order and the money supply of the world, or elite families/dynasties):* This word shall refer to the group of men who stand to lose the most if their wealth, power or status is taken away from them and placed in the hands of another group. This group of men exercise their power through presiding over the money supply of the world and the international order. In other words, this group of men owns and controls the architecture that gives any money any worth, including seeing that no money changes hands on any operating platforms beside the one that those individuals' (members) control. To perceive how this group exercises its controls over the world, one must regard its members as being nothing other than the people who own and administer the wire that feeds electricity into homes from the street. People would be living in darkness if they do not connect to this wire to have light. In theory, the member of this club can only be the families/dynasties who preside over the different religions, hence no authority can outlive the authority of the group of people who rely on the idea of good (i.e., idea of God) as a tool to solidify their power. The elite families/dynasties control the international order or the money supply of the world through the rich countries or the five permanent nations of the UN Security Council.

*Five permanent nations of the UN Security Council:* This word shall refer to the countries who provide legal functionality for the architecture that the elite families/dynasties who won WW2 want that every member of the human family to respect. In other words, those five nations are the countries who legitimize the social contract (natural and legal rights) that the victors of WW2 want all people to respect. In principle, those five countries are the group of rich and poor nations who the families/dynasties who won WW2 want other societies to consider their opinion before taking action of their own. The families/dynasties who control the five permanent nations of the UN Security Council are not necessarily the families/dynasties who control the international order and the money supply of the world.

*Rich nations (rich countries):* This word shall refer to the countries who provide financial functionality for the architecture that the elite families/dynasties who won WW2 want that every member of the human family to respect. In other words, they are the countries who own the companies that through them most of the world's trading is handled as well. Until the end of WW2, those countries were based in western Europe and the families/dynasties who won WW2 used to make those countries as their home base. The principal job of the government in those rich nations is to induce the atmosphere which will determine market is to fall and which one is to grow, which nation is to be engulfed in a civil war, and which country is to stay in peace. In other words, they pull the strings and levers which determines which nation to have power or wealth, and which one to be engulfed in instability.

*Banks, large financial institutions or Corporations:* This word shall refer to the legal organizations that the rich nations depend on to ensure that people are routing the money that created things generate through such service providers. Governments regulate the power of banks, large institutions or corporations and vice versa. All the wealth that banks, large institutions or corporations gain comes from investment in research financed by governments.

*Governments:* This word shall refer to the structure (legal entity) that determine and enforce the natural and legal rights that people legitimize. Banks, large institutions or corporations regulate the power of governments and vice versa. All the wealth that any nation acquire gets determined by the families/dynasties who won WW2 through the rich nations. In other words, the families/dynasties who won WW2 decide which country is to inject in it money to increase its productivity might, and which country to build within it or next to it (i.e., in a neighboring country) competitors to weaken its government and impoverish its people. The families/dynasties make this decision based on how the balance of power is shifting within a nation and between nations in function of progress.

*Global policemen of the world:* This word shall refer to the United States. In this work the United states is not regarded as a member of the club of rich nations or the powerful families/dynasties who won WW2. The United States is viewed as a satellite state that the rich countries and

the powerful families/dynasties control. On the aftermath of WW2, the families/dynasties who won this global war took this global policemen responsibility that Great Britain was playing till 1945, and delegated its functionality to the United States. The job of the United States (the global policemen) is to secure that the social model that the families/dynasties who won WW2 wanted to install or extend in the different UN member states on the aftermath of WW2 be adopted. This social model was summarized in the work program stipulated in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

*Leading by example:* The word “leading by example” shall refer to two relations: political and economic. The political meaning shall refer to cooperation based on the principles set forth in the UN Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. The economic meaning shall not refer herein to the readiness of the industrialized nations (the Italians, the Norwegians, Germans, British, the Americans, Chinese, French, Russians, etc.) to follow the legal procurement rules during the implementation of projects. Rather the economic meaning of the word “leading by example” shall refer to the preparedness of the rich and industrialized nations to ensure that no newborn stays idle. This can only happen when the industrialized nations and the rich nations recognize that all what people do on earth is create material things to improve basic social services (water, health, food), transportation and communication, and that there is a vast empty space on earth that if exploited and inhabited, less people would live in fear and want. This shall mean that industrialized nations give the nations that its people are idle, the blue print (technology) that can show them how to build tunnel boring machines or pile driving machines, etc., to enable them to interconnect mountains, or explore the sea (build submarines, roads on the surface of the sea to interconnect the world through such network, build tall buildings in the middle of the sea, build large boats, etc.) thus preoccupying them with building instead of being devoted to stripping from them their power.

# PREFACE

In mathematics, curve fitting is “the process of constructing a curve, or mathematical function, that has the best fit to a series of data points, possibly subject to constraints.” Humans took it upon themselves to explore how to fit each other’s behavior to fixed ethical values that they do not even know if they are the exact answers to the outcomes and conditions that matters to them. Regrettably, despite all the ideas that was introduced throughout history to help people to agree to fit behaviors to ethical values that the majority believe are the best fit to achieve the outcomes and conditions that matters to everyone, the end result has been a roller coaster.

Likewise, in the mathematical field of numerical analysis, interpolation is a “type of estimation, a method of constructing new data points within the range of a discrete set of known data points.” For this reason, humans have been interpolating ideals to construct behavior that they believe could fit as closely as possible the ethical values that they consider interpret best how they would like their interdependence or relations to be structured like since antiquity.

In botany, a tree is “a perennial plant with an elongated stem, or trunk, supporting branches and leaves in most species.” All the ideals that man determined to persuade each other to engage in virtuous behaviors or prudent actions can be said to be concepts that has been branching out in the same way this process occurs in trees. The new ideas that people have been coming up with has helped the social order to alter between periods of peace and wars. However, no one knows if the reason why the social order behaves as such is due to the new rules introduced aiding, or if this alteration is due to the world knowing rulers who rightly guide and others who use their power to get their way despite the resistance of others as most historians suggest.

Then again, humans came up with many new ideas and created many nations in modern history. One of the newly created nation that its rulers managed to make its inhabitants become capable to prevail over the weakness of their will more than in other social agglomeration in modern history is the United States of America. From 1776, when the

United States was founded, to 1945 when WW2 ended, the people of this country managed to show that it is possible for mankind to be mindful about the dignity and worth of the human person while everyone is working to realize the full development of his personality. The people of this nation (despite all their internal problems) managed to transform the United States from a country that in 1776 was full of uncertainty to a nation that its nationals became the happiest in 1945.

No one knows how the people in the United States managed to take all the conclusions from all the ideas that existed up to 1776 and to apply them to possess understanding of themselves to the extent of becoming ready to voluntarily surrender freedom to achieve practical results for the greater well-being of their society. Many scholars suggest that this idea that was penned during the beginning of the American Revolution about all men being born free and equal to have created the impetus. Irrespective of what motivated the American people to accept cultural diversity, we cannot disregard that the behavior that the American people exhibited from 1776 to 1945 represent a sample of the “best type of person” that mankind’s search to arrive at political and ethical truths had produced to date. In other words, the Americans were the frontier of mankind’s ongoing search to improve morality.

Indeed, the attitudes and values that are explicit or implicit in the American culture were acquired in the course of generations through individual and group striving. They are the deposit of the cultivated behavior that mankind invested thousands of years to reach.

In 1945, on the aftermath of World War II, the families/dynasties who won this global war determined that if all people in all nations cooperate based on ideals that are not any different from the one the American people used to increase their happiness, mankind could ultimately reach “the end of the historical dynamic with the perfection of a civil society.” The work program that is stipulated in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, represent the blue print that the families/dynasties who won WW2 expected that every member of the human would observe to secure the happiness that the people in the United States achieved. In other words, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights are the ideals that the families/dynasties who won WW2 wanted that every member

of the human family use to preserve freedom, reduce fear and want, or help later generations to prosper through using.

From 1945 to now, progress in human development has been dramatic. However, the nations that the families/dynasties who won WW2 tasked with preventing wars through collective security failed to prevent conflicts between nations or to make future wars impossible. In fact, the peace and security situation in the entire world appear to have deteriorated to a low level that a good number of people are questioning if the international order was not better off before humans began to cooperate collectively to achieve greater stability in the world. In fact, in recent years, the nations that are not normally known to have been in crisis such as Great Britain or the United States (including the Vatican) are beginning to show some evidence of probably being in crisis.

It took the people who formed the United States 169 years (from 1776 to 1945) before this country became a superpower. During this period the people who formed this country dealt with lots of ups and down in their search to create conditions of stability and well-being. In fact, racial discrimination was not theoretically fully abolished till the middle of 1960s in the United States.

No one knows if the deteriorated peace and security situation that emerged in the world is due to the reorganization that existing nations are undergoing or if the abnormal rise in intolerance that emerged is due to a rule that is prompting this unwillingness by people to be tolerant to secure the results that the American people managed to achieve from 1776 to 1945.

From 1945 to now, lots of people are struggling terribly to understand what could be prompting this rise in intolerance. Many scholars claim that the rates of population growth, knowledge, technology, communications, commerce, environmental degradation, and many other relations are hindering people ability to fit their behaviors within the guidelines that were proclaimed in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

Human nature has not changed pre and post 1945. None of the arguments that scholars give can be regarded as principal motives for

this abnormal rise in intolerance that people are expressing post 1945, because tolerance is a function of perseverance. Throughout history, whenever people were pushed against their limit, their sense became one of empowerment. The American people were not dealing with an existential threat from 1776 to 1945 when they managed to show that it is possible for a human being to give up some of his natural freedom (or tribalism) to obtain the benefits of the political order and still be happy. If existing people are not able to demonstrate the same will or grit that the American people managed to show is possible from 1776 to 1945, what could be provoking this wavering attitude that emerged post 1945 can only be a rule that its drawback is making people become incapable to naturally model their behavior according to the courage that the people who lived in the United States from 1776 to 1945 showed is possible.

This work tries to support that if nations are not able to speak the same language post 1945 and/or apply the same principles that the political leaders employed in the United States to make their nationals become capable to surrender their natural freedom, that this powerlessness is due to the families/dynasties who won WW2 having preferred to deviate away from the work program that the founding fathers of the UN counselled them to stick to using to secure the goals that those same powerful families/dynasties deeply care about, i.e., power, status and wealth. The work tries to show that the decision of the families/dynasties who won WW2 to permit the intergovernmental organization which they created to coordinate the activities of governments on a global scale and named United Nations provide solutions alongside existing nations to accelerate the attainments of the outcomes and conditions that matters to them, could be the rule that instigated this rise in intolerance that emerged around the world.

The work tries to show that the families/dynasties who won WW2 (and the families/dynasties that own the companies that through them most of the world's trading is now handled) need to choose between continuing to let the United Nations foster human rights to create an egalitarian world thus continuing to pile ahead of them vast problems to deal with and solve, or choose to go back to implementing the initial work program that the founding fathers of the UN counselled be followed to avert that the international organization named United

Nations and human development organizations such as NGOs, charities, etc., revert them to a simpler form.

Furthermore, the history of human progress is all about expanding limits to increase happiness. Unfortunately, when it comes to governance, this idea is not something that man can explore in the same way mankind uses his human ingenuity to find significance in created things. There is no understanding or principles that mankind can reorganize or build upon beyond recognizing that to ensure lasting peace it is important to cooperate based on the principles of equal rights.

The families/dynasties who won WW2 failed to say if this common standard that they wanted that on its premise people cooperate post 1945 is a rule that they would be adhering to it themselves also, or if this standard is something that the people who they freed should adopt only. The challenge with allowing the United Nations to foster human rights to create an egalitarian world and/or to fix dates to end poverty or injustice as if the international order is a bottle of milk that would expire if not consumed before a set date is that it makes most people believe that the purpose of the coming together of people to cooperate in the economic field post 1945 is to make every person realize his dreams (or realize the full development of his personality).

It is wonderful to reframe adversity as adventure and to bring seemingly impossible ideas into the world of possibility. Unfortunately, not every drowning man can learn to swim, and therefore, there are certain experiences that the odds of defying them is not an undertaking that everyone possesses the right mental balance to walk intact from. The words "The end of the line" or "dead end" are two expressions that humans use to express what a person is obliged to do when located at an end of a road from which no exit is possible. The person is obliged to turn around and head back to where he came from, or wait for a miracle to happen. The families/dynasties who won WW2 (the families/dynasties who control the international order and the money supply of the world) can continue to let the international organization named United Nations and human development organizations such as NGOs, charities, etc., foster human rights to prevent technical progress (created things) from running to waste in the hope that they could find a way to stop the awareness that those actors are awakening in the heart and mind of people makes them

be ready to surrender freedom to them, or they could brace and hope that their heirs would be able to find an elusive line of holds that would enable them to stay in power when the socio-cultural patterns that emerged post WW2 continue to regress to reconstruct the in-bound world events in reverse order.

This book shows that if the families/dynasties who won WW2 (the families/dynasties who control the international order or the money supply of the world) do not stop the international organization named United Nations from continuing to be an economic operator who is using the ideals that are stipulated in the UN charter as a ladder to develop power, the American culture or Anglosphere power that mankind invested the last thousand years to build could collapse thus giving rise to new families/dynasties starting to play their role.

## **Can mankind limit the abomination and desolation that the victors of WW2 compelled worldwide?**

---

A deep state is a type of governance made up of networks of power operating independently of a state's political leadership in pursuit of their own agenda and goals.<sup>1</sup> It would be naïve to suppose that elected officials in executive positions act freely on behalf of top-level finance, military and industry complexes on matters that involve committing their nations to go to war or not, no matter how much this decision is to serve the public good. In other words, it would be naïve to suppose that the buck to go to war or not stops in the hand of an elected official or the president of any country unless this official is superrich or a feudal lord. In real life, when two employees from two companies compete for a contract and one loses to the other, it is the owners of the companies who decide to accept the defeat or to go to war. It would be very difficult to justify why the opposite should happen in politics. This means that in every country there must be wealthy families/dynasties who operate independent of a state's political leadership and who takes decisions on all issues involving committing a country to go to war or not.

Accordingly, we cannot say that the wealthy families/dynasties in the different societies that Great Britain was administering before WW2 erupted, and who were powerful enough to commit men to go to war, began fighting on the camp of Great Britain when WW2 erupted because they were against Germany invading Poland (what historians

---

<sup>1</sup> [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Deep\\_state](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Deep_state)

say is the event that caused WW2 to break out),<sup>2</sup> or had a feud with Germany. The wealthy families/dynasties who Great Britain was administering in distinct societies and who were powerful enough to commit men to fight the Germans during WW2, sidelined with Great Britain (their conquerors), because they were convinced that if Great Britain would win this war that their best interests would be better served.

The Atlantic Charter was a statement issued on 14 August 1941 that set out American and British goals for the world after the end of WW2.<sup>3</sup> Among the statements that the United States and Great Britain made and agreed to follow once Germany was defeated included the restoration of self-government to those societies deprived of it. Indeed, this offer that Great Britain agreed to extend to the wealthy families/dynasties in the different societies that this kingdom was administering before WW2 erupted and who were powerful enough to commit men to go to war on its side is surely an offer that no one society that was dominated could reject.

I have no way of knowing how useful the poor societies who the allies (the monarchs or nations who were operating empires) had promised to grant them self-determination if they would fight on their side during WW2 were to help them win this global war, especially that what secured the allies victories was not based on surplus or lack of soldiers but rather on scientific progress.

In addition, we surely cannot say that all the local wealthy families/dynasties (in the societies) that Great Britain was administering before WW2 erupted and who this monarch had promised to reward with granting them independence once Germany was defeated if they would be prepared with their men to fight on its side during WW2 were all families/dynasties who believed that “all men are created equal.” To this day, Great Britain is a country that uphold the supremacy of the social order (i.e., Great Britain is a monarchy). In other words, Great Britain does not believe that all “men are created equal” when it comes

---

<sup>2</sup> <https://www.history.com/topics/world-war-ii/world-war-ii-history#:~:text=Hitler's%20invasion%20of%20Poland%20in,globe%20than%20any%20previous%20war.>

<sup>3</sup> [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Atlantic\\_Charter](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Atlantic_Charter)

to political hierarchy despite this country being among the principal proponents who pushed for the creation of the formal intergovernmental organization named United Nations. It would be naïve to suppose that all the local wealthy families/dynasties ( in the societies) that Great Britain was administering before WW2 erupted and who this monarch had promised to reward with granting them independence once Germany was defeated if they would be prepared with their men to fight on its side during WW2 were all in favor of creating a world in which all people would be in it disarmed, prevent wars through collective security, or protect human rights and share outcomes on equal rights (justice and technical created things) as UN member states later expanded the functions of the intergovernmental organization named United Nations to include and tasked with pursue. The United States is a founding nation of the intergovernmental organization named United Nations, and its constitution ratified in December 1791, provides U.S. citizens the right to bear arms to this day.<sup>4</sup> The Yearbook of International Organizations is a reference work on non-profit international organizations, published by the Union of International Associations.<sup>5</sup> The Yearbook include a listing of 5,000 intergovernmental organizations (IGOs) such as European Union, African Union, Arab Leagues, etc., who are in operation as of 2012/13).<sup>6</sup> This large number of IGOs that are operating parallel to the United Nations, the primary formal organization coordinating activities between states on a global scale, is evidence to show that mankind is not united as of 1945 to improve collective security but to deepen division even more.

However, we could say that the mere disposition of Great Britain, the monarchs and nations who had empires before WW2 erupted, and the poor societies who agreed to fight during WW2 on the side of those powerful monarchs and existing nations who were administering them on condition that they would be rewarded with being granted independence on the aftermath of this global war were all inclined to cooperate to build a just and peaceful world post 1945.

---

<sup>4</sup> <https://www.livescience.com/26485-second-amendment.html>

<sup>5</sup> [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Yearbook\\_of\\_International\\_Organizations](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Yearbook_of_International_Organizations)

<sup>6</sup> [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List\\_of\\_intergovernmental\\_organizations](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_intergovernmental_organizations)

Then again, the reason why WW1 and WW2 erupted is because of all the political gridlock or distrust that the powerful monarchs and existing nations were entangled with one another over to determine who would make the weakest consider the opinion of the strongest before taking actions on his own, despite being in accord, in principle, all the time, with one another over how the poor societies should be administered by them. In other words, the disputes that the powerful monarchs and existing nations were having with one another till WW1 erupted and after was mainly about who between them would dominate the other, and not about whether or not the poor societies should continue to live under domination or not. Surely, the distinct poor societies who Great Britain and the rest of the western European powers who were administering them could not refuse to endorse this offer of self-determination if they would side up with those old powers during WW2 (the allies), while the German leaders were cheering for “far right ideas, racism and eugenics.”<sup>7</sup>

In my opinion, the factor that led all the local wealthy families/dynasties (in the societies) who were powerful enough to commit men to go to war to sideline with their conquerors (Great Britain and the rest of western European powers) was not their fear of Germany winning WW2, but their conviction that it would be possible to build on top of the experience that mankind had gained from 1776 to 1939 in the United States in the field of social cohesion despite humanity’s poor track record with democracy till 1939.

Then again, irrespective of what the implicit goals of the powerful monarchs and existing nations from bringing people who did not believe in the idea of freedom before WW2 erupted, and ones who did subscribe to such idea, and to make everyone mix and accept such tenet so they can defeat Germany, when throughout history the disadvantages of democracy seem to outweigh the advantages shows that this strategy of mixing different beliefs and convictions has not been as effective in preventing wars so far as it was in the United States from 1776 to 1945.

It is highly possible that the fixation of the rulers and political class of Great Britain and the rest of western European powers who were

---

<sup>7</sup> <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Nazism>

fighting on its side of defeating Germany at any cost, may have compelled them to ignore the fact that even though minority (wealthy) usually rule over the majority (the poor), for governance to function properly it is required that the majority (the poor) be ethically or morally right and not the minority (wealthy). When the majority (the poor) become not ethically or morally right, the deception that the majority (the poor) would be effecting in the social order can put the lives of the minority (the wealthy) at great risk.

Furthermore, it is highly likely that the scientific breakthrough that were ongoing at the start of the 20<sup>th</sup> about the nature of atoms and most importantly, chemical fission and fusion reactions played a major role in the conviction of the powerful monarchs and existing nations that it would be safe to bring people who did not believe in the idea of freedom before WW2 erupted, and ones who did subscribe to such idea, and to make everyone mix and match. To put it differently, before WW1 or WW2 erupted it was the society who controlled the sea who got to tell all others to consider its opinion before taking actions of their own. Great Britain and the rest of the western European powers controlled the sea before WW1 or WW2 erupted. The work leading to the production of the atomic bomb began at the start of the 20<sup>th</sup> century and not during WW2. Great Britain and the rest of the western European powers who were like this monarch operating empires, and fighting on its side to defeat Germany knew that very soon it was going to become no longer necessary to continue to be involved in the governance of the poor societies as they were doing. In other words, Great Britain and the rest of the western European powers knew that sooner or later they would be developing ICBMs (intercontinental Ballistic Missile) to deliver an atomic bomb to anywhere they want. Their conviction that they would be able to continue to maintain their grip on the societies that they were going to free if they would be ready to fight the Germans on land on their behalf could be what has compelled them to agree to grant the poor societies self-determination.

Then again, the majority of people live on land and not on floating cities that roam the sea (aircraft carriers). On land it is the local wealthy families/dynasties who rule and not the rulers and political class of the rich or industrialized nations. For example, the population of Nigeria, Ethiopia and Egypt alone is almost equivalent to the population of the

United States. The United States could threaten with its aircraft carriers the governments of those afore mentioned three countries to make them acquiesce to its demands, but the United States cannot make a child in anyone of those three countries develop trust in their government or in its ideals. This trust or distrust will always be a function of the power of the natural and legal rights that would be legitimized (ideals) and how such ideals help an individual to sustain survival needs or satiate earthly desires.

For example, during WW2 Great Britain and its western European allies managed to convince its citizens and all the poor societies that the Germans were evil thus compelling all those who were ready to fight this nation to be ready to do it to prevent Germany from winning WW2 and shrink their freedom. Nonetheless, because Great Britain and its western European allies chose to not stay faithful to the work program that those old powers were preaching (democracy and rule of law) and saying it was a better alternative, their power shrunk and the number of people who distrust them and distrust their ideas is on the rise steadily.

Likewise, at the start of the 21<sup>st</sup> century, the United States and its allies tried to convince the whole world this time that the Iraqi regime (and even Islam to a big extent) was a threat to freedom, but its efforts did cost this country its reputation so far.

Then again, one would think that Great Britain (rulers and political class) who, in principle, is the founding father of the Anglosphere which dominate the world today would be wise or careful about the type of civilizing mission that it should sponsor to avoid the price that its self-determination work program had taxed the Anglosphere so far; for one reason or another, this monarch has been incessantly since 1945 sponsoring initiatives that stands a chance of weakening the Anglosphere rather than to strengthen it. In fact, Great Britain invited the whole world to go to this country in October 2021 to say no to continuing to generating energy using methods that increases carbon footprints in order to switch into green energy. In other words, Great Britain does not want the Anglosphere to be only used as a civilization mission that people could use to ensure social justice, this monarch wants the Anglosphere to be used as a tool to defend the right of the environment to a better treatment from people as well.

Father of the Poor?: Vargas and His Era is a book by Historian Robert M. Levine<sup>8</sup> (1941 – 2003) in which the author writes about the Vargas Era of Brazilian history with a focus on Vargas' life, his political history, Brazilian political atmosphere and a critique of the Revolution being “incomplete.”<sup>9</sup> Unfortunately, the father of the poor, Getúlio Dornelles "Gegé" Vargas<sup>10</sup> (1882 – 1954), President of Brazil from 1930 – 1945 and from 1951 – 1954, piled so many political crisis that led him to commit suicide in 1954.

Indeed, the aspirations of the rulers and political class who control the Anglosphere in Great Britain to invite the whole world to protest in support of reducing carbon footprints and increasing the usage of green energy is a common standard of achievement that the “environment” should be pleased and exalted with. Said differently, surely the refurbishing of the human progress to make it become green will boost tremendously the wealth of Great Britain and its western European allies hence the majority of the green technology proposed is manufactured in those European countries, and those nations have legitimized after WW2 that they reserve the right to protect the material interests resulting from any scientific production and possess nuclear weapons to enforce the rules they determine. The question that begs an answer is not whether or not Great Britain and its western European allies who want the Anglosphere be also used to defend the right of the environment to a better treatment from people as well would be rich or not from such endeavor. The question that begs an answer is whether or not the Anglosphere can take on defending the right of the environment to a better treatment from people, before finishing first, with defending the right of people to social justice?

I have no way of knowing how peace and security would evolve on earth, after mankind started to rally for “climate justice” before finishing first with the already ongoing rally for “social justice” that started in 1945. In other words, I have no way of knowing the implications of empowering people to deliver climate change “justice” and social change “justice” at the same time could have on the Anglosphere in

---

<sup>8</sup> [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Robert\\_M.\\_Levine](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Robert_M._Levine)

<sup>9</sup> [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Father\\_of\\_the\\_Poor%3F\\_Vargas\\_and\\_His\\_Era](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Father_of_the_Poor%3F_Vargas_and_His_Era)

<sup>10</sup> [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Get%C3%BAlio\\_Vargas](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Get%C3%BAlio_Vargas)

particular. The valorizations that Getúlio Dornelles "Gegé" Vargas was introducing grew dangerously until prompting him to commit suicide. Could the valorizations that governments (the rich) are compelling lead to the collapse of the Anglosphere?

Indeed, putting "climate justice" at the heart of education as the UN member states decided to do in 1945 when they tasked the intergovernmental organization named United Nations with putting "social justice" at the heart of education is a great initiative.

I have no way of knowing if the impact of putting "climate justice" at the heart of education today would produce seventy years from now the same impact that making the intergovernmental organization named United Nations put "social justice" at the heart of education has produced so far. Nonetheless, there is a big contrast in the way the two actions (social justice and climate justice) have evolved that it is worthwhile noting. For example, when the action for "social justice" was promoted in 1945, it was the wealthy (the minority) who sponsored its awareness. Presently, the action for "climate justice" it is teenagers and very young kids (majority) who are spreading and sponsoring this awareness.

If the companies, banks, financial institutions who are programed to gain the most when the restoration of the human progress to make it run on green energy continue to empower youth and use teenagers and very young kids to influence them into putting climate change at the heart of their priority instead of keeping on putting playing as being their number one preoccupation, then mankind would be empowering children to develop their skills and knowledge not only in biodiversity and sustainability but also in "justice."

I have no way of knowing what impact empowering children about "justice" from an early age, would have on the companies, banks, financial institutions, who profit from keeping economies moving. However, what I do know is that encouraging children from a young age to prioritize justice could be a challenge for rulers and political class (the rich) to continue to transform outcomes and conditions that matters to them. In other words, if it was not possible to make adult be ready to surrender freedom to any political order since mankind emerged on

earth, compelling children to be preoccupied with justice could be a remedy to accelerate entangling mankind in a class conflict or a social revolution that its consequence could be disastrous on the Anglosphere.

I have no way of knowing what the families/dynasties who control the international order of the money supply of the world (the victors of WW2) are planning for the world or mankind. World revolution is a Marxist concept of overthrowing capitalism in all countries through the conscious revolutionary action of the organized working class. It is possible the victors of WW2 (the most powerful families/dynasties) could be intentionally favoring encouraging raising the awareness of children to successfully help them to reset the rich and the international order around the world.

Then again, many questions beg an answer. For one, if the victors of WW2 failed to secure the goals that are proclaimed in the UN charter after they tasked the intergovernmental organization named United Nations with equipping “adults” with the skills and knowledge to build social justice, will the most powerful families/dynasties (the victors of WW2) would be able to prevent a social revolution after they decided to task the intergovernmental organization named United Nations with equipping “children” and “adults” with the skills and knowledge to build “social justice” and “climate justice”? Most importantly, would the victors of WW2 (the most powerful families/dynasties) manage to protect the Anglosphere when “children” and “adult” begin to be unprepared to think twice about the things they care about? Simply put, would the families/dynasties who control the Anglosphere be able to continue to solidify their powers and get their ways despite the resistance of others, when children, young people, adult, and senior citizens begin to rightly want to see far more concerted action from policy-makers?

I do not have the answer to the afore questions because man was not programmed with power to forecast the future, and the companies, banks, financial institutions who are programed to gain the most when the restoration of the human progress to make it run on green energy began to attract people to this ambitious new project very recently. However, what I do know is that because the social justice action (activism) that the victors of WW2 began to raise awareness about as of

1945 has been a total failure so far, it might be possible to use (extend) this pattern to determine if compelling people of all ages and sexes to raise their awareness and understanding of the problem of “climate justice” would also equip them to with the skills and knowledge to build a sustainable future, or accelerate the spiraling of peace and security into an irreparable state.

It is important to keep in mind that the social justice action (activism) that the victors of WW2 began to raise the awareness of the poor about as of 1945 is not the one that the founding fathers of the UN proposed in the UN charter or in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. The founding fathers of the UN did not counsel the victors of WW2 to task the intergovernmental organization named United Nations with raising awareness and understanding of people around the world so outcomes be shared on equal rights (social justice, material things, etc.). The founding fathers counseled the victors of WW2 to let governments provide their own political, economic, social, and cultural solution, and at their own pace, until eventually the understanding they gain of themselves would help them to improve social justice. In other words, all the UN system, international aid organizations, NGOs, charities, foundations, corporate social responsibility initiatives, government foreign aid agencies, etc., that exists today in the world are all initiatives that the rulers and political class that succeeded the founding fathers of the UN took, and was not proposed in the initial work program of the founding fathers of the UN. As I just said, the founding fathers of the UN proposed that governments develop understanding of themselves and not to have UN system, international aid organizations, NGOs, charities, foundations, corporate social responsibility initiatives, government foreign aid agencies, etc., be the ones who is developing their own understanding on the back of governments.

That is said, hence for as long as the victors of WW2 use their wealth, power and status to make the working class (UN system, international aid organizations, NGOs, charities, foundations, corporate social responsibility initiatives, government foreign aid agencies, etc.) adopt global scopes (social justice, climate justice, economic justice, political justice, cultural justice, etc. etc.) to allow them to strip wealthy and bourgeois ownership and rule, the more the future of the world would be uncertain; this signify that the more awareness and understanding

enhances peoples own conviction, the more the future of the Anglosphere would be getting up in the air. In other words, if the more technology enhances people's awareness and understanding, the more people would be putting into question the legal and natural rights that the Anglosphere compass legitimize, this means that the more the wealthy and the bourgeois resist the global scope that the working class (UN system, international aid organizations, NGOs, charities, foundations, corporate social responsibility initiatives, government foreign aid agencies, etc.) are adopting to achieve world socialism (in theory), the more the future of the Anglosphere would be reciprocally getting uncertain.

Furthermore, hence the more the awareness and understanding of people rise, the harder it gets to convince people to commit to tolerate injustice or to go to war (unless of course the spoil to be gained are worth a lot), this means that the families/dynasties who control the international order or the money supply of the world could only rely on gene editing technique, famine, global war, pandemic, etc. to continue to solidify their power.

To give an example, let us take the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. This conflict has been waging since 1948. So far there is no sign that this conflict is ending any time soon. Hence the Israeli government cannot continue to make the Israeli citizens live indeterminately under fear, which is one of the parameters that the families/dynasties who control this government rely on since 1948 to enlist newborns to soldier (i.e., to protect the wealthy families/dynasties and protect the ideas that those families/dynasties use as tools to brainwash newborns with), this means that the families/dynasties who control the Israeli government would have to eventually compromise or rely on an annihilation method such as gene editing technique, famine, global war, pandemic, etc., to once and for all dissipate the unending Palestinian threat.

Then again, in my opinion, the Palestinians are posing the least challenge or threat to the families/dynasties who control Israel, or to the international social order which the victors of WW2 (families/dynasties who control the international order or the money supply of the world) legitimized on the aftermath of WW2. I strongly believe that the threat the Israeli youth, and youth in general around the world are posing on

the strength and stability of the families/dynasties who control the international order or the money supply of the world is far greater. I will show how this could be the case by making a comparison between the threat that the Israeli youth are posing on the families/dynasties who control Israel to the threat that the Palestinians are compelling.

The Palestinians can be easily expended and no nation would lift a finger if the Israeli government were to exterminate them. It is the Israeli youth who the Israeli government need to control. The Israeli youth are the ones who are operating labs that conducts gene editing research, artificial intelligence research, data collection (biometric and others) research, weapons development research, etc., and not the Palestinian youth or Palestinians. The Palestinians are not involved in research work that has the potential to threaten the Israeli government nor they are protesting to the Palestinian authorities or the Israeli authorities to reduce their carbon footprints or to increase it. It is the families/dynasties who control Israel who are encouraging their youth to push their scientific and technical understanding to enable them to realize the full development of their personality. That's all wonderful and necessary, but the families/dynasties who control Israel are going to have two problems in their hand to resolve in the future if the Israeli youth begin to want to see more concerted action from their government to improve climate justice, social justice, etc. The threat of the Palestinians and the threat that the awareness and understanding of their own youth would be posing.

Then again, I have no way of knowing how the families/dynasties who control Israel are planning to control the youth in this country when more and more of them would begin to want to see more concerted action from their government to improve climate justice, social justice, etc. In other words, if Israel would begin to let its youth riot as the case is like in its neighbor Lebanon, or lock them up as the case is like in neighboring Egypt or Jordan. I do not see how Israel could avoid becoming converted into any one of those afore mentioned societies if this country continues to sign peace agreements, and continue to be encouraging its youth to push their scientific and technical understanding to enable them to realize the full development of their personality. That is of course, unless the families/dynasties who control Israel decide to rely on gene editing technique, famine, civil war,

pandemic, etc. to control their youth and thus continue to solidify their power.

Said differently, if the Palestinians do not want any footprint of the Israeli in the territory that they are confiscating illegally; and if the victors of WW2 (the families/dynasties who control the international order or the money supply of the world) are relying on the working class (UN system, international aid organizations, NGOs, charities, foundations, corporate social responsibility initiatives, government foreign aid agencies, etc.) to teach their youth to be devoted to secure global scope that achieves nothing but make people become unprepared to obey the natural and legal rights that the wealthy legitimize, then if the families/dynasties who control Israel do not put its youth to be doing what the youth in Palestine are doing (fighting the Israeli) or Egypt are doing (building roads and prisons), the only other they would have would be doing is what the Lebanese youth are doing (preventing the government from working). That is of course, if the families/dynasties who control Israel want to put their youth to compete against the German, British, American, Russian, Chinese youth in the hope that the blows that they were dealt before WW2 would not happen. The same can be said to apply in all the nations that its youth are in them pestering their governments (the rich) with social justice claim, climate justice claim, economic justice, political justice, cultural justice, etc. etc.

Indeed, the challenges that the families/dynasties who control Israel are piling up against them if they continue to let the victors of WW2 (the families/dynasties who control the international order or the money supply of the world) are relying on the working class (UN system, international aid organizations, NGOs, charities, foundations, corporate social responsibility initiatives, government foreign aid agencies, etc.) to teach their youth to be devoted to secure global scope that achieves nothing but make people become unprepared to obey the natural and legal rights that the wealthy legitimize, are not any different than the challenges that the victors of WW2 are battling since 1945 but on a global scale.

In fact, to show how the victors of WW2 (the families/dynasties who control the international order or the money supply of the world) are

threatening mankind by permitting the working class (UN system, international aid organizations, NGOs, charities, foundations, corporate social responsibility initiatives, government foreign aid agencies, etc.) teach youth to be devoted to secure global scope that achieves nothing but make people become unprepared to obey the natural and legal rights that the wealthy legitimize, I will once again take the case of the people who subscribe to the Jewish faith to show how.

All what people do on earth is explore, reproduce and use created things to deny with such technical progress each other's right. For example, the Europeans (the Christians) abused the Jews throughout the second millennium. Only in 1948, the Jews managed to put their hands on social space thus enabling them to start to use created things to begin to deny with such technical progress rights from other societies. Many questions beg answers. For one, would the Jews be able to solidify their power and build the Third Temple which is sacred in Judaism while the victors of WW2 (the families/dynasties who control the international order or the money supply of the world) are relying on the working class (UN system, international aid organizations, NGOs, charities, foundations, corporate social responsibility initiatives, government foreign aid agencies, etc.) to teach their youth to be devoted to secure global scope that achieves nothing but make people become unprepared to obey the natural and legal rights that the wealthy legitimize.

To put it differently, the Jews believe that construction of the Third Temple must be fulfilled prior to, or in tandem with, the Messianic Age.<sup>11</sup> In Abrahamic religions, the Messianic Age is the future period of time on earth in which the messiah will reign and bring universal peace and brotherhood, without any evil.<sup>12</sup> Will the families/dynasties who control Israel or Judaism around the world, be able to construct the Third Temple, so universal peace and brotherhood, without any evil flourish on earth, while the victors of WW2 (the families/dynasties who control the international order or the money supply of the world) are relying on the working class (UN system, international aid organizations, NGOs, charities, foundations, corporate social responsibility initiatives, government foreign aid agencies, etc.) to teach their youth to be devoted to secure global scope that achieves nothing

---

<sup>11</sup> [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Third\\_Temple](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Third_Temple)

<sup>12</sup> [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Messianic\\_Age](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Messianic_Age)

but make people become unprepared to obey the natural and legal rights that the wealthy legitimize?

Said differently, could the families/dynasties who control Israel or Judaism around the world prevent the antisemitism that was prevalent in Europe against them throughout the second millennium<sup>13</sup> from playing a major role in diverting them away from their goal for the world if the victors of WW2 (the families/dynasties who control the international order or the money supply of the world) are relying on the working class (UN system, international aid organizations, NGOs, charities, foundations, corporate social responsibility initiatives, government foreign aid agencies, etc.) to teach their youth to be devoted to secure global scope that achieves nothing but make people become unprepared to obey the natural and legal rights that the wealthy legitimize? Of course, that is if the messiah will reign and bring universal peace and brotherhood, without any evil over the entire world, and not only within their own Judaic society.

I have no way of knowing if the antimerism ideas that existed before WW2 erupted and which are in full force till today would be an obstacle ahead of the aspirations of the Jews for the world (that is if the messiah will not be coming for them only). What I do know is that if the Jews were to manage to build the Third Temple, they would need to prevent certain events first.

That is also to say that if the victors of WW2 (the families/dynasties who control the international order or the money supply of the world) want to continue to transform their aspirations for the world including continuing to transform the conditions and outcomes that matters to them, they would need to prevent the same challenges that the Jews need to overcome. I will once again explain what those challenges are by highlighting what the Jews must be able to do to build their Third Temple.

Nazism is a form of fascism that incorporate fervent antisemitism.<sup>14</sup> I have no way of knowing why the families/dynasties who controlled

---

<sup>13</sup> <https://www.annefrank.org/en/anne-frank/go-in-depth/why-did-hitler-hate-jews/>

<sup>14</sup> <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Nazism>

Germany believed that the Jews could never be fully-fledged German Citizens before WW2 erupted. Some scholars blame this bias on Jews having betrayed the families/dynasties who controlled Germany during WW1 including linking the Jews to monetary power.<sup>15</sup> Of course, the afore shall not be interpreted to mean that the Jews caused the defeat of the Germans in WW1, but shall refer to a handful of superrich Jews or Jews with great political and military power who betrayed the families/dynasties who controlled Germany. Throughout history, betrayal played a key role in the defeat of many nations. For example, some commentators suggest that the leaders of the Iraqi military betrayed Saddam Hussain during the US-Iraq war reason why Iraq fell without any real resistance.<sup>16,17,18</sup>

Then again, I think only one motive could have compelled the prejudice that the families/dynasties who controlled Germany (or Europe) felt toward the Jews before WW2 erupted. This motive is jealousy. This same motive could be what has compelled the few superrich Jews or Jews with great political and military power to betray the families/dynasties who controlled Germany prompting their loss during WW2, if this account that some historians use to support such narrative happens to be true.

People show envy of someone because of their achievements and advantages. Achievements are what people depend on to obtain and accumulate wealth, status and power. When people accumulate wealth, status and power, they legitimize natural and legal rights. All the crisis and wars that people became entangled with occurred because most people are not ready to surrender freedom to the natural and legal rights that the people with wealth, status and power legitimize. Since antiquity, only a handful of people used their wealth, status and power for the benefit of mankind as defined in Biblical scriptures.

---

<sup>15</sup> <https://www.annefrank.org/en/anne-frank/go-in-depth/why-did-hitler-hate-jews/>

<sup>16</sup> <https://www.smh.com.au/world/middle-east/saddam-betrayed-by-republican-guard-chief-report-20030526-gdgtqe.html>

<sup>17</sup> <https://www.baltimoresun.com/news/bal-iraqcollapse0811-story.html>

<sup>18</sup> <https://www.thetimes.co.uk/article/treachery-how-iraq-went-to-war-against-saddam-rct9s802cg2>

It would be naïve to suppose that the families/dynasties who discriminated and persecuted the Jews in Europe throughout the second millennium and denied them right, approved on the aftermath of WW2 that the Jews create a new country in Palestine because they wanted to help the Jews to return to the Holy Land to fulfil biblical prophecies or to give them a fresh start after all the abuses that they endured on the hands of Christians throughout the second millennium in Europe. In my opinion, only one motive compelled the families/dynasties who won WW2 to approve that the Palestinians make room for the Jews to create a new country in Palestine (or the Holy land). This condition was the money that the Jews placed at the disposal of the families/dynasties who won WW2 to help them win World War Two.

In fact, I strongly believe that Great Britain and its western European allies won WW2, only because of the money that the Jews placed at their disposal. I also strongly believe that the large US foreign assistance Israel receive of any country since WW2,<sup>19</sup> is not because the Americans and the Jews maintain a special relationships, but rather because it was the Jews who paid for all the military gear the US fabricated so this country could enter WW2.

As the afore shows, jealousy is a very dangerous emotion, but at the same time, money or sympathy can make the people who were once a rival to become ally easily. This is very serious and worrisome.

In other words, if the victors of WW2 (the families/dynasties who control the international order or the money supply of the world) fail to control jealousy around the world, they would not be able to prevent the fear and insecurity that people feel from resizing them as happened to the Jews during WW2. Likewise, if money or sympathy can make the people who were once a rival to become ally easily, then the victors of WW2 could be taking great risks if they let their emotions guide them, because they have no way of knowing if the favors that they extend would produce outcomes that they would regret in the future or benefit from.

---

<sup>19</sup> <https://www.usnews.com/news/best-countries/articles/2021-05-24/afghanistan-israel-largest-recipients-of-us-foreign-aid#:~:text=Israel%20has%20received%20the%20most,aid%20every%20year%20since%201971.>

Indeed, the decision of the victors of WW2 (the families/dynasties who control the international order or the money supply of the world) to have the Palestinians make room for the Jews has been very beneficial to the Jews to increase their happiness, but not for the international rule based world order that they tried to legitimize on the aftermath of WW2 so far.

I have no way of knowing how the international rule based world order that the victors of WW2 legitimized on the aftermath of WW2 is holding out so far. The word “hold out hope” is an expression that is used when the thing one wants is unlikely, but the person still allow himself a hope.<sup>20</sup> I have no way of knowing if the victors of WW2 still have hopes in the international rule based world order they legitimized on the aftermath of WW2 still serving them to continue to solidify their power, or if they think that the intolerance that people began manifesting post 1945 is natural.

Definitely, the manner the victors of WW2 are going about to make people obey the international rule based world order they legitimized is original. For example, instead of the victors of WW2 putting pressure on the Israeli government to either return the land that the Palestinians claim the Israeli government confiscated, or put pressure on the Israeli government to buy this land from the Palestinian (including giving the Israeli government this money if the Israeli do not have it) and finding a new piece of land for the Palestinian for them to live on since the Israeli do not want them next to them, thus the who world can move on, the victors of WW2 believe that keeping the Israeli-Palestinian conflict celebrate its 73<sup>rd</sup> anniversary is helping them.

I have no way of knowing how the victors of WW2 are deeming that letting a conflict last for 73 years could be helping then and not be eating away from their own power. What I do know is that the word “hierarchy” is defined as a system in which “people” or “things” are placed in a series of levels with different importance or status.<sup>21</sup> This definition suggests that when individuals fail to reach social goals and they continue to pursue them, their first tendency is to place in a series of levels with different importance or status “people” or “things.”

---

<sup>20</sup> <https://plainenglish.com/expressions/hold-out-hope/>

<sup>21</sup> <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/hierarchy>

However, in mathematics, hierarchy refers to truism (axiom) of a set of theoretical object, consisting of a preorder defined as a set.<sup>22</sup> In other words, hierarchy in mathematics refers to an arrangement of items (objects, names, values, categories, etc.) that are represented as being "above", "below", or "at the same level as" one another.<sup>23</sup> That is to say that hierarchy in mathematics is natural. This means that hierarchy in mathematics should not be confused with the general concept of a hierarchy in the social realm (the hierarchy that is used in social, economic or political systems). In mathematics, the only way to get to something higher is through using the lower. Simply put, if we want to get to the number 3, we cannot add anything other than the number 2.

Evidently, if the victors of WW2 believe that it is okay if the Israeli-Palestinian conflict last 73 years already, this means that the victors of WW2 do not want to admit that hierarchy may also be natural. In other words, the victors of WW2 do not want to admit that perhaps a force (a God) chose them to play the deputy of God role, and they should be taken decision for the benefit of the entire world and not a specific society. To put it differently, there are three ways that a person can depend on to have access to power: wealth, status and power gained through a job. It is much harder to obtain power via status or to gain power from a job than doing it through wealth. In other words, the number of people who their wealth grants them power is much higher than the number of people who possess power from status (prestige), or from engaging in social change (individuals in government jobs). If the victors of WW2 (i) do not want to show the right leadership, and (ii) want the Israeli government and another 192 government think that they are exempt from the appeal to obey the work program set forth in the UN Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and to make matters worse, (iii) want the UN system, international aid organizations, NGOs, charities, foundations, corporate social responsibility initiatives, government foreign aid agencies, etc. teach people to have power through increasing their wealth, this means that the victors of WW2 believe that they can continue to solidify their power while they are allowing hierarchy to behave unnaturally.

---

<sup>22</sup> [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Hierarchy\\_\(mathematics\)](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Hierarchy_(mathematics))

<sup>23</sup> <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Hierarchy>

If the victors of WW2 do not want to believe that hierarchy is natural, this means that they must believe that wealth (class) is the supreme factor from which a person can draw power. This is very serious and worrisome. This is because as of 1945 it is no longer the few who are accumulating wealth but the majority. This means that it is highly likely that the victors of WW2 do not possess all the power or immense influence that they believe they wield (unless, of course, they are all mathematicians, artificial intelligence engineers, computer programmers and geneticists).

To put it differently, when the Europeans were making the life of the Jews difficult in most of Europe, the Europeans (Germans, British, French, Italian, Spaniards, Austrians, Dutch, etc.) were not teaching their youth about the importance of wealth (awareness, knowledge, money) as a tool to have power; only the Jews were doing it. As of 1945, no newborn is prepared to accept to be anything in life less than a President or a king after the victors of WW2 tasked the UN system to be teaching every newborn why it is important to be holding a phone in his hands all the time instead of the Bible. This means that if the victors of WW2 do not assume their responsibility and make people go back to seeing each other as equal or as the United States managed to make people in this country to see each other like from 1776 to 1945, it is highly likely that the tribalism and nationalism that has been on the rise since the start of the 21<sup>st</sup> century in particular would not be limited to having nation rise against another nation, and kingdom against another kingdom, but neighbor rise against his neighbor, and a brother betraying his brother.

Surely, this abnormal rise in intolerance or sense of immense influence or power that newborns are all over the world presently feeling would have not occurred if the victors of WW2 stayed faithful post 1945 to the initial work program that the founding fathers of the UN proposed and did not embark on a new work program to combat social injustice using non-traditional methods. In other words, if the victors of WW2 did not approve that entities such as the UN system, international aid organizations, NGOs, charities, foundations, corporate social responsibility initiatives, government foreign aid agencies, etc. begin to regulate and provide parameters for everyday behavior, well-being and happiness along with governments. Then again, if the principal

founding fathers of the UN (i.e., Great Britain and the United States), and all the wealthy families/dynasties who before WW2 erupted did not believe that “all men are created equal” but who agreed to dismantle their empire in order to build a just and peaceful world are more and more backing away from their proclaimed readiness to collectively cooperate to reduce fear and want, there could be two motives that compelled this change of heart.

The first could only be due to the wealthy families/dynasties who are controlling regime in UN member states considering themselves exempt from the appeal of obeying the work program stipulated in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, because they perceive that the principal founding fathers of the UN (i.e., Great Britain and the United States) are themselves not observing the principles that they are preaching. This signify that those wealthy families/dynasties who are controlling regime in UN member and who are basically cooperating with those two principal founding fathers of the UN to improve international security could only be interpreting the programming that Great Britain and the United States proposing as being intended to deepen despotism and anarchy.

The second motive could be weaved in a rule that was added into the work program that all the people in rich and poor nations came together to secure, and its drawback is making people become unprepared to obey the work program that the principal founding fathers of the UN (i.e., Great Britain and the United States) suggested (i.e., the Universal Declaration of Human Rights). Evidently, this rule is one that Great Britain and the United States introduced, or gave their non-objection to it being introduced since they are the principal founding fathers of the UN.

I have no way of knowing which scenario could be frustrating people in rich and poor nations to the point of being unprepared to be ready to surrender freedom to the work program that the principal founding fathers of the UN (i.e., Great Britain and the United States) suggested.

In my opinion, what could be frustrating the wealthy families/dynasties who are controlling regime in UN member states could not be lodged in convictions that leads them into perceiving that the principal founding

fathers of the UN (i.e., Great Britain and the United States) are working to deepen despotism and anarchy in the world. In the Gospel of Mark 3:25, Jesus states, "And if a house be divided against itself, that house cannot stand."<sup>24</sup> If this afore expression literally mean that success comes from sticking together and to do anything else is to invoke disaster,<sup>25</sup> we cannot say that politics in the United States politics or in Great Britain are not polarized since 1945. If a society has plan to dominate the world its people would not be showing sign of divisiveness in every action it is taking. Actually, there is no better evidence to support that Great Britain and the United States (the principal founding fathers of the UN) could not be after deepening despotism and anarchy in the world, then the outcomes that all the wars that the United States waged since 1945 produced.

Hence no society (nation) is prepared to establish post 1945 relations that uphold the truths that the founding fathers of the UN reached, and every society (nation) is working to make the weakest consider the opinion of the strongest before taking action on his own, we cannot say that one society (nation) is working to deepen despotism and anarchy more than the other in the world because all of them are doing it. To put it differently, hence no society is prepared to consider the opinion of Great Britain and the United States (the principal founding fathers of the UN) before taking actions of their own, and no nation is prepared to be faithful to the work program set forth in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and all people in rich and poor nations are frustrated with one another and repelling each other, including torturing on moral ground thus making it impossible to know if this conduct adopted is intended to reduce fear and want or to deepen despotism and anarchy, only a rule could be compelling this disorientation.

I have no way of knowing what this rule that could be making rulers and political class in rich and poor nations consider themselves exempt from the appeal of obeying the work program stipulated in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights other than to attribute this motive to a diminution in awareness and knowledge, which is contrary to what researchers argue happened as of 1945.

---

<sup>24</sup> [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Lincoln%27s\\_House\\_Divided\\_Speech](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Lincoln%27s_House_Divided_Speech)

<sup>25</sup> <https://www.gingersoftware.com/content/phrases/a-house-divided-against-itself-cannot-stand/>

To give an example, I will use the Israeli-Palestinian conflict to reflect how awareness and knowledge has diminished in the world post 1945 instead of improve. It would have not been possible for the Jews to have accumulated all the wealth they amassed before WW2 erupted if they were not cooperating in accordance with what the Bible (Torah) counsel. Religion enchant the mind in the same way magnetism force two objects to attract to each other against their will. This means that the Jews who lived before WW2 erupted were very religious and spiritual people. An example of societies who its leaders are not religious and spiritual are the rulers and political class of most Arab nations before WW2 erupted and after WW2 erupted.

Hence it is not possible for a person to be religious and spiritual and not have values at the same time (otherwise, the society would end up dispersed as the Arabs are since the fall of the Umayyad Caliphate), this means that the Jews who wanted the victors of WW2 grant them social space to create a new country had to have been the only people in 1945 who truly believed that “all men are created equal.” In other words, this awareness and knowledge that those people had gained exemplify what mankind is trying to build.

Only one force is capable to convert a person from being with values to being without one as the rulers of Israel are portraying in recent years, and this happens only when a person stops to possess any religiosity and becomes bound by his personal power and conscience. I will not say anything about the religiosity of the Palestinian leaders, but it is not worth mentioning, because they possessed none before WW2 erupted or after.

If the Israeli leaders, and another 192 rulers in another 192 UN member states including the leaders of the United States, Great Britain, and the Vatican are not prepared to surrender freedom to the work program that the founding fathers of the UN proposed (Great Britain and the United States), then this signify that the rulers of all those nations are not impressed or awed by what the founding fathers of the UN told them they should hold sacred. If all those leaders are not impressed, this means that either awareness or knowledge diminished in the world post 1945, or there is a rule, which has made the people who were in 1945

(the Jews) oppressed because of nothing other than their awareness and knowledge to be 70 years later devoted to oppressing.

I have no way of knowing what rule could be compelling the Israeli leaders to refuse to give the Palestinians the land that the Palestinians claim the Israeli government confiscated or pay them for it, and most importantly, cooperate together thus avoid becoming an island and obliged to be devoted to doing what Great Britain spent its entire history doing to integrate, then to attribute their convictions to their unpreparedness to accept that advances in science deepens abomination instead of reducing desolation.

For example, in the 18<sup>th</sup> century, the American people reached their own truth about how all men could have been “created equal” and how they could all have been endowed by their “Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty, and the Pursuit of Happiness....”, against their will. The Americans managed to come up with the right leadership thus enabling them to cooperate with each other based on advocating popular sovereignty, including reaching to be the happiest society by 1945 (despite all the internal problem they were knowing).

Indeed, we cannot say that the families/dynasties who are controlling the state of Israel as of 1948 are cooperating with the Palestinian post 1945 while upholding the truths that the founding fathers of the United Nations reached in 1776. Nor could we say that the families/dynasties who are controlling the remaining UN member states are subscribing to this same ideal as of 1945 as well. In fact, the erratic political stance that the United States (the owner of this ideal that promote all men are created equal) has been adopting since 1945 is making many people around the world cast doubt about the truthfulness of this country toward such ideal.

Hence, we cannot say that any society (nation) is cooperating with one another while upholding the truths that the founding fathers of the UN reached in 1945, this then means that unpreparedness of the victors of WW2 to demonstrate the right leadership must be founded on the same convictions that the Israeli leaders are unprepared to accept and thus making them become unprepared to live in peace with the Palestinian.

As I said before, this conviction about advances in science deepening abomination instead of reducing desolation.

Hence the longer the rulers and political class in UN member states including the victors of WW2 take to begin to cooperate in accordance with the truth that the leaders in the United States reached in 1776 to enable them to avoid the insecurity that was waging in Europe, we can say that for as long as the rulers and political class in UN member states continue to consider themselves exempt from the appeal of surrendering freedom to the truth that the American people reached in 1776, the more all the nations would be advocating popular sovereignty publically, while implicitly subordination is the natural and normal condition.

Furthermore, because the lack of international co-operation that would be prevailing, cannot be helping the nations who have an exacerbated appetite to establish world domination, because to begin with what gives rise to tribalism and nationalism is lack of leadership, this means that mankind is in principle doomed if the intolerance (corruption, betrayal, deceit) that emerged in the world keep rising. Evidently, the first victim of this disorder or rousing that would be developing is bound to be the United States (the liberal interventionism and self-determination philosophy), if this country who is playing the global policemen of the world continue to demonstrate that it lacks the right leadership to stop its citizens and everyone else from blaming everything that has gone wrong with the world since 1945 on its rulers or political class.

Then again, it is comprehensible why all the UN member states would be hostile toward Great Britain and the United States, including why most UN member states would be in favor of stalling those two countries from making progress on their pledge to reduce fear and want around the world. What is not very clear to me is why the United States is allowing political divisions or US nationalism to rise in the US, and most importantly, why is Great Britain allowing tribalism and nationalism to rise around the world including showing no urgency to stop such phenomenon from threatening the Anglosphere.

To put it differently, the steps that any regime could adopt to continue to count on the readiness of its people to obey the political order fixed are two only. The first step requires that the rulers and political class

who consider themselves exempt from the appeal of obeying the natural and legal rights they legitimize stop permitting that any perspective spread beside the government perspective (just as the case is like in Egypt as of 2014). The second step require enforcing the ideas that the regime legitimizes just as the Lebanese are demanding the government to be accountable for as of 2019.

What is very peculiar in the way peace and security evolved as of 1945 around the world is that mankind is nowhere near where Great Britain and the United States (the principal founding fathers of the UN) said humanity would be transcending toward when they were urging all nations (societies) to adopt the international rule based postwar world order they proposed.

Then again, it is possible to comprehend why Great Britain could be in favor of letting states, local governments and private citizens fill the policy void or leadership role that this monarch as the custodian of the Anglosphere is refusing to play. What is not clear is why the United States (the global policemen of the world) is backing away from its duty to be a force for good as this country was regarded till 1945.

To put it differently, the United States was not running an empire before WW2 erupted as all western European countries were doing, or the ones who were not doing it were adopting feudal systems. The United States was the only country from 1776 to 1939 when WW2 is regarded to have erupted who espoused its own truth about how all men could have been “created equal” and how they could all have been endowed by their “Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty, and the Pursuit of Happiness....” In addition, despite all the internal problems that the United States stumbled upon from 1776 to 1939, the way the American people dealt with them was not returning them to square one as was happening in the rest of the world. All the internal problems that this country was knowing were resolved in a manner that served the common interests and not the interests of a specific faction. As of the start of the 21<sup>st</sup> century, the tenuous nature of current US national and foreign political climate is peculiar. Put differently, if we build a conservation law around the United States (i.e., this system), we cannot say that the American ideals that this country started adopting post 1945 (and in particular as of the start of the 21<sup>st</sup>

century), are the same American ideals that this country adopted from 1776 to 1945. As of 1945 (and in particular as of the start of the 21<sup>st</sup> century), the anger and the frustration of the American people with the American ideals and the anger and frustration of the world with the American ideals is not natural. In fact, as of the start of the 21<sup>st</sup> century, the rulers and political class in the US see no harm with telling their citizens that they are right to be frustrated!

Likewise, if we build a conservation law around Great Britain (i.e., this system), we cannot say that this monarch is conducting after WW2 ended in the same way its rulers and political class were conducting before World War Two erupted. This monarch is not using force as a mean to strengthen morality or social cohesion. In other words, the rulers of Great Britain are not raising awareness about democracy and the rule of law post 1945 through using force as per the way the United States is doing, and in particular, as of the start of the 21st century.

Then again, if we consider that to create outcome a person (or a nation) needs resources (human and material), it is baffling to comprehend how can a nation who throughout its entire history preserved its dominance by dominating other societies mainly because it lacks its own resources or lets' say want to get its ways despite the resistance of others, end colonialism after winning two back global wars (WW1 and WW2) and grant all the poor societies that this kingdom was dominating independence, when the principal reason why this monarch dominated other societies was to supplement its own lack of resources with the resources of others so it could increase its happiness.

Most importantly, what is more baffling about the manner Great Britain decided to preserve the Anglosphere post 1945 is its abrupt mindfulness to end the injustice of poverty and human rights violations around the world, including being, as of 1945, more Roman than the Romans on any issue that requires spending money to improve social justice (along with the Scandinavian monarchs).

If Great Britain began to exhibit the human rights mindfulness that the United States was manifesting before WW2 erupted, and the United States started manifesting the opposite after WW2 was regarded to have ended (i.e., the one that Great Britain was manifesting), then one of

those two countries or both waged on a rule that either believed is capable to allow them to continue to solidify their power, or both decided to revert themselves to a simpler form in the course of time and things.

I have no way of knowing what rule Great Britain and the United States are waging on thus compelling them into believing that they could let states, local governments and private citizens around the world violate the international rule based postwar world order that they invited everyone to adopt on the aftermath of WW2 to reduce fear and want, without such drawback weakening their wealth, status and power. What I do know is that researchers who develop technology class the fundamental changes that they introduce into existing technology according to what is called “technology generation”. For example, “the generation of computer means the gap between the development of the computer in terms of the technologies. Each generation of computer is characterized by a major technologies development that fundamentally changed the way computer operate, resulting in smaller, cheaper, and more powerful, efficient and reliable device.”<sup>26</sup>

Hence Great Britain started to count on a new method (mindfulness about human rights) to protect the Anglosphere post 1945, and the United States started to count on the method that Great Britain was using to solidify its power (force to improve morality) on the aftermath of WW2 as well, we can say that each one of those two countries began to rely on a “second generation” product or logic to begin to transform the conditions and outcomes that matters to them.

Then again, because people protect their wealth, status and power through created things; and hence people class the progressive fundamental changes they introduce to created things into technology generation, then we can say that the rule that Great Britain could be counting on to protect the Anglosphere and the rule that the United States could be counting on to solidify its power has to be a “second generation” product or logic.

---

<sup>26</sup> <https://www.quora.com/profile/Farid-Hossain-24>

Furthermore, since we cannot take the logic that is included in the work program of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights or the UN charter and manipulate it to get a second generation logic through permutation, rules of thumb, etc., we can say that the second generation rule that Great Britain and the United States could be relying on to continue to transform the conditions and outcomes that matters to them must be mainly in the form of a variable (such as a product).

For example, when Great Britain was throughout the 19<sup>th</sup> century till the middle of the 20<sup>th</sup> century (1939) controlling the sea and all the trading posts that played important role in global economic, through relying on product such as ships, cannon, etc., and on logic that involve domination what this country was relying on was first generation product and technology. Similarly, we can say that when this country (Great Britain) began to rely post 1945 on artificial intelligence, computers, drones, etc. (product) and on mindfulness about human rights (logic) to solidify its power, what this country started relying on to continue to transform the conditions and outcomes that matters to its members was second generation product and logic.

I have no way of knowing if the families/dynasties who control Great Britain and the United States did right by making those two countries abandon the methods and values that each societies depended on before WW2 erupted to gets its way despite the resistance of the other in order to begin to secure the same glory post 1945 using artificial intelligence, computers, robots, etc.

Then again, hence we know that ships, trains, stock markets, trading markets, etc., are not going to become obsolete anytime soon, the question that would be begging an answer would be knowing whether or not the families/dynasties who control Great Britain, for example, would be better off solidifying their power if this monarch protect the Anglosphere (ships, markets, technology, logic, money, stock markets, trading markets, etc.) using real men (human ingenuity) as this country was doing till 1945, or to delegate this role to computers and machines (software that tracks ships, stock markets like the NASDAQ, satellites, etc.,) as it is doing is better.

Said differently, we know very well that the more researchers seek to make computers, robots, machines, etc., do more to perform faster (push the envelope, etc.), the more the improved iterations would be making people obtain answers faster (improve living standard), but at the expense of making the number of people who would be becoming ignorant grow much faster. In simplified terms, the majority of the items that surround us are produced by melting an element (metal, sand, etc.), pouring the liquid metal or sand into a mold, then allowing it to solidify to form a shape. Humans were till the middle of the 20<sup>th</sup> century capable to produce and operate the machinery and equipment they use to improve their living standards themselves (using human ingenuity and human body). The process to produce computer chips follow a similar course used in the production of essential consumer goods (pipes, cups, engines) but with one exception. The casting process (patternmaking, molding, melting, pouring, ejection, cleaning, fettling and inspection) is happening at very small scale. Man was not programmed or equipped with the degree of precision needed to put such process together. In other words, the role of the human body is almost zero. Furthermore, because computer chips are used to make equipment and machineries operate on their own (distance human ingenuity from continuing to develop knowhow), this means that the more humans delegate to computer chips (automation) the role the human body and human ingenuity was programmed to serve in nature (making them both become idle), the more the number of people who would be getting ignorant should be reciprocally growing equally faster.

I have no way of knowing if the families/dynasties who control the international order or the money supply of the world would be solidifying their power better if the five permanent members of the UN Security Council (Great Britain, the United States, China, Russia and France) protect them as per the way Julius Caesar<sup>27</sup>, (100 BC – 44 BC), Roman general, or William the Conqueror<sup>28</sup> (1028 – 1087), king of England, were doing it relying solely on human ingenuity, or if they would be better off doing it as per the way it is done right now (this task is split between human ingenuity and computers and machinery, but while aware that humans are half ignorant or blind, because man does not know how to troubleshoot such equipment when they malfunction

---

<sup>27</sup> [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Julius\\_Caesar](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Julius_Caesar)

<sup>28</sup> [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/William\\_the\\_Conqueror](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/William_the_Conqueror)

or analyze the large data they generate). What I do know is that humans live on land, and the resources which humans rely on to sustain their survival needs and satiate their earthly desires are located on land as well. Likewise, when Julius Caesar or William the Conqueror were making changes they were not afraid of their own power. In fact, it looks as if Julius Caesar or William the Conqueror intelligence is not necessary to have immense influence over the world or over the course of human evolution, particularly since we are still following the convictions they charted.

To put it differently, when Great Britain dominated a large number of societies throughout the second half of the second millennium, this monarch managed to achieve its superiority by controlling the consciousness of those dominated societies (love, pain, hate, etc.) and not their intelligence. In other words, even though the societies who Great Britain administered did not have ships' and guns to defend themselves with, they had at their disposal weapons that were more powerful. Those weapons were the Bible, Quran, the Vedas, etc. This is because those biblical and philosophical books teach people about the existence of good and evil. Therefore, because those societies were as intelligent as the Brits were (i.e., capable to betray, crisscross, backstab), Great Britain kept those societies passive by keeping them away from feeling any love, hate, pain. etc. Simply put, Great Britain (the government) did not organize before 1945 conferences in the territories of the societies that this monarch was administering or on its own soil, and asked citizens to come together and to protest for social justice, climate justice, LGBT justice, animal rights, etc., as this monarch began doing post 1945. Accordingly, it is highly likely that the low human right profile or mindfulness that Great Britain adopted before 1945 could have helped this monarch and smaller monarchs like Belgium who is about 77 times smaller than the Democratic Republic of the Congo,<sup>29</sup> and whose population was also relatively greatly smaller than the DRC<sup>30</sup> to abuse the Congolese and keep them passive during 100 years. And so if mankind needs to have people stay unconscious (ignorant) not necessarily because man is evil by nature,

---

<sup>29</sup> <https://www.mylifeelsewhere.com/country-size-comparison/belgium/democratic-republic-of-congo>

<sup>30</sup> <https://www.mylifeelsewhere.com/country-size-comparison/democratic-republic-of-congo/belgium>

but because it is not possible to have all the people around the world compelling evil at the same time, could the families/dynasties who control the international order or the money supply of the world manage to solidify their power when all the people are developing awareness at the same time? In other words, if the reason why the Belgians managed to abuse the Congolese during 100 years is because it was the Belgians who were relying on the idea of evil to get their ways despite the resistance of the Congolese and the Congolese were tolerating them because they were pure people, can the families/dynasties who control the international order or the money supply of the world manage to solidify their power when another 90 million Congolese begin to be bound by their personal power and conscience in addition to the already 11 million people who are in Belgium refusing to cooperate in accordance with political order legitimized in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights?

It looks as if the reason why the Belgians, French, Brits, and the rest of the western European nations (the old powers) managed to abuse the Congolese, and the Lebanese, and the Egyptians, and the Chinese, and the Indians, and the Malaysians, and the Indonesians, etc., etc. before WW2 erupted, was because those powerful monarchs and nations were taking the resources that those poor societies possessed but were leaving them with the goodness that existed in their heart. Could those rich monarchs and nations (old powers) manage to continue to solidify their power after they decided to persuade all the societies that they were dominating to stop to cope as per the way they were doing and invited them to be as wicked as they are? To make matter worse, those rich monarchs and nations (old powers) enlisted the intergovernmental organization named United Nations to help them accelerate the dependence of people on intolerance, anger, partisanship, division, corruption, betrayal, disobedience, tribalism, nationalism, etc. to get their ways, instead of teaching them to adopt the work program that the United States used to make citizens relatively passive from 1776 to 1945.

And so, once again, if the families/dynasties who control the international order or the money supply of the world do not want the same homo sapiens culture that existed throughout the first and second millennium to continue to roam the earth, and prefer that an enhanced

culture of homo sapiens start doing it during this third millennium (just as researchers usher technological iterations into technology generation), many questions beg answers. For one, could the families/dynasties who control the international order or the money supply of the world manage to continue to get their ways despite the resistance of others if the new people that would be roaming the earth with them would be as intelligent or as wicked as they are?

To put it differently, when researchers seek to make computers, robots, machines, etc., do more to perform faster (push the envelope, etc.), what those researchers are doing is making people obtain answers faster. If intelligence and consciousness enhances people awareness, and future newborns would be using their intelligence and consciousness to refuse to cooperate in accordance with the work program stipulated in the Universal Declaration of Human rights as we are doing since 1945, this signify that mankind is building to develop a generation of people whose unpreparedness to obey, or to be tolerant, etc. should be also faster just as researchers do when they seek to make computers, robots, machines, etc., obtain answers faster to improve living standards.

That is said, if the new enhanced humans that would be roaming the earth with the families/dynasties who control the international order or the money supply of the world would be a breed of people that would be, most likely, not any different from the one Zuhayr bin Abī Sūlmā (520 – 609), a pre-Islamic Arabian poet who lived in the 6<sup>th</sup> and 7<sup>th</sup> centuries<sup>31</sup> said in his famous poem titled *general truth or piece of advice*<sup>32</sup> occurs when newborn are breastfed vice from their parents (intolerance, anger, partisanship, division, corruption, betrayal, disobedience, tribalism, nationalism, etc.), then could those powerful families/dynasties solidify their power if wickedness happens to rule on land, and the five permanent members of the UN Security Council (Great Britain, the United States, China, Russia and France) who are protecting them are controlling all the ships that roams the sea or the satellites (computers and machinery) that roams the space?

In other words, would the families/dynasties who control the international order or the money supply of the world be able to continue

---

<sup>31</sup> [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Zuhayr\\_bin\\_Abi\\_Sulma](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Zuhayr_bin_Abi_Sulma)

<sup>32</sup> <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mu%27allaqat>

to solidify their power and transform the conditions and outcomes that matters to them when the thing newborns would have going for them is reliance on intolerance, anger, partisanship, division, corruption, betrayal, disobedience, tribalism, nationalism, etc. to get their ways despite the resistance of others, and the powerful families/dynasties and the five permanent members of the UN Security Council (Great Britain, the United States, China, Russia and France) who protect them are holding to nothing basically. This is because the ships they depend on are kept in the water and humans live on land and not in the water; Likewise, all the satellites, drones, internets, that the five permanent members of the UN Security Council (Great Britain, the United States, China, Russia and France) are protecting those powerful families/dynasties with are roaming in the space, and humans live on land and do not float in space.

Said differently, if no amount of careful planning will ever be enough to fully protect the families/dynasties who control the international order or the money supply of the world if wickedness on earth rise because artificial intelligence is very complex to troubleshoot and man cannot analyze the huge amount of data that algorithm produce to reach a conclusion (it takes 11 days for a person to just count from 1 to million),<sup>33</sup> this means that the families/dynasties who control the international order or the money supply of the world, could learn the hard way about one of life's very tough lessons. This lesson is to not underestimate the power of distrust, jealousy, anger, impatience, frustration, tribalism, nationalism, etc.

Furthermore, since we cannot say that this abnormal rise in distrust, jealousy, anger, impatience, frustration, tribalism, nationalism, etc. that emerged in the world as of 1945 is due to the work program that the founding fathers of the UN counselled the victors of WW2 to obey (because this wok program was not implemented), but rather to the decision of the victors of WW2 to task the UN with ending social injustice, climate injustice, etc. etc., this means that the reach of the old powers (Belgium, France, Great Britain, and the rest of the western European nations) or the new powers (the United states, China, Russia,

---

<sup>33</sup> [https://airandspace.si.edu/exhibitions/explore-the-universe/online/etu/html/digital\\_age/architecture/arch\\_bil.html#:~:text=%2D%201%20Million%3A%20To%20count%20to,take%20you%20about%2011%20days](https://airandspace.si.edu/exhibitions/explore-the-universe/online/etu/html/digital_age/architecture/arch_bil.html#:~:text=%2D%201%20Million%3A%20To%20count%20to,take%20you%20about%2011%20days).

Brazil, India, etc.) to the manpower or resources they were capable to easily have access to, or continually need to enable them to maintain their relative status or power stable should have shrunk. In other words, if as of the date the victors of WW2 commissioned the intergovernmental organization named United Nations to teach farmers living in remote places about democracy, and most importantly, about how computers and the internet could help them to reduce middlemen fees and increase their profits, we do have a new breed of a much smarter species of humans now roaming the earth, then we have engineered new people. If access to social space and material of terrestrial origin (air, water, food and natural elements) are a prerequisite to amass wealth, power, and status, it looks as if this tradeoff that the old powers proposed to the poor in return of helping them to defeat Germany does not seem to be paying them off as much as they may have anticipated they would be reaping when they proposed it the poor before WW2 erupted. This tradeoff, of course, was the offer of the old powers to the poor societies to fight on their side to defeat the Germans in return for granting them self-determination (independence). It looks as if the old powers and the new powers are ruling over lots of ships, machineries, computers and data as of 1945, and not as much over real humans. This is very serious and worrisome. This is because the poor societies expect the rich societies to cooperate with them based on the principles of equal rights, and the rich societies believe that without the technology and data collection tools that they possess and are protecting with weapons of mass destruction, the poor societies would not be able to increase their happiness as they would like.

Ali, son-in-law of the Islamic prophet Muhammad, said “the more the truth becomes clearer, the more enemies it would have.”<sup>34</sup> We cannot say that the poor would be in favor of drifting from the truths because they have only two options to increase their happiness. The first is to reinvent the wheel (i.e., learn to fabricate all the technologies that the rich societies possess and are denying them). The second option is to cooperate based on the principles of equal rights. We cannot say that the rich societies have the same options. The rich societies can use force to make the poor societies to surrender freedom to them, or would accept

---

<sup>34</sup> <https://almerja.com/azaat/indexv.php?id=4030>

to cooperate based on the principles of equal rights with the poor societies.

Let us divide societies into two groups: urban and rural. Let the rural society be a constant.

Throughout history mankind has been divided between those who believe that the corruption of the subjects (in urban cities) is a reflection of the ruler and their righteousness is a reflection of their ruler righteousness. Likewise, others argue that rulers echo a sample of the environment or nature of the society, and therefore the people are the ones who bear the burden of the corruption of their rulers.

In 1945, the world underwent a political, economic and social reset (the odometer was set to zero). Therefore, we cannot say that the United Nations (the nations) failed to prevent wars on the aftermath of WW2 because the poor societies (in urban cities) are not obeying the work program set forth in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, or the rich societies (in urban areas) are the one who is refusing to do it. Both, the poor societies and the rich societies are refusing to obey the work program set forth in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights or the UN Charter.

If we equate the options I said earlier that the rich and the poor societies have to create balance and then subtract from each one the unpreparedness of either society to cooperate based on the principles of equal rights, we would be left with two options on each side of this equation. On one side, we would be left with the option of the poor societies trying to reinvent the wheel to get their ways despite the resistance of others, and on the other side of the equation we would be left with the rich societies relying on force to get their ways.

Indeed, this afore conclusion on what the families/dynasties who control the international order or the money supply of the world need to be balancing out to continue to solidify their powers captures the dilemma that has overwhelmed mankind since antiquity, and its drawback has prevented newborns from becoming capable to obey the natural and legal rules that gets legitimized.

I have no way of knowing how the families/dynasties who control the international order or the money supply of the world intend to keep the international order stable when all people of all ages and sexes and not only the rulers and the political class begin to view the world as an arena for the permanent struggle for social justice, environmental justice, etc., etc. between people.

For example, one of Belgium principal source of wealth is its dependence on diamond as a source of industry and trade. Likewise, one of the principal source of wealth for the Scandinavian countries is their dependence on Coltan mining which is a principal material of terrestrial origin that is used in the fabrication of phones and computers. Diamond and Coltan are not readily available in western Europe but they are available in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. Hence the Congolese are the underdog here because their Diamond or Coltan would be worth nothing if the Belgians and the Scandinavians do not give it values, this means that if the Congolese do not want to be entangled in a game of throne with the Belgians and the Scandinavians and be trapped blaming each other for the problem of the other, those actors have two choices. They could use force in the hope that the strongest would be able to make the weakest consider the opinion of the strongest. The second choice would be raising each other's awareness in the hope that they could manage to unify their voices.

Traditionally, the use of force (bloodshed, pogroms, etc.) has not helped those proponents who waged on such recourse to get their ways except when this remedy was founded on a strategy that sought total annihilation (physical and mental wiping) by the conquering force of opponents.

Research in genetic engineering is developing at breakneck speed. Indeed, the rich nations who are competing to find out who would be the first at telling the other to consider its opinion before taking actions on their own will soon be able to solve the philosophical question about who to kill or who to spare.

I have no way of knowing if the biological inequality (skin color, height, weight, etc.) that exist already between humans is a result of gene editing method that our predecessors developed, or if this inequality is

due to all the technical and philosophical hypothesis that investigators suggest. What I do know is that until the rich begin to determine who shall live and who shall die (or govern based on biological castes), it would be necessary that those who are playing the deputy of God role already on earth keep the social order under control to enable them to continue to transform the conditions and outcomes that matters to them.

Therefore, since between now and when the families/dynasties who are playing the deputy of God role on earth already begin to sell their gene editing technology to the highest bidder, mankind would have no choice but to rely on the use of force or awareness in the hope that such recourse could manage to gather followers and unify voices, this means that those powerful families/dynasties must keep distrust, jealousy, anger, impatience, frustration, tribalism, nationalism, corruption, deceit, etc. under control.

I have no way of knowing the families/dynasties who control the international order or the money supply of the world have to reduce distrust, jealousy, anger, impatience, frustration, tribalism, nationalism, corruption, deceit, etc. without people becoming ready to surrender freedom to values that are legitimized in the American ideals, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, or religious and philosophical scriptures.

What I do know is that in the Quran it is stated in verse 122-129 of Surah Al An'am that God has programmed humans with knowledge, cognition, and awareness to help people distinguish between right and wrong, good from evil, and honesty from dishonesty. Accordingly, God programmed that wicked leaders roam in every land so that all those who refuse to accept the values (truth) proposed in religious scriptures lead all those who find pleasure in every act of distrust, jealousy, anger, impatience, frustration, tribalism, nationalism, corruption, deceit, etc. to renewed experiences of distrust, jealousy, anger, impatience, frustration...., hoping that where they were previously unsuccessful they will now find success.<sup>35</sup> This is very serious and worrisome.

---

<sup>35</sup> <https://www.islamicstudies.info/tafheem.php?sura=6&verse=122&to=129>

Simply put, if for as long as people stay unprepared to surrender freedom to values that are legitimized in the American ideals, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, or religious and philosophical scriptures, there would be wicked leaders (or people) who would be roaming in every land to weave their plots; but in truth they would be plotting only to their own harm, without even realizing it, [Surah Al An'am 6:123] this means that the failure of mankind to reduce distrust, jealousy, anger, impatience, frustration, tribalism, nationalism, corruption, deceit, etc. would be tangled in the existence of lots of false teachers.

Jesus warned about the rise of false teachers throughout his ministry. Then again, it would be naïve to suppose that Jesus was warning the poor to be cautious of incorrect or unsound doctrine (policies) spiraling them or steering them toward deeper incertitude. In other words, it would be naïve to suppose that Jesus was cautioning the poor to be aware of the invitation of the rich to cooperate with them to reaffirm faith in human rights, because this invitation could be a pretext to help those rich nations have access to the resources that exists in those poor nations and avoid the ramifications that their lack of access could tax them. Simply put, if all the people who are already poor are in the situation that they are in is because they are ignorant or are refusing to acknowledge Darwin concept on the theory of evolution (survival of the fittest), it would be naïve to suppose that Jesus was warning the poor societies to be cautious against other fit people (societies) diverting them away from correct and sound doctrine or maturity, when they are already off course (confused and blind).

Hence, the invitation of the old powers to all the poor nations to cooperate with them in 1945 based on the principles of equal rights can never be a threat for the poor nations but an opportunity to grow, Jesus's warning to be careful of false teachers could only be intended for the rich nations, because they are the one who are going to lose if distrust, jealousy, anger, impatience, frustration, tribalism, nationalism, corruption, deceit, etc. deepens in their own sphere (environment).

Furthermore, since it is the curiosities and exploration of the societies who live in developed or rich nations is what made those societies believe that when men pushes' the boundaries of his scientific and

technical limits, and then push further, that such strategy deepens happiness, this means that it is people who live in those developed or rich nations who are refusing to cooperate with the poor societies based on the principles set forth in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and not the other way around. This is because it is the members of those rich societies who are unprepared to be tolerant and who believe that when they deepen their modernity they would be happier.

To give an example, it is not the Congolese who are fabricating computers and cell phones so we could say that the people in this society are unprepared to be tolerant because they need to increase their happiness. To the contrary, it is the rich societies (Norway, Sweden, Denmark, the Netherlands, Italy, Great Britain, the United States, etc.) who are unprepared to be patient and want the Coltan that exists in the Congo to be able to increase their happiness, because this resource does not exist on their soil (also, if it exists it would be too expensive to recover).

Moreover, because those societies who live in developed or rich nations cannot satisfy their curiosities or increase their happiness without access to the resources that others are possessing and they desperately need, or force on others the created things that they are always producing to keep their manufacturing industries up and running, this means that those rich societies could rely on two options to get their ways despite the resistance of others. The first is if those developed or rich nations rely on force to obtain the resources that others are possessing and they need (also sell them the goods they produce). The other is to rely on distrust, jealousy, anger, impatience, frustration, tribalism, nationalism, corruption, deceit, etc. to manage to obtain the resources they need or sell the goods they produce.

I already shared the drawback of relying on force to enable any society (culture) to get its ways despite the resistance of others. Then again, hence the developed or rich nations cannot obtain the resources they need to satisfy their curiosity through relying on distrust, jealousy, anger, impatience, frustration, tribalism, nationalism, corruption, deceit, etc., because most people for the exception of the rich (rulers or political class) refuse to establish relations based on such immoral principles, this means that those societies who are unprepared to control their

imagination, can only rely on the “idea of good” to get their ways despite the resistance of others.

In other words, since the developed or rich societies (nations) refuse to let the inventions that their researchers are coming up with since 1945 wait until the economic and social gap between rich and poor nations improve (the inventions to combat diseases are not factored); and refuse to cooperate on the basis of equality of opportunity among each other or with poor societies; and refuse to create a new economic reset; and all what those rich and developed nations are doing is convince themselves that the technology and industries that they are controlling and denying other poorer societies access to so its leaders could preoccupy their manpower overflow with is helping them and helping everyone to foster a peaceful connection, then we can say that what those rich countries are doing is nothing that is any different than what the people who embraced the ideas Jesus was teaching and after his crucifixion started doing. Those adherents began to use the ideas of Jesus as a tool to transform the conditions and outcomes that mattered to them (i.e., the individuals involved). In addition, those adherents began to partake in missions that its objective was to spread the ideas of Jesus to solidify their powers.

Indeed, what the old powers (Belgium, France, Great Britain, and the rest of the western European nations) or the new powers (the United states, China, Russia, Brazil, India, etc.) are doing since 1945 is nothing that is any different than what the people who embraced the ideas Jesus was teaching and after his crucifixion started doing in antiquity.

Those adherents to the ideas of Jesus called themselves “Christians.” The adherents to the ideas that the founding fathers determined in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights or UN Charter call themselves “United Nations.” Likewise, as in antiquity, the adherents to the Christian faith were fielding missions to spread the ideas of Jesus in villages, the old powers and the new powers are doing the same presently. In fact, it is not mentioned in the Bible if the adherents to the philosophy of Christ were injecting money in the societies that they were visiting and inviting its inhabitants to convert to Christianity. Presently, the missions that the old powers and the new powers field, its

members are all granted right to inject money in the societies that they are asking to stop to cope as they are doing and to be modernized.

We cannot say that the missions that the old powers and the new powers are fielding are preparing the societies that they are teaching its members to stop to and to be modernized is improving democracy and the rule of law as well. This is because if this was the case, Lebanon would have not become a chaotic state and Egypt would have not switched its achievements from being about building pyramids to building roads and prisons.

Indeed, the missions that the adherents to the ideas of Jesus fielded to villages to invite pagans to convert to Christianity did not end the injustice of poverty or the creation of conditions of stability and well-being, but sustained social hierarchy and deepened despotism and anarchy. In fact, the only victor from the ideas of Jesus so far has been the Catholic Church. What if the only victor of this new attempt to end the injustice of poverty or the creation of conditions of stability and well-being end up the families/dynasties who control the intergovernmental organization named United Nations and not the families/dynasties who control UN member states!

I have no way of knowing if the goal of the families/dynasties who control the international order or the money supply of the world from having the old powers and the new powers field missions around the world to teach its beneficiaries to abandon their values and traditions in favor of being modernized is because they are working to set up a common political authority for all of humanity that the international organization named United Nations would lead or not. Many rulers throughout history aspired to create a single state or polity with jurisdiction over the entire human world, but then they were blamed for everything that was wrong with the world, and were reverted to a simpler form. What compelled the disintegration of the rulers who thought that they were invincible was not a default in the tools that they were depending on for their protection, but a default in the heart of the people who were protecting them. This default was distrust, jealousy, anger, impatience, frustration, etc.

The idiom biter bit is used to indicate that someone can be treated in the same way they have treated others.<sup>36</sup> Indeed, the regular protests, cancel culture that the rich nations are knowing in recent years reflect how their unpreparedness to be faithful to the work program that the founding fathers of the UN proposed to solidify their power is overwhelming them.

In the Bible, in the gospel of Luke Chapter 12, we read that Jesus told his disciples, “be on your guard against the yeast of the Pharisees, which is hypocrisy. There is nothing concealed that will not be disclosed, or hidden that will not be made known. [Luke 12:1-2] He (Jesus) then adds that when a manager is in charge of giving food to servants on behalf of his master and then the servant begins to neglect his responsibilities, when his masters comes back, he will be reprimanded or judged according to the level of disregard he committed. [Luke 12: 47-48]

Then again, it is not possible to suppose that the families/dynasties who were controlling the international order or the money supply of the world during WW2 (i.e., the families/dynasties who controlled Great Britain and all the western European countries) were unaware that only through a horde of men or gold (money) can a person (or a society) strengthen his (its) power, wealth or status. The preparedness of the families/dynasties who were controlling the old powers to free (decolonize) the poor nations, and to allow them to possess right to exercise authority over their national territory post 1945 (which is a milestone unheard of in the history of human rights) support inclination to improve morality in the world. Accordingly, the preparedness of the families/dynasties who were controlling the old powers to create conditions of well-being post 1945 is evidence to support the aspiration of those former colonizers to build a form of international rule based postwar world order that would improve the standard of life for everyone. In other words, the mindfulness of the families/dynasties who were controlling the old powers during WW2 support that they were wise servants to the idea of good and not irresponsible servants so the punishment that Jesus said in his parable await irresponsible people could affect them.

---

<sup>36</sup> [https://www.lexico.com/definition/the\\_biter\\_bitten](https://www.lexico.com/definition/the_biter_bitten)

Hence, the mindfulness of the families/dynasties who were controlling the old powers about the human worth during WW2 does not support that those families/dynasties were in favor of continuing to deepen fear and want in the world post 1945, what could be compelling this rise in distrust, jealousy, anger, impatience, frustration, tribalism, nationalism, corruption, deceit, etc. that emerged in the world post 1945 cannot be frustration that is resulting from those old powers preferring to follow their old crooked paths and the challenges that they are facing to dominate the world is pushing them to behave immorally.

To put it differently, throughout the history of the world, a mind that became wise showed sign that it could be treacherous. However, the preparedness of the families/dynasties who were controlling the old powers to free (decolonize) the poor nations, and to allow them to possess right to exercise authority over their national territory post 1945 (which is a milestone unheard of in the history of human rights), is a conduct that men who have plan to dominate the world would never undertake.

Said differently, this abnormal rise in distrust, jealousy, anger, impatience, frustration, tribalism, nationalism, corruption, deceit, etc. that emerged in the world post 1945 cannot be frustration that is resulting from the unpreparedness of the wealthy families/dynasties who allied with Great Britain to win WW2 (defeat Germany) but who did not believe that “all men are created equal” thus they are backing away from their proclaimed pledge to build a just and peaceful world post 1945, nor it can be tangled in Great Britain or the rest of the old powers including the United States not doing much to push their citizens to cooperate based on the principles stipulated in the UN Charter.

As I said before, there has to be a rule that the principal founding fathers of the UN (i.e., Great Britain and the United States) introduced in the international order that was not initially agreed upon when this idea to replace the League of Nations with the intergovernmental organization named United Nations was approved. The frustration that this rule is compelling could be what has given way to this abnormal rise in distrust, jealousy, anger, impatience, frustration, tribalism, nationalism, corruption, deceit, etc. that emerged in the world post 1945. Accordingly, the frustration that this rule is compelling could be what

is pushing the wealthy families/dynasties who proposed to replace the League of Nations with the intergovernmental organization named United Nations and the wealthy families/dynasties who allied with Great Britain to win WW2 (defeat Germany) but who did not believe that “all men are created equal” to the brink of preferring to back away from their proclaimed pledge to build a just and peaceful world post 1945.

Then again, even though it is not possible to call this rule out or know where it is lodged specifically, because as I said, it is blended in the ideas of good that all people say they are fostering, we do know that its nuisance or repulsion cannot be something that the families/dynasties who won WW2 perceived as being a threat or that it could be one day one. In other words, if there were a rule that the families/dynasties who won WW2 believed could be threatening their strength and stability post 1945, they would have not accepted to invite all the members of the human family to cooperate with them in the economic, political or social field on the principles of equal rights, or to liberate (decolonize) the poor nations and be ready to cooperate with them (the poor) to help build a just and peaceful world.

Likewise, it would be anti-logic to argue how this rule that could be frustrating the wealthy and powerful families/dynasties in poor and rich countries, or those who believe that all men are created equal and those who believe in social hierarchy, to the point of being ready to back away from their proclaimed readiness to build a just and peaceful world post 1945 to be tied to economic rivalry, competition, religion, environmental degradation, overpopulation, etc. etc. If those wealthy and powerful families/dynasties supposed that those factors would be a drawback, they would have not agreed to get on-board to promote democratic process. People make plans to ensure that their strength and stability are upheld in the future and not in the present.

Furthermore, we cannot say that the different ideas that were stipulated in the UN charter in 1945 were revolutionary or far-reaching, because the work program that was proposed was not something new or something that mankind did not test with to develop evidence that it is doable. The happiness that the Americans knew by 1945 (despite all internal problem from 1776 to 1945) serve as evidence to support that it

is possible to use the idea of liberal interventionism or the idea of self-determination to improve democracy and the rule of law. The ideas that are stipulated in the UN charter cannot be a motive to support why this abnormal rise in distrust, jealousy, anger, impatience, frustration, tribalism, nationalism, corruption, deceit, etc. that emerged in the world post 1945, or why the wealthy and powerful families/dynasties in poor and rich countries, or those who believe that all men are created equal and those who believe in social hierarchy seem to be backing away from their pledge to cooperate according to the proposed standards.

In my opinion, only one rule could have prompted the wealthy and powerful families/dynasties in poor and rich countries, or those who believe that all men are created equal and those who believe in social hierarchy to appear as if they are backing away from their pledge to surrender freedom to jointly build a just and peaceful world or to use the idea of self-determination as a tool build a better world. This rule can only be the result of causality (cause and effect) that was not agreed upon or discussed in 1945. In other words, what could be triggering the unpreparedness of the wealthy and powerful families/dynasties in poor and rich countries, or those who believe that all men are created equal and those who believe in social hierarchy to be ready to surrender freedom to the work program that they all pledged to obey to build the just and peaceful world (i.e., the Universal Declaration of Human Rights) has to be tangled in the introduction of a “change order” or “addendum” to the initial scope, thus making the new modified scope become aspirations that are over and above what was discussed and agreed upon in 1945 between the victors of WW2 and the poor nations. It is the frustration that people in rich and poor nations are bearing from this “change order” or “addendum” to the initial scope, what could be prompting this abnormal rise in distrust, jealousy, anger, impatience, frustration, tribalism, nationalism, corruption, deceit, etc. that emerged in the world post 1945.

Moreover, hence it was the victors of WW2 who invited the rich and poor societies to surrender freedom to attain the goals stipulated in the UN charter, we could say that the families/dynasties who did the invitation are the ones who introduced this new rule (change in scope) that its distress appear to be pushing people in rich and poor nations to walk away from the commitments that their leaders pledged on their

behalf, and in which they guaranteed that they would be ready to surrender freedom to the work program set forth in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights to ultimately build a just and peaceful world.

In order to bring to light what this specific rule that I believe could be pushing people in rich and poor nations to the point of favoring backing away from obeying the work program set forth in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights to ultimately build a just and peaceful world, I suggest to share how the victors of WW2 (the founding fathers of the UN) programmed that the international postwar world order be structured like on the aftermath of WW2, and how the case is like today. This exercise should also aid to determine if the new international postwar world order that was erected would make the distressing effect of this rule stand out.

In 1997 Townsend Hoopes<sup>37</sup> (1922 – 2004), an American historian and government official, and Douglas Brinkley<sup>38</sup> (born 1960), an American author, published a book on the creation of the United Nations. The book was titled *FDR and the Creation of the UN*.<sup>39</sup> In this book, Hoopes and Brinkley state that Franklin D. Roosevelt, 32nd President of the United States, envisioned the United Nations to consist of three branches: an executive branch comprising the Big Four (Great Britain, the United States, China and the Soviet Union), an enforcement branch composed of the same four great powers acting as the Four Policemen, and an international assembly representing the member nations of the UN. Most importantly, the Four Policemen would be responsible for keeping order within their spheres of influence: Britain in its empire and in Western Europe; the Soviet Union in Eastern Europe and the central Eurasian landmass; China in East Asia and the Western Pacific; and the United States in the Western hemisphere.

Indeed, the political and social canvas that exist around the world is totally different today to what President Franklin D. Roosevelt envisioned. The intergovernmental organization named United Nations

---

<sup>37</sup> [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Townsend\\_Hoopes](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Townsend_Hoopes)

<sup>38</sup> [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Douglas\\_Brinkley](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Douglas_Brinkley)

<sup>39</sup> Hoopes, Townsend; Brinkley, Douglas (1997). *FDR and the Creation of the U.N.*. Yale University Press. ISBN 978-0-300-08553-2.

has now offices in 193 nations, and has a countless number of organizations and bodies who are preparing people to achieve the UN goals as well as selling watches, t-shirts and mugs,<sup>40,41,42</sup> while enjoying privileges and immunities. In as far as how the Four Policemen are keeping order, there is a lot that could be said. For one, the United States is increasingly giving the impression in recent years that it would not be happy if it reaches to have its soldiers control the maneuvering of ships in the South China Sea, but only if its soldiers direct traffic in the street of Beijing. Likewise, instead of China's soldiers building silk roads in China and Asia only, this country is increasingly giving the impression in recent years that it would not feel accomplished until its soldiers finish this road at a stand that would be selling silk in front of the White house.

I have no way of knowing if the families/dynasties who won WW2 or the leaders of the Big Four who were doing the negotiation on behalf of those families/dynasties programmed or counselled that the United Nations ground become a place to sell t-shirts and mugs, as well as a place that those four nations who were going to do the policing of the world would go to in order to avert wars between each other and between the nations that were given independence to keep order. It is important to note that France was later added to the number of countries that were supposed to be doing the policing of the world, bringing the total number to five - to permit to have a quorum.

Likewise, I have no way of knowing if the families/dynasties who won WW2 or the leaders of the Big Four who were doing the negotiation on behalf of those families/dynasties programmed or counselled to have each UN member state create an international aid organization such as the one that the British Government created (i.e., Department for International Development which was replaced by the Foreign, Commonwealth & Development Office in 2020)<sup>43</sup>, so each country open 193 offices to accelerate the attainment of a just and peaceful world. Similarly, if the leaders of the Big Four programmed or

---

<sup>40</sup> <https://shop.undp.org/collections/all>

<sup>41</sup> <https://www.market.unicefusa.org/>

<sup>42</sup> <https://shop.un.org/united-nations-bookshop>

<sup>43</sup> <https://www.gov.uk/government/organisations/department-for-international-development>

counselled that the intergovernmental organization named United Nations create self-financed organizations such as UNDP, WFP, UNHCR, UNOPS, UNICEF, etc. and to help each organization open 193 offices in 193 nations to accelerate the attainment of a just and peaceful world. In like manner, if the leaders of the Big Four programmed or counselled that any religious and humanitarian groups create non-governmental organization such as Oxfam, the Red Cross, etc. and to open 193 offices in 193 nations to accelerate the attainment of a just and peaceful world as well. Last but not least, if the leaders of the Big Four programmed or counselled that any person who is wealthy or who wish to dedicate himself to the service of his neighbor interfere in the preparation of people to build a just and peaceful world by opening 193 offices in 193 nations to accelerate the attainment of a just and peaceful world.

Could the failure to deliver on the consideration of the victors of WW2 (the most powerful families/dynasties) on the war aims they fixed in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights be due to all the added amendments that the Big Four introduced into the original scope thus prompting the failure of governments to deliver on the aspirations fixed? Definitely, this idea to let the UN population<sup>44,45</sup>, for example, become larger than the population of some of the nations<sup>46</sup> that this intergovernmental organization was created to coordinate their relations is unorthodox and revolutionary in the history of governance.

Structural functionalism, is "a framework for building theory that sees society as a complex system whose parts work together to promote solidarity and stability."<sup>47</sup> Structural functionalism looks at society through a macro-level orientation. In sociology, social action is an act which takes into account the actions and reactions of individuals (or agents).<sup>48</sup> According to Max Weber<sup>49</sup> (1864-1920), German Sociologist, "Action is 'social' insofar as its subjective meaning takes account of the behavior of others and is thereby oriented in its course."

---

<sup>44</sup> [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/United\\_Nations\\_System](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/United_Nations_System)

<sup>45</sup> [https://www.un.org/en/pdfs/un\\_system\\_chart.pdf](https://www.un.org/en/pdfs/un_system_chart.pdf)

<sup>46</sup> <https://www.worldometers.info/world-population/population-by-country/>

<sup>47</sup> [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Structural\\_functionalism](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Structural_functionalism)

<sup>48</sup> [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Social\\_actions](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Social_actions)

<sup>49</sup> [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Max\\_Weber](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Max_Weber)

I do not know if the different shadow governments (UN agencies, International aid organizations operated by governments, NGOs, charities, etc.), are generating a set of collective consciousness (set of shared beliefs, ideas, and moral attitudes which operate as a unifying force within society).<sup>50</sup> If we take for example the United Nations system (i.e., subsidiaries organs and bodies) which operate a political authority in all 193 UN member states, we cannot say that people are varying (modifying) their actions in a meaningful way or according to what this international organization claim that its agents are effecting in the social order – rational reactions.

If as structural functionalists believe that society (i.e., people’s behavior) evolves like organisms do (i.e., spread like bacteria, clouds, water), and if the United Nations system who is installed in 193 nations since 1945, for example, has not been able to modify the behavior of people (i.e., norms, customs, traditions, and institutions) to generate social reactions that deepens connectedness at least - never mind ending poverty or injustice, this means that the power of the intergovernmental organization named United Nations to create a stable cohesive social system is highly unlikely.

The end justifies the means is an expression that is used to say that “a desired result is so good or important that any method, even a morally bad one, may be used to achieve it.”<sup>51</sup> This begs many questions. For one, can the most powerful families/dynasties continue to transform the conditions and outcomes that matters to them, if the epistemology that they are relying on so far to solidify their power (i.e., via UN agencies, International aid organizations operated by governments, NGOs, charities, etc.), has been ill-suited to structure (control or regulate) the nuance and variability found in human interaction?

Indeed, this fundamental change (or directional change) that the victors of WW2 (the most powerful families/dynasties) introduced in the war aims they initially outlined at the end of WW2, both from the perspective of how to go about attaining those initial goals, and also

---

<sup>50</sup> [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Collective\\_consciousness](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Collective_consciousness)

<sup>51</sup> <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/the%20end%20justifies%20the%20means>

from the perspective of exceeding those initial goals to attain goals that are above and beyond, signify introducing a total change in the vision and mission of this whole idea of bringing nations to collaborate together in collective security. To put it differently, by changing the job description of the United Nations so this international intergovernmental organization stops with being an agent that was responsible for the coordination of the war aims that the victors of WW2 laid out in the UN Charter so this organization become a coordination agent and an agent that provide political and economic solutions in UN member states translate to nothing other than creating a redundancy. This signify that we now have two agents determining and enforcing natural and legal rights in every nation: The United Nations (the international organization) and governments.

I have no way of knowing if the decision of the victors of WW2 (the most powerful families/dynasties) to let the international intergovernmental organization named United Nations become an economic operator or an apparatus that is involved in the ongoing fighting that people get together and fight one another ruthlessly in order to get in control of violence-wielding apparatus is the right tactic to solidify their powers. What I do know is that since the date the victors of WW2 (the most powerful families/dynasties) granted right to the intergovernmental organization named United Nations to interfere in the social order and to become an economic operator that offers what governments were created to do (determine and enforce social programs) and does what governments do (kill, steal, cheat, deny people right), and intolerance has been on the rise around the world. This also means that all the intolerance that people are exhibiting, or wars that are ongoing could be a result of an-going battle that exists between the Agents of Change (UN agencies, International aid organizations operated by governments, NGOS, charities, etc.) that the victors of WW2 introduced in the social order, and the traditional status Quo Agents (i.e., governments), who usually determine and enforce social programs.

In the 17<sup>th</sup> century Thomas Hobbes cautioned against letting human condition be absent of any political order as the case is right now whereby any person use the ideas of Jesus or the idea of good as a tool to benefit his own self-interests instead of the collective interests.

Hobbes said that when people begin to use the idea of good (i.e., political order and law) to benefit their self-interests life would become "solitary, poor, nasty, brutish and short." I have no way of knowing if the rule that could be pushing people to be against observing the work program that was proposed in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (as of 1948) is tangled in the decision that the families/dynasties who won WW2 made to have the intergovernmental organization named United Nations and any person (or group) who wish to dedicate himself (herself) to the service of his (her) neighbor consider themselves exempt from the appeal of behaving according to said principles just as the most powerful families/families who won WW2 and the families/dynasties who control governments in UN member states are doing. However, what I do know is that when people in antiquity began to regard themselves as the deputy of God on earth, and to conduct just as we are doing (whereby anyone who wish to dedicate himself [herself] to the service of his [her] neighbor, he [she] can start to "plunder, rape, kill, cheat, steal," just as governments use the idea of governance as a mean towards an end [the benefit of the individuals involved]), then mankind could be building to repeat the same history that our ancestors lived. This was an endless "war of all against all."

To put it differently, Richard Feynman (1918 – 1988), was an American theoretical physicist known for his work in quantum mechanics. When Feynman was working on the problem of quantizing gravity, he was not able to make progress as he would have wished. Then, one of his colleagues, Murray Gell-Mann (1929 – 2019), American physicist, suggested to him to be aware of the following criteria, which was what Feynman needed to know to arrive at the breakthrough he made in the field. Gell-Mann said "if you have two examples of the same disease, then there are many things you don't worry about."<sup>52</sup> In other words, if a person is trying to solve a problem and each method he uses does not help him to make progress, then there must be some common thing which is making it difficult to solve the problem.

Said differently, if when people were attributing that they were delegated by God to play his deputy, man was not able to make progress on his aspiration to reduce fear and want, and when man relied on his

---

<sup>52</sup> [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=sF2HLvcWkjc&ab\\_channel=caltech](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=sF2HLvcWkjc&ab_channel=caltech)

human reason to achieve the same, i.e., he encountered the same problem, then one of two things could be creating the same problem. Either humans are living animals or the individuals who are being tasked with securing that everyone obey the political order are the one who is being bound by their personal power and conscience.

Simply put, if after men partitioned the world into different nations and used the idea of government as an apparatus to deepen good in the world, people failed to achieve his goal; and if when men tasked a common political authority to do the same, this authority (the United Nations) has also failed, then either the problem, is with the idea that is being pursued, or the problem is with the method that is being used to pursue the problem. We cannot say that the problem is weaved in human nature, because human nature has not changed in either case.

However, hence the method that the victors of WW2 (the most powerful families/dynasties) are trying to use was tested before in the United States and its results showed that it is possible to make people develop understanding of themselves, but when the same method was applied in a larger system (culture) it failed, then only two motives could have prompted this failure. Either the people are not obeying the rule that are being legitimized because they are irrational, or the rule that people are being asked to obey are aspirations that human nature was not programmed naturally to obey.

I do not know if man was programmed to cooperate based on the equality of outcomes as the victors of WW2 (the most powerful families/dynasties) tasked the United Nations (the international organization) with determining policies and enforcing. But hence the victors of WW2 (the most powerful families/dynasties) converted the ground of the United Nations (the international organization) into becoming exactly as per what Jesus found was happening in the temple courtyard – a place to buy and sell, and granted right to the administrators and staffs of this organization to plunder, steal, victimize and operate courts to deny their victims right, then we cannot discard the likelihood of the heirs of the existing powerful families/dynasties becoming reverted to a simpler form on the hand of the administrators and staffs of the United Nations in the future as happened to the rulers

of the Roman Empire in the middle of the first millennium after their fathers allowed the Catholic Church to behave in the same manner.

Then again, in the middle of the first millennium, when the Catholic Church was plundering, stealing, victimizing and operating courts to deny its victims right in the name of good (or Jesus), the people were all ready to let the Church get its way because they were all hoping that the switch from the existing Roman rules to the new Christian way of doing things would increase their happiness. In other words, before the Roman Empire collapse, there were no international aid organizations operated by governments, UN agencies, NGOs, charities, and anyone who wish to dedicate himself [herself] to the service of his [her] neighbor, making his living from this Christian idea. Only the idea of Christianity was gaining trust and the people who were soldiering so the Roman Empire fail and be absorbed by the Catholic Church were the only ones who were refusing to obey so their convictions succeed. The case is not the same today. Presently, people are divided, and it is very difficult to make people agree to reach a consensus. In other words, it is very difficult to make people get rid of their tribal traditions (religion, language, political status, opinion, national origin, social origin, etc. to cooperate to achieve collective security. This is because the competing ideas equal the number of living people.

To put it differently, the difference between give and get and take and bring is sometimes confusing: “give” is where a person has something, and he pass it to another person to own it; “get” is where a person receives something from another person; “take” is where a person holds something in his hand when he gets it from somewhere; “bring” is where a person is already having something and he takes it along with him when he goes somewhere.<sup>53</sup>

The founding fathers of the UN (or Jesus) passed to us their teaching. We received it from them. We did hold on to it in our hands, and we are the one who refuse to cooperate based on its principles wherever we went since 1945. If the families/dynasties who won WW2 (the most powerful families/dynasties) want to stabilize peace and security, this means that those powerful families/dynasties must look for ways that

---

<sup>53</sup> <https://hinative.com/en-US/questions/1859430>

would make it difficult for people to “bring” along with them the ideas of human rights to continue to get their ways. When we start to find no usage for us to bring along the ideas that are stipulated in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, it would not be necessary for us to “take” them along with us to remind us to obey them. When people do not find any usage from bringing along the ideas that are stipulated in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights because when they take them along they would not be useful to them, then they must be “getting” the ideas that they would be legitimizing from a different source. This means that someone or some source must be “giving” it out.

This begs many questions. In theory, the founding fathers of the UN passed the teaching that is in the religious scriptures. If we are refusing to cooperate based on the principles that the founding fathers of the UN passed, then there is only one other method that is known to have made people begin to obey. This method is through the use of force.

When the Catholic Church was revolting against the Roman Empire, this movement was soldiering under the flagship of the philosophy that is included in the New Testament of the Bible. In theory, the philosophy that the founding fathers of the UN passed and the one that the Catholic Church was relying on to get its way despite the resistance of others during the Roman Empire are one and the same. Most importantly, hence people refuse to surrender to each other unless the reason is to improve the idea of good, (but the idea of good is what makes the world stay dynamic), then it would not be possible to make people agree to come together so the idea of good prevail if this idea is what makes people repulse to begin with. This also means that the victors of WW2 (the most powerful families/dynasties) must either increase death rate (organize a global war to reduce the flux of poor people who are all using the idea of good to prompt them to split their wealth, status or power with them), or remain apathetic in the hope of when this ongoing “war of all against all” that they ignited through the United Nations reaches its end, they would come out as victor. Of course, the rate at which this ongoing war would be changing will depend on the role the United Nations plays. Hence the United Nations is the fuel, the more the victors of WW2 (the most powerful families/dynasties) allow the United Nations interfere in the social order of UN member state (i.e., become an economic operator who buys and sells), the more the world

dynamism rise. The less the interference of the United Nations in the political status of nations the UN plays (i.e., reducing the political and economic corruption that the United Nations is sponsoring in UN member states), the more stable the world would be getting.

Once again, I have no way of knowing if the families/dynasties who won WW2 would be in favor of stopping from using this new, unorthodox and revolutionary way that they are adopting to solidify their power and reduce fear and want. What I do know is that no tribe, nation, kingdom, or empire in the history of the world, programmed to solidify its power by delegating to the people who they were dominating role in helping them to maintain their strength and security. Always, tribes, nations, kingdom, and empires delegated to its own people the task of determining the course of its future.

To put it differently, when king Nebuchadnezzar brought the Jews to Babylon, he taught them his Aramaic and trained them in how to enter in his service. King Nebuchadnezzar did not create an international intergovernmental organization that was composed of the Babylonians and the Jews that he tasked with running around in the Kingdom teaching the Babylonians and the Jews why they should be in favor of dedicating themselves to the service of their neighbor, and to not stop until outcomes are shared on equal rights. Most importantly, King Nebuchadnezzar did not task the Jews to dictate to him how he (the King) should dispose of his natural wealth and resources (human and material). He (King Nebuchadnezzar) knew what he would be wagering on if he cut all the trees in Babylon or leave them to grow. He did not need people telling him about the effect of his actions on the ozone layer. This is because King Nebuchadnezzar must of have had his feet on earth and not in the sky!

Indeed, the readiness of people, rich and poor, to back away from keenness to surrender freedom to let the idea of liberal interventionism and self-determination build a just and peaceful world is strange. The wealthy families/dynasties in rich and poor societies who allied with Great Britain to win WW2 but who also did not believe that “all men are created equal” cannot be blamed for backing away from their proclaimed readiness to surrender freedom to build a just and peaceful world post 1945. The idea of having UN agencies, government operated

international aid organizations, NGOs, people with money, etc. interfere in how governments should determine their political status and freely pursue their economic, social and cultural development is not only unheard of, but it is also not right. In other words, this interference defies the liberal ideas that people want to protect.

Then again, humans are not like planets who maintain balance by orbiting around the sun all the time in a fixed path. On earth, human relations can create rift and drift. I have no way of knowing if the changes that were introduced in the Terms of Reference of the United Nations contributed to the geopolitical tension that the United States and the Soviet Union knew during the cold war. Nonetheless, the occupation of Russia of Crimea in 2014, and the trade war that exist between the United States and China as of 2018, is clear evidence to support that the international rule based postwar world order that the families/dynasties who won WW2 laid out at the end of WW2 is breathing its last breadth to not say it has collapsed already. This is very serious and worrisome.

If the five governments that are deputizing at the UN security council on behalf of the families/dynasties who won WW2 (the most powerful families/dynasties) are rifting and drifting, then the families/dynasties who control those nations could risk seeing that their relations rift (break) and drift in the same way iceberg breaks off and eventually melt.

To put it differently, “every summer in Antarctica, ice on the surface of the ice shelf melts and that water travels into the snow below where it refreezes.”<sup>54</sup> However, when more ice melt than snowfall, the water that end up pooling on the ice shelf’s surface, eventually breaks off an iceberg into the ocean, which then start to drift and melt when it moves into warmer water. If the five governments that are deputizing at the UN security council on behalf of the families/dynasties who won WW2 (the most powerful families/dynasties) continue to be divided, or continue to be in favor of allowing the intergovernmental organization named United Nations to be an economic operator who is devoted to teaching people to create equal outcomes, they would not be able to prevent the social order from continuing to rift. If the social order rift and start to drift, then they would not be able to prevent the social order

---

<sup>54</sup> <https://www.space.com/antarctic-ice-shelf-collapse-as-earth-warms>

from collapsing in the course of time and things just as per what happens to most iceberg.

I have no way of knowing if the reason why the Israeli and the Palestinian are not able to see eye to eye since 1948 is tangled in the decision of the families/dynasties who won WW2 to deviate away from the work program that the founding fathers of the UN counselled in order to task the intergovernmental organization named United Nations with interfering in the social order thus deepening distrust, jealousy, anger, impatience, frustration, tribalism, nationalism, corruption, deceit, etc., in the world. Most importantly, I have no way of knowing if the Jews would be able to build the Third Temple so mankind could finally establish universal peace and brotherhood, without any evil after the families/dynasties who won WW2 granted right to the intergovernmental organization named United Nations to become an economic operator, and while the administrators of this organization are buying and selling as people do on the outside of the UN fence, including doing it while enjoying privileges and immunities.

In the next chapter, I plan to continue to investigate to determine if this unorthodox aspiration that the families/dynasties who won WW2 are pursuing to unite the human race through having the intergovernmental organization named United Nations teach people to cooperate to create equal outcomes instead of on the principle of opportunity is one that would build a peaceful world, or if it would accelerate their own end.

## 28

# Did people stop to write the same history together

---

The expression “too many cooks spoil the broth” is an idea that alludes that when there are too many people involved in trying to do the same thing, the final result will not be good.<sup>55</sup> Indeed, the decision of the victors of WW2 (the families/dynasties who control the international order or the money supply of the world) to be against letting the intergovernmental organization named United Nations stay as a council that nations could go to in order to settle international disputes through negotiation and arbitration only, and to let this platform become a center that provide social gatherings, entertainment, performances, product launches, promotions and festivals as well is strange. In fact, the decision of the victors of WW2 to let UN agencies, human development organizations (international aid agencies operated by governments, NGOs, charities, etc.) and any person (or group) who wish to dedicate himself (herself) to the idea of good to start to make his living from interfering in the preparation of his neighbor is unheard of in the history of the world. This strategy has made the social order appear to be like a tower that its owners decided to revamp, but who invited all the different skilled laborers to come to carry out their work at the same time instead of waiting to do it in sequence. Surely, this approach that the families/dynasties who won WW2 adopted to build a just and peaceful world is not a tactic that builders employ when they are erecting or revamping a tower. So far, this unorthodox approach that the families/dynasties who won WW2 are adopting to solidify their power and build a just and peaceful world has not improved connectedness

---

<sup>55</sup> <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/too-many-cooks-spoil-the-broth>

between people (societies) but appear to have confused people much more than how they were initially.

Humans, by nature, accept that other people interfere in their preparation until they reach the age of puberty. After that age, people become independent and tolerate interferences in their lives only when they are unwell (sick) or when the matter involve increasing their happiness. This means that the intolerance people of all ages and sexes are exhibiting could be because the social order has become a restoration site, but it could also be a consequence of people being in the midst of a hostile class struggle. If people are in the midst of a class struggle, and the intergovernmental organization named United Nations, human development organizations (international aid organizations operated by governments, NGOs, charities, etc.) and anyone who believe that he (she) should dedicate himself (herself) to the service of their neighbor continue to push as the case has been like since 1945 so outcomes gets shared on equal rights, mankind could be building for a world revolution. This is because the social order has not existed without social classes integrated in its structure since man started to keep records. Not to mention, two people cannot fill the same void space.

Indeed, the decision of the families/dynasties who won WW2 to let the intergovernmental organization named United Nations, and human development organizations (international aid organizations operated by governments, NGOs, charities, etc.) ensure that created things do not go to waste has not helped mankind to start to bear with one another more. To the contrary, people of every social class are complaining against each other more, and have stopped to forgive each other easily. In other words, no person can say that the technical assistance that those human development agents offered has helped mankind to find ultimate significance or real practical usefulness so far. Simply put, we have no way of knowing if the progress in human development that is around us is due to the advances that were made in technology (communication and transportation) or if this progress is a result of solutions that those human development agents offered around the world.

Nonetheless, because throughout history, man used created and natural things to increase his own happiness first, and then used whatever exploration or creation he (man) made to elevate the common good, it

would be naïve to say that the credit for the world having become more hospitable post 1945 is due to the actions in human development that the agents of those human development organizations compelled, because they did not prevent wars. To the contrary, because those human development agents who the victors of WW2 tasked with providing solutions next to governments to attain the UN goals were performing their duties while pursuing the realization of the full development of their personality at the same time, it is those human development agents who are responsible for this wave of intolerance and anger that people of all ages, sexes and class are increasingly manifesting since 1945. This is because not all the people of all ages, sexes and class were dissatisfied with their economic and social situation as the case is like now in some nations before WW2 erupted or when governments when providing parameters for everyday life alone. If people of all ages, sexes and class are increasingly manifesting unpreparedness to obey the political order, and are all convinced that they have right to realize the full development of their personality when throughout history the common good was served on the back of having the common good of another group stay insecure, this means that the victors of WW2 (the families/dynasties who control the international order or the money supply of the world) are accountable for this rise in distrust, jealousy, anger, impatience, frustration, tribalism, nationalism, corruption, deceit, etc. that emerged in the world post 1945. This is because it is those victors who granted right to the different human development organizations to interfere in the social order. If, for example, the victors of WW2 did not shift and expand the role of the intergovernmental organizations named United Nations to provide solutions in economic, political, social, and cultural development while the officials of this organization are pursuing the realization the full development of their personality, perhaps peace and security would have been better today. In fact, the last time rulers and political class (the Romans) agreed to let their populace be influenced by ideas (Christianity) similar to the one human development organizations are offering, the Roman Empire was reverted to a simpler form.

Surely the decision of the families/dynasties who won WW2 to make people find ultimate significance in created things so the technical progress does not go to waste is a great idea to increase their happiness and the happiness of others. However, if this strategy does not train

people to bear with one another (i.e., lead them into believing that we are all in it for each other), then such tactic could be creating more damage than help fixing. To put it differently, if people unpreparedness to obey rise whenever their awareness is deepened, or whenever their awakening does not lead them into believing that their freedom is closing in on them, then mankind could be doomed. Said differently, if whenever people perceive that their freedom is not closing in on them, or let us say such conviction stops to constantly ring in their ears, they begin to refuse to forgive each other, or refuse to stop to complain about each other, then mankind is going to be always getting it wrong no matter how much the families/dynasties who won WW2 tries to want to get it right.

To put it differently, the families/dynasties who won WW2 can continue to solidify their power by focusing on two strategies. The first is deterrence through strengthening a faction to defend them from everyone else (the global policemen role played by the United States as of 1945). The second is to preoccupy people (societies) with either being devoted to building as the case is right now in Egypt or to be quarreling with each other as the case is right now in Lebanon.

However, because the worst defenders of democracy and the rule of law, in general, are usually people (nations) who no one has power over to stop them (the Falklands war between Great Britain and Argentina in 1982, the United States war on Iraq in 2003, Russia's annexation of Crimea in 2014, Russia's involvement in the Syrian civil war in 2015, etc.), or ones who the nations with great power such as Great Britain (Anglosphere) and the United States (global policemen of the world) cannot take actions against them because of their own strategic alliances with those people (nations) who are violating democracy and the rule of law (such as Jordan, Israel, Saudi Arabia, UAE, Qatar in the middle east; Egypt, Morocco, Nigeria, Ethiopia in Africa; and on and on.....), this means that the families/dynasties who won WW2 can never establish balance. This is very serious and worrisome. Said differently, this scenario is a dilemma that resembles a situation in which a father is preaching about the importance of family values to others while he is breaching what his tasking people to be doing, and his son is a junky on top.

In other words, if no one has power to stop the United States (as a nation), for example, from getting its way despite the resistance of others; and the only way for the United States to manage to solidify its power is through the use of force or deterrence, but the United States cannot apply either tactic because the worst defenders of democracy and the rule of law (the international rule based postwar political order) are the people (nations) who this country is protecting (maintaining strategic alliances with them), then the United States is doomed. This is because people explore to increase their happiness, and not to shrink it. That is to say that if whenever the happiness of people grows the more the common people expect their rulers or political class (the rich) to lead by example, then the more people awareness and knowledge grows, the more the common people would be conditioning their preparedness to obey to become a function of their rulers or political class (the rich) leading by example. Hence the principal reason why the international order is paralyzed since 1945 is tangled in the unpreparedness of rulers and political class (the rich) in UN member states to compromise (cooperate in accordance with the work program set forth in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights), this means that the more the rich (rulers and political class) regard themselves exempt from obeying the appeals set forth in international agreements and rules, the more people (rich and poor) would be talking about the challenges that are confronting the world, and how everyone needs to be working together to resolve them, instead of actually being devoted to observing the rules that are legitimized. Humans cannot do two things at the same. In other words, when rulers and political class (the rich) are talking to agree on how everyone needs to make compromise to reduce threat, this signify that no one is observing the rules that are already legitimized. This also means that mankind could be against its will (unknowingly) converting the world into becoming an authoritarian political system instead of remaining a liberal political system as was agreed upon in 1945 that the political order would function like. Actually, if all the distrust, jealousy, anger, impatience, frustration, tribalism, nationalism, corruption, deceit, etc., that emerged stays on the rise, this shift toward authoritarians would be required to avoid that insecurity deepening even more.

The United States is a country who solidify its own power by relying on the idea of human rights, rule of law, democracy, liberty, etc., to get its ways despite the resistance of others. Can the United States continue to

get its way despite the resistance of others (i.e., rely on the idea of liberal interventionism and self-determination to improve democracy and the rule of law) when the number of nations that would be ruled openly dictatorially in the world rise? Said differently, if the only reason why the United States managed to defeat the Iraqi regime so quickly in 2003 happened because the Iraqi forces disavowed the oath they pledged to protect the Iraqi constitution with their own lives (i.e., they deemed that the Iraqi ideals are not worth dying for), how can the families/dynasties who control the United States be sure that the deteriorated belief in ideas that emerged around the world (the rapid collapse of the Afghani forces without resistance to the Taliban in 2021 is a good example) would not be affecting the American soldiers in the same way. That is to say, no nation can keep its soldiers away from politics. All the soldiers have televisions at home and on military bases. If it is not possible to know what is going on in the heart and mind of any person, can the families/dynasties who control the United States be sure that the US soldiers would be ready to make the ultimate sacrifice to save the American ideals when the United States cannot show to its own soldiers how the regimes that this country meddled in their political structure and toppled since 1945 had improved peace in the world but rather how this meddling kept the United States safe. In fact, in theory, we cannot say that the United States who wrecked Germany or the one who rebuilt this country but Great Britain. First, it was Great Britain who waged a war against Germany and not the United States. The United States entered WW2 to help Great Britain. Second, the industry of Germany was not wrecked during WW2 so we could be sure that it was the Marshal Plan who helped rebuild Germany (or Japan), or the decision that was taken by Great Britain to not destroy them what did it. If this afore analogy is true, this means that the money that the United States injected helped Germany to have security but not to rebuild the economy. If an economy that is destroyed can be built with money and security, then the Lebanese (who are highly educated and rich) should have been able to build their economy already as of the date when the civil war ended.

Indeed, the war on Terror<sup>56</sup> that the United States launched following the September 11 attacks have prevented a foreign based terrorist attack

---

<sup>56</sup>[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/War\\_on\\_terror#:~:text=The%20War%20on%20Terror%20\(WoT,following%20the%20September%202011%20attacks.](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/War_on_terror#:~:text=The%20War%20on%20Terror%20(WoT,following%20the%20September%202011%20attacks.)

on the United States since 2001. However, this win was met with an equal and opposite loss. Since 2001, the deep divisions that exist in the United States, for example, are very scary.

To put it differently, in 1945, all the existing societies agreed to cooperate in the economic, political, social and cultural development together to grow the happiness that the American people developed by the middle of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, and not the British, Chinese, Indians, etc.

The only reason why all the UN member states are still ruled to this day by an authoritarian regime (either openly or clandestinely) is due to two reasons: half of the population in those countries do not want to cooperate based on the international rule based postwar world order that was fixed on the aftermath of WW2 (i.e., the work program set forth in the UN charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights), and the other half do not possess power to be able to change this truth. Presently, there are countries that control their regime dictatorially openly such as Russia, Belarus, Jordan, Egypt, Venezuela, Cuba, China, Saudi Arabia, Morocco, etc., and others who claim that they are constitutional monarch (i.e., largely ceremonial) but who approve every senior political appointment in the country, the work program of the government, as well as serving as the supreme commander of the armed forces such as in Great Britain, Denmark, Norway, Sweden, and others.

If the United States has become entangled in deep divisions in recent years, this means that half of the population in the US do not believe anymore in the American ideals, and the other half do not possess power to be able to change this truth. This also means that one half of the population is relying as the case is like right now in most UN member states on distrust, jealousy, anger, impatience, frustration, tribalism, nationalism, corruption, deceit, etc., to get their way despite the resistance of others, and another half are relying on the American ideals (the idea of liberal interventionism and self-determination to improve democracy and the rule of law). This is very serious and worrisome.

To put it differently, the only reason why the rest of the UN member states are still to this day ruled by an authoritarian regime (either openly or clandestinely) is due to either some nations lacking wealth (poor nations) and others locking wealth away from their citizens (rich

nations). If half of the population in the US believe in distrust, jealousy, anger, impatience, frustration, tribalism, nationalism, corruption, deceit, etc., and the other half in the American ideals, can the United States avoid its reversal to a simpler form if, in 1945, all the existing societies agreed to cooperate in the economic, political, social and cultural development together to grow their happiness to the one the American people developed by the middle of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, and not the one that exist today? Most importantly, can the United States avoid that its political system become dictatorial and not any different from the one that this country is entangled with them in a complex web of alliances when the only remedy that could prevent such outcome from taking place is if its citizens develop convictions in the American ideals, and it was the decline of belief by its own citizens in the American ideals what has gotten the world into the insecurity that mankind is knowing in recent years.

I have no way of knowing how the United States can prevent the UN member from continuing to unhinge its citizens including stopping them from continuing to put the blame on the insecurity that the world is knowing on the liberal interventionism and self-determination philosophy (the American ideals) to protect the political system that those UN member states depend on to stay in power. Said differently, I have no way of knowing how the rulers and political class in the United States plan to change the convictions that its citizens and the citizens or other nations about the United States political system (the American ideals) being responsible for everything that has gone wrong with the world when a large number of US leaders are using their time in office to discredit each other instead of being careful what they say to ensure that the American ideals is not trapped and thus decline.

To put it differently, the rulers and political class in the United States believe that if they discredit each other, or put political obstacles ahead of each other (pointing out who is abusing his authority or involved in corruption) that such tactic would help citizens to develop faith in the American ideals. If such strategy works mankind would not be using distrust, jealousy, anger, impatience, frustration, tribalism, nationalism, corruption, deceit, etc., to this day to keep the world insecure.

Only one tactic can ensure that the American ideals does not get weakened. This strategy require that the US rulers and political class take a step back and espouse the same values that the founding fathers of the United States adopted before WW2 erupted on US territory but this time in all the territories of the world. In other words, the nation who wants to play the deputy of God role cannot espouse advocacy for reform and for human and political rights. Simply put, the nation that wants to play the deputy of God role cannot be fulfilling this duty while establishing balance between its national interests and the interest of the world. When God was ruling the world with men in antiquity, he did not pick the Jews to be his favorite people because he preferred them over other people or societies, but rather he picked one tribe so He could show through their stories what awaits any society who refuses to adopt the truth that he was teaching. In addition, God and Moses were not leading the human race to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war, but he was leading a tribe to go to a new piece of land.

It looks as if the rulers and political class of the United States need to reexamine if they want to make America Great or use the American ideals to make the whole world a safer place. In other words, the rulers and political class of the United States need to decide if they want to deal with the real world of global politics and strategies to serve American interests around the world, or if they want to sustain values that has produced after seventy years of interference by the intergovernmental organization named United Nations in the political structure or status of nations the following iterations: Lebanon without any political structure; Egypt total dictatorship; France partial dictatorship; Great Britain (the custodian of the Anglosphere) concealed dictatorship.

Furthermore, hence we cannot say that all the destructive energy (intolerance, corruption, betrayal) that people are producing along the constructive energy that is underway (advances in medicine, computing) is being compelled by the ongoing effort to reshape our social order to become “untact”<sup>57,58</sup> (little direct human contact and most

---

<sup>57</sup> <https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2020-06-10/south-korea-untact-plans-for-the-post-pandemic-economy>

<sup>58</sup> <https://www.bbc.com/worklife/article/20200803-south-korea-contact-free-untact-society-after-coronavirus>

relations are established using machines) as the case is like today in South Korea, because all what people do from birth to death is to explore and whether our hands do the exploration or machines are doing it the outcome is one because the human brain is the one who is creating the change; this means that the faster a nation push its citizens to become modernized, the faster it would be competing with South Korean to occupy the top of the list of developed nations with highest suicide rate.<sup>59,60</sup> This is very serious and worrisome.

To put it differently, when our predecessors imagined what the future would be like, they mostly thought of things revolving around space technology or means of transportation, but not of people beginning to increasingly commit suicide. In other words, it is great that scientists and researchers have moved us away from having ambition to be moving around in airplanes so information technology can diagnose and even carry out medical procedures on behalf of medical doctors. But our problem, throughout history, was never about how to find new ways to adapt with tools, but with each other. Said differently, it is wonderful to have AI doctors diagnose and perform medical procedures, or to be able to cut the travel time from South Korea to New York to one or two hours, but would all people around the world be ready to accept to tolerate the darker aspect of society that technology unleashes and propel!

I have no way of knowing if governments (law enforcement agencies) would be able to control all the digital crime (or cybercrime) that technology unleashed in the world already, Nonetheless, we can say that the decision of the victors of WW2 (the families/dynasties who control the international order and the money supply of the world) to let our future develop around information technology instead of letting the future develop first around the values that the founding fathers of the UN counseled them to obey, created a problem for them and for mankind so far. This strategy did not reduce the number of crimes that people commit (distrust, jealousy, anger, impatience, frustration, tribalism, nationalism, corruption, deceit, etc.) but rather shifted people away from compelling those crimes openly to beginning to committing them discreetly. For example, robberies is insignificant in South Korea

---

<sup>59</sup> <https://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/world/suiciderate.html>

<sup>60</sup> <https://worldpopulationreview.com/country-rankings/suicide-rate-by-country>

presently (due to all the surveillance), but the number of digital crime that has been on the rise in the country is scary.<sup>61,62</sup>

To put it differently, if the more people around the world become “untact,” the more they would be developing compulsive desire to survey their leaders or political class as the South Korean are surveilling each other, then mankind could be doomed. Said differently, if all people are working on delegating their role to technology, and the more people delegate to technology their role, the more their goal would shift from being about how to provide for their families to how to strive to curb corruption to enable them to realize their goals or to watching how their neighbor is eating, walking and sleeping to entertain themselves, then mankind is building for a world revolution rather than to reduce fear and want. This is because people rely on distrust, jealousy, anger, impatience, frustration, tribalism, nationalism, corruption, deceit, etc., to obtain the things that others are denying them including increasing their own happiness through such methods. If people are working on delegating to technology the role that the human body was programmed by nature to fulfil for the environment, then mankind could be working on unleashing a social class conflict that its consequence may not bring to the victors of WW2 (the families/dynasties who control the international order and the money supply of the world) the outcomes they expect. This is very serious and worrisome.

Said differently, people know that guns kill, but they do not ban the fabrication of guns, because they need such tools to deny with them each other rights. This means that even though people know that artificial intelligence is a knife with two edges, the people who profit from the wealth, status and power that such tools provide them are not going to stop to forgo their happiness to benefit the common good.

Then again, we know that this toxic snooping or voyeurism subculture that emerged online in South Korea (Asia in general) after the victors of WW2 (the families/dynasties who control the international order and the money supply of the world) allowed this society to be digitally intelligent would not be something that the victors of WW2 would be

---

<sup>61</sup> <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2018/sep/03/seoul-to-check-public-toilets-daily-to-tackle-spy-cam-porn-crisis>

<sup>62</sup> <https://www.bbc.com/news/world-asia-45040968>

allowing to develop in all the societies that are working on hyper-connecting their population to become “untact” at the same time or as the South Korean have become. This is because the manner that people influence each other to abandon their values (traditions) and be modernized is not a linear function but parabolic. In addition, the victors of WW2 are always ensuring that societies maintain a human development gap to reduce social and economic bottleneck.

At the same time, we can say that if the victors of WW2 (the families/dynasties who control the international order and the money supply of the world) continue to delay the plunging of the world into a new global war or against the launching of an economic and a territorial reset, and go on with tasking the UN system and other human development organizations (international aid organizations operated by governments, NGOs, charities, etc.) to be devoted to teaching people to stop coping as they are doing unless their rulers and political class share with them outcomes on equal rights, this would translate to a situation which would be like asking the different gangs whose members makes their living from organized crime to protect them. This is because all the human development organizations (United Nations, international aid organizations operated by governments, NGOs, charities, etc.) are not teaching people to deepen social cohesion or improve morality as per the way clergy do it, but while working on realizing the full development of their personality at the same time. In the case of the UN system, the officials of this organization enjoy privileges and immunities. In other words, the UN officials are economic operators who interfere in the social order without receiving instructions from any government or from any other authority external to the Organization. Most importantly, no person (nation) can seek remedy for any cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment the UN officials commit in the exercise of their duties because the victors of WW2 (the families/dynasties who control the international order and the money supply of the world) granted them privileges and immunities.

We can also say that because all the UN member states are propelling their economic investment in technology, and in mobilizing human labor to serve such sector, this means that in the future, the nations who are not endowed with vast natural resources (human, water, metals, land, mountains, forests, etc.) and the ones who possess large swath

would not be recognizing such resources as wealth but would be looking ahead at how to make technology become their wealth or their only natural resource.

Said differently, when the Korean peninsula was split into two countries by the victors of WW2, the South Koreans had no access to large natural resources (water, metal, oil, mountains, etc.), and most importantly, God had not sent among them a prophet so he could tell them what they need to be doing. For this reason, the South Korean programmed to let technology become their natural resource.

The GCC countries (Saudi Arabia, Qatar, UAE, Bahrain, Kuwait and Oman) were endowed with natural resources (oil) which enabled them to be among the wealthiest societies throughout the second half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century and till today even. Based on the literature reviews that are circulated in magazines and on TV, the impression one gets does not reinforce convictions about the leaders and political class of those GCC countries using their wealth to implement what the Quran in Surah Yusuf<sup>63</sup> council them to be doing to not perish but to build futuristic cities.

In the Quran (or the Bible) it is reported that the Pharaoh had a dream and when he summoned Joseph to come and to interpret the dream for him, Joseph said that Egypt would benefit of seven good years, which shall be followed by seven years of famine.

I have no way of knowing if the GCC countries have built next to the skyscrapers that they have erected farms and barns as Pharaoh did so when a future famine strikes the world, they would have food to eat and milk to feed their newborns. If the GCC countries are not using the plentiful years they have been knowing to teaching their citizens about how to be farmers or about how to milk camels and are only devoted to building skyscrapers, then we cannot say that if a famine or a pandemic strike the world that the GCC would not perish. To the contrary we could say that if a famine or a pandemic strike the earth, the victors of WW2 (the families/dynasties who control the international order and the money supply of the world) are going to have seven countries (the GCC

---

<sup>63</sup> <https://quran.com/12>

countries and South Korea) whose population would be using all the teaching that they learned on the hands of the United Nations system, international aid organizations operated by governments, NGOs, charities, etc. on why they need to abandon continuing being farmers and Bedouins to practice guided capitalism, and in this way strip them from their own food.

To put it differently, if as some experts suggest that students do better than teachers because of “an underappreciated talent that almost every student has which is to live in the now, rather than to focus on some nebulous, uncertain ‘future’ that none of us understand,”<sup>64</sup> then it is highly likely that all the societies that the victors of WW2 (the families/dynasties who control the international order and the money supply of the world) granted independence could be one step ahead. In other words, if all the societies continue to be intolerant and living in fear because they do not want to live the failures of their fathers, then this means that the more people (societies) strive for more, the more jealousy, distrust, anger, impatience, frustration, tribalism, nationalism, corruption, deceit, etc., would continue to be on the rise. Can the victors of WW2 (the families/dynasties who control the international order and the money supply of the world control the societies who produce the technology that they depend on to rule the world and control the money supply of the world with?

I have no way of knowing if this strategy that the families/dynasties who won WW2 are relying on to solidify their power post WW2, and which consist of merging people with technology through human development organizations (United Nations, international aid organizations operated by governments, NGOs, charities, etc.) who its officials preach democracy, equal rights or rule of law, but while they are at the same pursuing the realization of the full development of their personality (and in the case of the United Nations possessing rights to create self-financed organization while enjoying privileges and immunities) is a good idea to allow them to continue to get their way despite the resistance of others, including building a just and peaceful world. What I do know is that this journey has been filled with tumultuous combination of military rule and dictatorship, political instability, wars,

---

<sup>64</sup> <https://www.teachthought.com/learning/what-students-do-better-than-teachers/>

assassination, crises, etc., for its most part. This is very serious and worrisome.

Said differently, cloning is a scientific process that duplicate the shape of an object or a living thing but not the character. The brain and the heart remain different. It looks as if the decision of the families/dynasties who won WW2 to deviate away from the work program that the founding fathers of the UN counselled them to remain faithful to its principles to continue to transform the conditions outcomes and conditions that matters to them in favor of letting human development organizations (United Nations, international aid organizations operated by governments, NGOs, charities, etc.) interfere in the social order to develop parameters for everyday life has not changed people's mentalities and made them be ready to not question decision taken by their rulers or political class even if they are wrong. Herein, it is important to recall that most of the time it is the common people who elect the rulers and political class who they later disobey. To the contrary the rise in distrust, jealousy, anger, impatience, frustration, tribalism, nationalism, corruption, deceit, etc., that emerged in the world since 1945 gives the impression that this strategy that the families/dynasties who won WW2 adopted to let human development organizations (United Nations, international aid organizations operated by governments, NGOs, charities, etc.) interfere in the social order next to government to attain the goals set forth in the UN charter and new ones has been cloning characters who are not prepared to accept to live peacefully with one another in the society of tomorrow that the victors of WW2 are erecting for everyone unless outcomes are shared on equal rights. In other words, this strategy has not helped to train people to be tolerant yet, but made the eyes of the blind open up, the deaf to start to hear, the lame man to leap like a deer, and the tongue of the mute to start to speak against nothing other than about how the rules that the rich (or their governments) are legitimizing is chocking them. Said differently, the spirit of competition that human development organizations awakened has not cultivated a culture of people who are ready to wait or be patient as was the case before 1945 when most newborn were ready until they go to eternity so God gives them what the rich denied them in their lifetime, but most newborns post 1945 appear to be impatient and everyone wants outcomes to be shared on equal rights exactly as per what the international organization named United Nations

spent the last seventy years teaching them to accept nothing more and nothing less.

In the bible, the author of the book of Ecclesiastes and the author of the book of Proverbs they both did not believe that man control anything in life. For example, in Proverbs 11:29, the author of this book says “whoever troubles his own household will inherit the wind.”

If the more people abandon their values and traditions and do as per what human development organizations (the United Nations, international aid organizations operated by governments, NGOs, charities, etc.) are asking them to do (that is to be modernized and to stop coping as they were doing unless the rich [rulers and political class] share outcomes with them on equal rights), and the more this tradeoff would be angering and dividing people rather than aid them to be ready to obey the discipline and instruction stipulated in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, then the more newborns continue to be bound by their personal power and conscience, the more the idea of freedom would be eroding.

Likewise, the more the idea of freedom erode, the more the wise will be servant to the fool. The more the fool seek to abide by their power and personal conscience, the harder it would be getting for the families/dynasties who won WW2 to ensure that their strength and stability remain intact and not resized. Similarly, the more the families/dynasties who won WW2 start to rely on their power and personal conscience to avoid their own reversal to a simpler form, the more mankind would be destroying the human progress and inviting unforeseeable changes in human civilization. In other words, if the awareness of each new generation to ensure that outcomes gets shared on equal rights surpasses the impatience that its predecessor exhibited, this then means that it is going to be the heirs of the most powerful families who would have to deal with how to control the international order if those who are in charge now continue to be in favor of letting human development organizations (UN, aid agencies, NGOs, charities, etc.) secure the solidification of their power instead of doing it solely based on the work program that the founding fathers of the UN counseled them.

Indeed, the decision of the families/dynasties who won WW2 to deviate away from the work program that the founding fathers of the UN counseled them to remain faithful to its principle to solidify their power and to exchange this suggestion with having human development organizations (UN, aid agencies, NGOs, charities, etc.) secure this goal has not helped people to stop from criticizing each other or forgiving each other. To the contrary, this strategy has produced complex relations so far.

For example, the Soviet Union (an existing nation in 1945) knew in 1945 that South Africa was a British colony and that in this country diamond is abundant. In other words, it would be naïve to suppose that the Soviet Union accepted to become a member of the United Nations at the end of World War 2, because this country was looking for a legal leverage that could permit Soviet businesses to trade diamond on the principle of equal rights as the rule of the UN counsel. The Soviet Union knew that all the diamond mines in South Africa were owned mainly by British (and western European) citizens and that even after South Africa obtain its independence, the rightful owners of those mines would remain British and nationals of western European countries. The Soviet Union, knew that only the diamond that the British merchants (or the standards that this country would be fixing and) say is valuable would be worth a lot and all the other diamond would be worth like any material of terrestrial origin nothing as well. The Soviet Union (an existing nation in 1945) accepted to become a member of the United Nations at the end of World War 2 to cooperate with Great Britain on the maintenance of international security jointly only. Actually, it would be naïve to suppose that a nation (the Soviet Union before this bloc collapsed) who its rulers and political class followed an unofficial policy of state atheism would be against religious institutions preaching about God (Human Rights) in the territory they control, but in favor of allowing that human development organizations (UN, aid agencies, NGOs, charities, etc.) do exactly what this country was blocking clergyman from doing.

The same can be said now about the manner the rich nations are going about recovering the rarest materials from which all computers, satellites, mobile phones and TVs are made, and which exist in specific countries. It would be naïve to suppose that the countries that the rich

nations unleash in them the UN system, aid agencies, NGOs, charities, etc. in full force, that the principal reason is to improve human development. If one carefully analyzes the countries that the UN maintains in them peace missions, he would find that either the mission is working in areas that improves access to recovering the rarest materials from which all computers, satellites, mobile phones and TVs are made, or to prevent the expansion of a growing economy thus threatening the strength and stability of powerful forces.

Said differently, it would be naïve to suppose that the rulers and political class in the nations that exist in them the rarest materials needed in technology development lack the knowhow to coordinate the human development of their local societies thus they need the human development organizations (UN, aid agencies, NGOs, charities, etc.) to help them out.

If governments are being prompted to play a less important role in the areas that exist in them such rarest materials and their role is being replaced by human development organizations (UN, aid agencies, NGOs, charities, etc.), the goal cannot be for other than to distance the awareness of the rich and political class from becoming an obstacle in recovering such resources. In other words, it would be naïve to suppose that the rich and political class in the nations that exist in them such rarest materials lack knowhow on how to disperse religious missionaries or human development organizations that knows how to preach about God (Human Rights), or in how to open roads that makes it much easier to recover such resources or to build administrative buildings to preoccupy the people who they want to have access to their resources be entangled in governance issues. If the rich nations want the societies in the areas that exist in them rarest materials needed in technology development know that there is a difference between the parameters that their rulers and political class are providing and the one that international human development organizations (UN, aid agencies, NGOs, charities, etc.) are preaching and offering, this strategy is only to help them manipulate the social order and make it fit their agenda better.

It looks as if the decision of the families/dynasties who won WW2 to let human development organizations (UN agencies, aid agencies, NGOs, charities, etc.) preach about human rights while being economic

operators at the same time, is producing the same false hopes that the Russian Church was creating before the rulers and political class in the former Soviet Union banned them.

Then again, when we analyze how the societies that were part of the Soviet Union evolved when the leaders and political class of this bloc banned religion and began to practice socialism, we find that those societies started to have complex relations. Likewise, even when the societies that were part of the Soviet Union ended their commitment to write the same history, we find that their disbanding created a much more complex social order in those societies. For example, the political suppression that the Russians are knowing today is worse than what the case was like before this country became supposedly a democratic nation in 1990.

If when the leaders and political class of the Soviet Union permitted the church to teach people to preoccupy themselves with what their neighbors are doing, the preaching that the church was making led to the development of a complex social order which persuaded the leaders and political class of this bloc to ban religion, then it is highly likely that the same phenomenon could be transpiring after the families/dynasties who won WW2 expanded the responsibilities of the intergovernmental organization named United Nations and tasked its officials to teach people to preoccupy themselves with what their neighbors are doing.

Then again, if we consider that from 1945 until 1990 when the Soviet Union was dismantled, the Soviet Union belonged to most of the special agencies of the United Nations,<sup>65</sup> this means that it is highly likely that the exposure of the leaders or political class of this bloc to the false hopes that the UN special agencies were claiming that their efforts were transforming led to both the breakdown of this bloc, and most importantly, to the complex social order that exist today in most nations that were once part of the Soviet Union and especially in Russia.

---

65

[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Soviet\\_Union\\_and\\_the\\_United\\_Nations#Participation\\_in\\_special\\_agencies](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Soviet_Union_and_the_United_Nations#Participation_in_special_agencies)

If we superimpose the period in which the Russian Church was preaching to people to preoccupy themselves with what their neighbors are doing (i.e., before being banned) and the period in which the UN special agencies started preaching to people about doing the same (i.e., 1945 to 1990), we find that they both evolved toward a more complex social order (i.e., after the church was banned communism emerged, and after the collapse of the Soviet Union the new nations are all dealing with a much more complex social order). However, when we analyze the magnitude of the confusion that each transition compelled, we find that when people in the Soviet Union banned religion and began to practice communism (atheism), the complex social order that emerged was tolerable. Mainly, during the Russian Revolution<sup>66</sup> and during World War Two were people unprepared to obey the political order. As of the date when the Soviet Union collapsed in 1990 to now, no society that was once part of the Soviet Union is prepared to cooperate based on the work program stipulated in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. The confusion that each society is dealing with is scary especially Russia. This is very serious and worrisome.

This means that if people (nations) continue to find that their coming together to write the same history is not helping them to increase their happiness and decide to dismantle the United Nations so everyone go back to writing his history on his own, mankind could produce the same complex relations that exist today in the states that were formed when the Soviet Union was split. This also signifies that it would not be possible to compel nations to disarm or to resolve disputes through negotiation and arbitration. When rulers and political class begin to be bound by their personal power and conscience, it would not be possible to stop them (rulers and political class) from snooping on people, restrict freedom, lock up any person, etc. This is because a government is an apparatus that various factions get together and ruthlessly fight with one another to determine who could get in control of such violence-wielding apparatus to control the violence for their own benefit. In other words, tell the weakest to consider the opinion of the strongest before taking action on their own. If the victors of WW2 (the families/dynasties who control the international order or the money supply of the world) do not shrink the power of leaders and political class and human development

---

<sup>66</sup> [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Russian\\_Revolution](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Russian_Revolution)

organizations (UN agencies, aid agencies, NGOs, charities, etc.) and prompt them to lead by example instead of regarding themselves exempt from the appeal called for in the work program set forth in the Universal declaration of Human Rights, the world risks sliding deeper into instability as national tensions, problems and conflicts combines with regional and global rivalries.

It looks as if the decision of the families/dynasties who won WW2 to deviate away from the work program the founding fathers of the UN counselled them to let governments only interfere in its programming and to expand the role of the intergovernmental organization named United Nations including inviting human development organizations (UN agencies, aid agencies, NGOs, charities, etc.) to preach in poor and rich nations about political, economic, social and cultural parameters provoked a wave of intolerance unheard of in modern history. Now, we have the families/dynasties who won WW2, the rich, the rulers and political class in UN member states, the officials of the human development organizations (UN agencies, aid agencies, NGOs, charities, etc.) and the common people who the human development organizations are helping to secure that outcomes are shared on equal rights are all working on realizing the full development of their personality at the same time. In other words, we have a situation today where the entire human family is not doing what the apostle James in the Epistle of James suggested: everyone should be quick to listen, slow to speak and slow to become angry. [James 1:19] To the contrary, the entire human family is speaking about the importance of obeying the political order that was set forth in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights but no one is doing what it says. Said differently, we have a situation today whereby every member of the human family is not practicing what he or she is preaching, and everyone is working to get his (her) way despite the resistance of others. That is to say, we now have a situation in which governments (central, state and local), private companies (large and small), charities, NGOs, United Nations agencies, etc. etc. all working to make the world become a better place, but while everyone is expecting that the other respect the policies that each body legitimizes instead of obeying the work program set forth in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights only. This is very scary.

To give an example, the United States imposed sanctions on China in response to allegations of trade and genocide against the Uyghur population in Xinjiang and human rights abuses in Hong Kong and Tibet.<sup>67,68</sup> Twitter and Facebook banned Donald Trump, 45<sup>th</sup> president of the United States, in 2021, from using their platforms as a mean of communication on ground that the content was in violations of their policies.<sup>69</sup>

Indeed, the decision of the United States to unilaterally sanction China for the human rights violations that this country claim they are committing, or the decision of Twitter and Facebook to ban the president of the United States from using those two social platform on ground that the material he was communicating contained ideas that risks inciting violence is a good preventive measure to create a safe environment.

For example, Radio Télévision Libre des Mille Collines (RTLM) was a Rwandan radio Station who broadcasted during the Rwandan genocide.<sup>70</sup> The International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda that was established in order to judge people responsible for the Rwandan genocide,<sup>71</sup> concurred that the messages that RTLM was broadcasting played a crucial role in creating the atmosphere of charged racial hostility that allowed the genocide to occur.<sup>72</sup>

Surely, no person can be against the slightest mindfulness that can create conditions of stability and well-being and peaceful and friendly relations between people, but unfortunately, humans do not see the world in black and white. For example, in the epistle of James, it is said that “All kinds of animals, birds, reptiles and sea creatures are being

---

<sup>67</sup> [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/United\\_States\\_sanctions\\_against\\_China](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/United_States_sanctions_against_China)

<sup>68</sup> [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/China%E2%80%93United\\_States\\_trade\\_war](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/China%E2%80%93United_States_trade_war)

<sup>69</sup> <https://www.washingtonpost.com/technology/2021/01/11/trump-banned-social-media/>

<sup>70</sup> [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Radio\\_T%C3%A9l%C3%A9vision\\_Libre\\_des\\_Mille\\_Collines](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Radio_T%C3%A9l%C3%A9vision_Libre_des_Mille_Collines)

<sup>71</sup> [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/International\\_Criminal\\_Tribunal\\_for\\_Rwanda](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/International_Criminal_Tribunal_for_Rwanda)

<sup>72</sup> [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Radio\\_T%C3%A9l%C3%A9vision\\_Libre\\_des\\_Mille\\_Collines#After-effects](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Radio_T%C3%A9l%C3%A9vision_Libre_des_Mille_Collines#After-effects)

tamed and have been tamed by mankind, but no human being can tame the tongue. It is a restless evil, full of deadly poison. [James 3:7-8]

Then again, the capacity of the powerful forces who control the social media platforms to tame the voice of the president of the free world when the definition given to the term "civil rights" in Bouvier's Law Dictionary is very concise and says: "Civil rights are those which have no relation to the establishment, support, or management of government,"<sup>73</sup> is very serious and worrisome.

To put it differently, "Separation of Powers in the United States is associated with the Checks and Balances system. The Checks and Balances system provides each branch of government with individual powers to check the other branches and prevent any one branch from becoming too powerful."<sup>74</sup>

Twitter gave the following statement to justify its decision to suspend Donald Trump Twitter account: "After close review of recent Tweets from the @realDonaldTrump account and the context around them — specifically how they are being received and interpreted on and off Twitter — we have permanently suspended the account due to the risk of further incitement of violence."<sup>75</sup>

If the President of the United States was saying things that was being received and interpreted erroneously, it is the responsibility of the US government to request that Twitter suspend the account of Donald Trump. When Twitter suspend the account of the President of the United States on ground that the content of his messages could further the incitement of violence, this means that the powerful forces who control the social media platforms are telling the world that they are a better authority to provide the parameters for everyday behavior for citizens, protect them from outside interference, and providing for their well-being and happiness then the US government. This is very serious and worrisome.

---

<sup>73</sup>[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Civil\\_Rights\\_Act\\_of\\_1866#Introduction\\_and\\_amendment](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Civil_Rights_Act_of_1866#Introduction_and_amendment)

<sup>74</sup> [https://www.law.cornell.edu/wex/separation\\_of\\_powers\\_0](https://www.law.cornell.edu/wex/separation_of_powers_0)

<sup>75</sup> [https://blog.twitter.com/en\\_us/topics/company/2020/suspension](https://blog.twitter.com/en_us/topics/company/2020/suspension)

To put it differently, in criminal law, intent is a subjective state of mind that must accompany the acts of certain crimes to constitute a violation.<sup>76</sup> In addition, in the epistle of James it is said that “each person is tempted when they are dragged away by their own evil desire and enticed.” [James 1:14] If in theory it is not possible to responsabilize Donald Trump for how others interpret his words, because words do not physically drag a person to commit any wrong doing, but “the bitter envy and selfish ambition that reside in the heart of every man” [James 3:14] is what pushes a person to commit a fault, this means that when every person of the human family starts to believe that the created things that every individual has right to protect grant him (her) right to determine and enforce his (her) own rules, mankind is inviting disorder.

Said differently, people do not deny each other wealth, power and status through relying on the idea of evil only but do it through using the idea of good more. If every business owner, company, bank, human development organization, charities, etc., perceives that because the law grants them right to protect moral and material interests, that such rights qualifies the individuals involved to legitimize and enforce civil rules that normally different branches of government are usually responsible for determining and enforcing, then mankind could not be working to create a safe environment, but to the contrary, a very dangerous one. This is because it becomes very hard to know whether or not the person who is denying another person right is doing it because of discrimination or because there are real reasons. For instance, the Civil Rights Act of 1866 was the first United States federal law to define citizenship and affirm that all citizens are equally protected by the law.<sup>77</sup> The US government is still to this day unable to prohibit the unequal application of this law and is regularly drafting new acts to improve enforcement.

I have no way of knowing how the families/dynasties who won WW2 plan to continue to transform the conditions and outcomes that matters to them, when every member of the human family start to believe that the laws grant him (her) right to provide for the equality of citizens in the enjoyment of "civil rights and immunities," without such subjective convictions and practice setting very dangerous precedence that can

---

<sup>76</sup> [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Intention\\_\(criminal\\_law\)](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Intention_(criminal_law))

<sup>77</sup> [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Civil\\_Rights\\_Act\\_of\\_1866](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Civil_Rights_Act_of_1866)

have complex consequences on those powerful families/dynasties. Most importantly, when the families/dynasties who won WW2 continue to permit human development organizations (UN agencies, aid agencies, NGOs, charities, etc.) to lead people into believing that in all things civil, social, political, all citizens, without distinction of race or color, shall be equal, and while everyone is discouraged from expressing himself (herself) explicitly which is crucial to discern information about people beliefs.

The expression “the Walls have Ears” is a figure of speech to caution people about what they may say.<sup>78</sup> In general, this expression is used to caution people to criticize the government. If we exchange the word walls with people, we obtain “people have ears.” It looks as if the mindfulness of the families/dynasties who won WW2 to let human development organizations (UN agencies, aid agencies, NGOs, charities, etc.) preach to people about human rights and rule of law produced a culture that is prepared to eavesdrop on what rulers and political class are doing instead of being devoted to observe the work program ruler’s and political class legitimize.

To put it differently, if the families/dynasties who won WW2 continue to be in favor of technical progress not go to waste (put on hold) as they have been doing since 1945, and/or keep on being in favor of allowing human development organizations and institutions such as the different United Nations agencies, NGOs or charities use the idea of good as a conduit to make sure that assembly lines are up and running, they would not be able to stop the unjust gains that this course would be provoking. This is because humans are not able to separate their propensity from objective decision making. If people cannot divorce their self-interest from politics, then the families/dynasties who won WW2 could be wagering on their power and status if they continue to allow United Nations agencies, international aid organizations operated by governments, NGOs, charities, etc., mix money and politics.

Said differently, if as of the date the author of the book of Romans in the Bible suggested that “the mind that is set on the flesh is hostile to God, for it does not submit to God's law; indeed, it cannot, [Roman 8:7]

---

<sup>78</sup> <https://writingexplained.org/idiom-dictionary/walls-have-ears>

then we cannot expect that the mind is going to change its conduct any time soon and to start to submit to human institutions or manmade laws if people continue to freeze social space and accumulate material things on cumulative basis and to transfer it to designated individuals. This also means that if the families/dynasties who won WW2 continue to be in favor of being transformed by the renewal of the mind instead of according to the measure that is demanded, then their imagination could be setting them up to confront a different reality.

For example, throughout history, humans depended on renewable energy to increase their comfort. Humans switched from burning wood to exploring oil and natural gas to help meet their needs for energy. No one can deny that depending on oil or gas aids people to obtain energy faster, but at the same time, when people rely on oil and gas as source of energy, they undercut or idle the efforts that the human body could have exhausted in order to produce the same quantity of energy that a person needs to sustain his survival needs and earthly desires had he gone and cut a piece of wood from a tree and burned it.

As I just said, it is true that relying on oil and gas is more practical, but when humans depend on oil and gas to obtain energy they turn the human body into becoming a function of the changes that the environment undergo, in contrast to when humans make the quantity of energy that they need become a function of the efforts of the human body. In the case of the latter, this process does not idle the human body, because a person has to be always working hard planting trees, cutting trees, etc. etc. to meet his survival needs.

However, when humans will replace oil and gas energy with green form of energy, this again will aid people to obtain energy while the human body is playing an even lesser role in this process including provoking lesser damages in the environment. However, hence the legal and natural rights that humans legitimize does not make it possible for the mind to submit to the human institution (i.e., because people freeze social space and accumulate material things on cumulative basis and transfer it to designated individuals), this means that when people start to have less role to play to have access to energy, the time that the human body and the mind is gaining will require that the person expend this free time in another preoccupation that bring true happiness. And

because there is no other preoccupation that a person can have in this life besides either using the idea of good or the idea of evil to freeze social space and accumulate material things on cumulative basis to increase his happiness, then a newborn is doomed if he happens to be born in the wrong household, nation, or environment.

This also means that the most powerful families/dynasties are building for their destruction, if they continue of being in favor of tasking human development organizations (UN agencies, aid agencies, NGOs, charities, etc.) with provoking people to abandon their ways of living in favor of becoming modernized. This is because what those afore human development actors are doing when they are accelerating the modernization of people is nothing but accelerating the unpreparedness of the people who they are influencing to accept to cooperate unless relations are done on the basis of equality of outcomes. However, because the world does not function as such (people use the idea of good to freeze social space and accumulate material things on cumulative basis and transfer it to designated individuals and not only the idea of evil), then the most powerful families/dynasties could be provoking a social revolution if they continue of being in favor of tasking human development organizations (UN agencies, aid agencies, NGOs, charities, etc.) to teach people about democracy, human rights.

To put it differently, if we ask a person to cross a mountain, there are two ways to do it. The first is through excavating a tunnel and the other is through excavating a road or climbing to the peak and then going back down to the base. Surely, excavating a tunnel would get a person to cross a mountain faster, but this option piles a much bigger problem ahead of the person who arrived to his destination faster. This person has to find for himself a new project faster. In other words, if the government does not come up with a new project to preoccupy this person who arrived to his destination faster, the only two scenarios that the government has to prevent that this person starts to create problem at the new destination is either he goes back to where he came from (using the tunnel), or through the longer and harder way (i.e., excavating a road or climbing to the peak and then going back down to the base).

This is also to say that since the advances in science and technology is reducing the role that the human body could play in transportation,

communication, research and development, this means that mankind is at a cross road: either the families/dynasties who won WW2 start to increase death rates to stop people from putting the free time that the human body and the mind is gaining due to advances in technology in the service of forgoing each other's rights, or people accept to go back to living with no rights and at the mercy of the state (i.e., at the mercy of a small group).

Said differently, the human body (the hands) cannot fabricate or repair (weld) a computer chip but can fabricate or repair (weld) a pipe. Hence, advances in science and technology pushes the human body (hands and mind) against its will from having an essential role to play in what would be required to sustain the survival needs or satiate the earthly desires of this mass to one that would be very minimal, this means that the more people switch from using regular vehicles to driverless vehicles, thermal energy to green energy, fighter jet operated by pilots to drones, the more this switch would be idling a larger number of human bodies (minds) and preventing a larger number of people from refurbishing the human progress if needs be.

The only way to stop all the people who would not be happy with their status, and/or the ones who would be convinced that they should enlist the free time that their mind gained from advances in technology to improve social justice, and therefore, devote themselves to influencing those who are already surrendering freedom and obeying to stop doing it, is either through using force to silencing them, or if they accept to be blind, deaf and mute voluntarily. Hence the deeper ideas or convictions spread, the harder it gets to stop whatever is being disseminated from finding the right ears especially when the ideas involve increasing one's own happiness, this means that the likelihood of the people who are not happy with their status accepting to be blind, deaf and mute voluntarily in the future would continue to be low as the case is right now. Force is the only option that makes people be ready to surrender freedom and to obey. The only drawback to using force to maintain peace and security is that this option produce anger that no man has power to predict how the affected individual chooses to expend. When the use of force result in the loss of lives, the rage that develops in the heart of the family who lost a loved one becomes unforgivable.

Then again, death rates can be increased through wars, famine or through disease (manmade plague). All contention over social justice are better resolved through the use of starvation and genetically modified bacteria or viruses (manmade plague) because such method increase death rates without creating collateral damage in human progress. In other words, the advantage of using famine, manmade plague, or a combination as a tool to increase death rates is that this tactic prevents the people (nations) who are not pleased with their status from going to war to resize each other. During a famine or plague, people (nations) become preoccupied with how to contain the spread of the plague or to have access to food much more than how to resize their adversaries. In addition, another advantage of using famine and manmade plague to increase death rates is that this strategy makes it impossible to have nations gang to resize each other, because it is not possible to discover the exact reason why a situation is the way it is.

Actually, the most important advantage of increasing death rates using a famine or manmade plague, is that this method creates a balanced diminution of evil, tension or desires from the social order. For example, the bible says that when God was helping Moses to escape from Egypt, he asked Moses to take some blood and to put it on the sides and tops of the doorframes of the houses where he and his followers would be staying. [Exodus 12:7] The bible also says that God passed through Egypt and struck down via a destructive plague every firstborn of both people and animals in the houses that did not have the blood sign placed on their door frames. [Exodus 12:12] As can be seen, the advantage of this destructive method that God used to help Moses manage to bend the heart of the Pharaoh who was against letting Moses and his people leave initially is a very effective method to reduce evil, tension, or desires. By getting rid of all the newborns without any exceptions (including the first born of Pharaoh) no one in Egypt could take advantage or develop power much faster than the other, because they were all devastated equally.

In my opinion, if the families/dynasties who won WW2 (the victors of WW2) find that the peace and security in the world will diminish to a point that it would start to threaten their strength and stability, I do not rule out that they could try to reset the social order in the same way God did in Egypt through the use of a manmade plague or a forced famine,

especially since they are on their own this time, and God would not be helping them. Only if the usage of manmade plague or a forced famine fails to reduce the intolerance that people are compelling worldwide would the families/dynasties who won WW2 resort to engulfing the world in a new global war to create a new balance.

Then again, when God helped Moses to overwhelm Pharaoh, God meddled to help Moses advance the idea of good in the world, and not to increase evil. As of 1945, the common people are unprepared to obey the international rule based postwar world order because the rich (rulers and political class) are refusing to cooperate with them based on the work program set forth in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and are regarding themselves exempt from this appeal. If the families/dynasties who won WW2 (the victors of WW2) choose to reset the social order in the same way God did in Egypt through the use of some chemical or virus that travels in the air (or forced famine), those powerful families/dynasties would not be resorting to such recourse to increase good in the world, but the opposite, let alone reset the world through a global war. This begs many questions. For one, would the families/dynasties who won WW2 (the families/dynasties who control the international order and the money supply of the world) be able to prevent that their first – born (their heirs) be reverted to a simpler form, in the course of time and things, if they decide to reset the social order through using a manmade pandemic, manmade famine, or a conventional world war.

I have no way of knowing if peace and security in the world would continue to diminish thus prompting the families/dynasties who won WW2 to be in favor of wanting to preserve their strength and stability through relying on manmade pandemic, manmade famine, or a conventional world war to reset the social order or not. What I do know is that if the families/dynasties who won continue to be in favor of using the international intergovernmental organization named United Nations to threaten and reverse the democratic institutions that mankind paid a heavy price with the church to help build around the world from as far back as two thousand years ago already, divisiveness to determine how the social order should be organized would continue to grow.

For example, the decision of Great Britain to withdraw from the European Union could be a consequence of this on-going divisiveness. If other countries choose to break away from the relative canvas that advances in transportation and communication technology facilitated as of 1945, and begin to do as Great Britain convened is far better for it to increase the happiness of its nationals than to remain a member of the EU, then more nations would be saying that they are against the EU laws having precedence over their national laws.

Indeed, the decision of Great Britain (the principal founder of the international rule based postwar world order) to withdraw from the European Union has immeasurable implications on the future viability of the convictions about the human worth that were mentioned in the UN Charter.

To put it differently, when Great Britain said no to the EU laws having precedence over its national laws, this country was saying no to the UN Charter having precedence over the EU laws. Likewise, when Great Britain said no to the UN Charter having precedence over its national laws, this country was also saying that it is against continuing on writing the same history together. In other words, this country was saying no to this central idea that the founding fathers of the UN used to convince societies to come together to build a world free from fear and want. This idea is summarized in Article 1 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which says that “all human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights.”

I have no way of knowing if Great Britain is going to be able to convince people after it withdrew from the EU that it holds the idea that are affirmed in Article 1 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights as truth when its decision to be against continuing to write the same history with the rest of mankind does not support that it is in favor of building this free world that the United States has been fighting tirelessly for since 1776. What I do know is that only one of two scenarios could have compelled the families/dynasties who control Great Britain to withdraw from the EU and to be devoted to building a just and peaceful relationship within the spatial space of this country and with their neighbors. The first is if this country believes that it can continue to prompt the existing societies (now nations) to consider its opinion as

they were doing before WW2 erupted. The second is if this country believes that it is invincible.

I have no way of knowing if the families/dynasties who control Great Britain dismantled the empire that this monarch was maintaining before WW2 or know anything about the complex web of alliances and alignments that this monarch is part of to know which one of the afore scenarios led the families/dynasties who control Great Britain to think that they can repeat history when every member of the human family is practicing guided capitalism and working to avoid that the failures or defeat of their ancestors repeat. What I do know is that when Great Britain, completes its break up from the European Union, and this monarch starts to strengthen its own currency to compete against other societies, or begin to use its citizen to control its border better, as was the case before post 1945, to prevent migrants, contrabands, drugs and criminals from entering into this country, this monarch would be adding lots of new jobs, but would be inviting other countries to be prioritizing tribalism and nationalism at the same time. Moreover, because the jobs that Great Britain would be adding in the island would not be centering on making citizens return to becoming farmers (planting and cutting trees) or factory workers but would be more centered on making the person focus on what his neighbor is doing rather than to focus on what the person needs to be doing to sustain his own survival needs because machines are already doing the lion share, this means that the individuals (families/dynasties) who control this nation have two options to maintain their strength and stability. The first is returning Great Britain to adopting pre 1945 political systems internally to enable the rich in the country to maintain their strength and stability as was the case in Japan when this country closed its border for a period of 214 years (from 1603 to 1868). The second is to return the country (Great Britain) into attempting to reestablish the same hegemony that it maintained on the exterior of its geographical boundary before WW2 erupted. The drawback of the first option is that it can lead to a civil unrest or civil war in the course of time and things (case of Lebanon). The drawback of the second option is that it can lead to a war with its neighbors, in the course of time and things, as well (case of WW1 or WW2 is a good example). Those two options carry the risk of resizing the individuals (families/dynasties) who control Great Britain.

Then again because the families/dynasties who control Great Britain (or any nation) do not gamble with their wealth, status and power, and like everyone else, they need to get their ways despite the resistance of others through using the idea of good as a mean (rule of law, democracy, human rights, etc.), this means that if the families/dynasties who control Great Britain choose to prioritize revanchist ideologues to reclaim the power that they wielded before the British empire was dismantled they need to rely initially on strategies that are similar to the one God adopted when he helped Moses to overwhelm Pharaoh by striking the Egyptians down with a destructive plague. The families/dynasties who control Great Britain could try to test with whether or not they could reproduce the past glory of the British empire through relying on economic and social isolationism (famine, shortages) or military power. All those three strategies (plague, starvation, war) preoccupy people with how to escape death instead of with rivaling.

People go to war to defend their land, an ideology, when they are attacked or when they think that a war can produce a positive outcome. No nation is claiming territorial aggrandizement for the exception of Russia (annexation of Crimea) since 1945, and those who are doing it under the pretext of needing a security buffer such as the state of Israel. No nation can stop Russia or the state of Israel from getting their ways despite the resistance of others, because of the military power of Russia and the political influence that the state of Israel leverage through the United States. This means that only if the three remaining scenarios happen could the families/dynasties who control Great Britain manage to convince the British society and others to justify going to war to attack another nation. In my opinion, after the experience the world gained from the arguments the United States gave to wage its wars following the Sept 11, 2001 attacks, and the outcome such interventions produced so far, the world will need to wait for one or two generations to lapse before people beginning to trust going to war to save an ideology, or produce a positive outcome. In other words, to avoid this abnormal rise in desertions that military forces are manifesting around the world because of lack of convictions in either their leaders or the ideas given to justify a war.

Hence the causes that are usually necessary for the families/dynasties who control Great Britain to use military force to get their ways despite

the resistance of others are not strong presently, only reliance on formulaic biological warfare (manmade plague) or economic and social isolationism (famine, shortages) are a viable option.

In as far as economic and social isolationism (famine, shortages) is concerned, I do not believe that the families/dynasties who control Great Britain could force economic and social bloc (famine, shortages) today after the level of awareness and knowledge that people have developed along with the existing technology. To put it differently, there are two types famine (or drought): natural and manmade. For example the Soviet famine of 1932 -1933 in which seven million people died was a deliberate manmade famine.<sup>79</sup> The Great famine of Mount Lebanon (1915-1918) in which 200,000 people died, was a combination of both manmade and natural.<sup>80</sup> In addition, to the deliberate manmade famine that the Ottoman Empire had placed on the inhabitants of Mount Lebanon, a swarm of locusts devoured the crops. Hence all people from all walks of life would rise to protest if a worldwide manmade famine or shortage strike the earth, I think the idea that God adopted to overwhelm Pharaoh is the only promising option to enable the families/dynasties who control Great Britain to get their ways despite the resistance of others. The advantage of this option (a manmade plague) is that it allows the families/dynasties who control Great Britain to maintain their strength and stability, without this monarch having to stop to promote the importance of cooperating based on the principles stipulated in the UN Charter as a mean to reduce fear and want, or to have to adopt pre 1945 political systems. Most importantly, permit the world to continue to be devoted to making scientific progress, and the human progress would not be dismantled.

The idea of using animal and human fetal tissues to create genetically modified bacteria or viruses to increase death rates is not new and it dates to as far back as to the twenty-fourth century BC with the prominent rise of Enlil.

Enlil was an ancient Mesopotamian God who was regarded as the chief of deity of the Sumerian pantheon.<sup>81</sup>

---

<sup>79</sup> [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Chinese\\_famine\\_of\\_1928%E2%80%931930](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Chinese_famine_of_1928%E2%80%931930)

<sup>80</sup> [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Great\\_Famine\\_of\\_Mount\\_Lebanon](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Great_Famine_of_Mount_Lebanon)

<sup>81</sup> <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Enlil>

Enlil's approach to bringing judgment against people who refused to obey him was different than the God who figure in the Bible. Enlil did not run around like the God who figure in the Bible favoring people over others (i.e., establishing covenant with specific people), or asking people who he want to save to build an arch and to hide in it until he bring floodwaters<sup>82</sup> on the earth to destroy all life [Genesis 6:14-16], or ask people to take some blood and to put it on the sides and tops of doorframes so that when passes and bring judgment he could break the heart of the people he was displeased with their behaviors, [Genesis 12:7-12]. Enlil simply ensured that the earth does not become overpopulated by reducing the number of the earth's inhabitants by using wild animals and famines.<sup>83</sup> He usually maintained formulaic intervals of 1200 years to unleash his wrath or carry out an act of divine retribution. In addition, when people refused to listen to him preferring to increase wickedness and corruption instead, Enlil would send a flood.<sup>84</sup>

As the afore narrative on the different ways the Gods were using to maintain their strength and stability on earth according to legends, we can say that the reliance of the Gods on animal and human fetal tissues to create genetically modified bacteria or viruses to increase death rates is not new. We could also say that Enlil's approach to getting his way despite the resistance of man on earth was less problematic than the one that the God who figures in the Bible was using. First, Enlil's approach does not disrupt the rule of law, freedom, oblige people to adopt pre-determined political systems, have people stop from continuing to be devoted to making scientific progress, etc. Second, Enlil's approach does not include the practice of nepotism as the God who is narrated in the Bible was doing.

Then again, the Bible has provided us with some good news. We are told that this God who figure in this book has said that he was "Never again going to curse the ground because of man, even though every

---

<sup>82</sup> [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Flood\\_myth](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Flood_myth)

<sup>83</sup> Dalley, Stephanie (1989), *Myths from Mesopotamia: Creation, the Flood, Gilgamesh, and Others*, Oxford, England: Oxford University Press, ISBN 0-19-283589-0

<sup>84</sup> <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Atra-Hasis#Synopsis>

inclination of his heart is evil from childhood. And never again will he destroy all living creatures, as he has done.”<sup>85</sup>

This is indeed great news. This is because if the families/dynasties who control Great Britain, or the families/dynasties who control the international order or money supply of the world (the victors of WW2) decide to create genetically modified bacteria or viruses to increase death rates to continue to get their ways despite the resistance of others, or adopt social isolationism (famine, shortages), or military power recourse to achieve the same, they do not have to worry about this God who is mentioned in the Bible unleashing his wrath on them since he has already made a promise to not take his anger against humanity as he did in the story of the flood no matter how much the wickedness of the heart of man deepens. In fact, it looks as if this God that is mentioned in the Bible concluded that it is useless for him to adopt force or anger to get his way as he was doing with the people who he had established covenant with them, or after he saw that no matter which route he tried to transform the conditions and outcomes that matters to him with the people who he had established covenant with them he was failing. The new strategy of forgiveness that he began adopting to get his way as reflected in the teaching of supposedly his son (refer to the new testament of the bible) has not been any different so far. Actually, the new testament of the bible report that the rulers of the old world crucified his only son that’s how much they were against adopting his teaching.

Then again, this God that is mentioned in the Bible could be boiling in anger especially after his attempt to send a prophet with a new message, which once again, was received with the same disinterest by the rulers of the old world.

Surely, we cannot say that the victors of WW2 (the families/dynasties who control the international order or money supply of the world) are obeying the rules set forth in the Universal Declaration of human rights, or the Bible (Torah or new testament), Quran, Vedas, Jīng, etc. as of 1945.

---

<sup>85</sup> [http://web.mit.edu/jywang/www/cef/Bible/NIV/NIV\\_Bible/GEN+8.html](http://web.mit.edu/jywang/www/cef/Bible/NIV/NIV_Bible/GEN+8.html)

It is highly possible that this God that is mentioned in the Bible is staying silent and not doing nothing about the lack of leadership that emerged in the world on the aftermath of WW2, because he gave up on rulers continuing to regard themselves as the measure of all things.

Unfortunately, we cannot say that Enlil would be willing to be passive or as indifferent about the unpreparedness of the victors of WW2 (the families/dynasties who control the international order or money supply of the world) to obey the rules set forth in the Universal Declaration of human rights, or the Bible (Torah or new testament), Quran, Vedas, Jīng, etc. as the God that figures in the Bible has been behaving subsequent to the refusal of the rulers of the world to obey the last guidelines or standards he shared in the Quran 1400 years ago.

I have no way of knowing if Enlil would be staying silent and doing nothing about the lack of leadership that emerged in the world on the aftermath of WW2 as a result of the victors of WW2 (the families/dynasties who control the international order or money supply of the world) choosing to be passive and indifferent about the appeal of the common people to rulers and political class to compel them to cooperate with them in accordance with the work program set forth in the Universal Declaration of human rights, and religious or philosophical books. In other words, if Enlil would be in favor of tolerating all the distrust, jealousy, anger, impatience, frustration, tribalism, nationalism, corruption, deceit, etc., that emerged in the world since 1945 as the victors of WW2 (the families/dynasties who control the international order or money supply of the world) are doing.

Indeed, the unpreparedness of the common people to obey the rules set forth in the Universal Declaration of human rights, and religious or philosophical books is not something that can be blamed solely on the lack of leadership by the victors of WW2 (the families/dynasties who control the international order or money supply of the world) to assume their responsibility, but rather the rulers and political class who protect them in different UN member states equally share equal blame in this accountability. This is because it is not the victors of WW2 (the families/dynasties who control the international order or money supply of the world) who are enforcing the rules that were legitimized in the international rule based postwar world order (i.e., the Universal

Declaration of Human Rights) but the rulers and political class who protect them in the different UN member states.

To put it differently, we cannot say that it is the victors of WW2 (the families/dynasties who control the international order or money supply of the world) who are refusing to bear with one another, or are the one who are complaining against one another, or are the one who are not willing to forgive each other, because those powerful families/dynasties are not the one who are refusing to be united in the same mind and the same judgment that they determined at the end of WW2, but it is the common people and the rulers and political class who protect them in different UN member states who are refusing.

Said differently, Great Britain is the nation who lost the most after this monarch agreed to dismantle its empire so the poor societies that its rulers and political class was administering be free and get a chance to live without fear and want post WW2. The Queen of England did not ask the people in Lebanon to elect the rulers and political class in this country, or to disobey the principle set forth in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights so this country become stateless seventy years later. Likewise, the Queen of England did not ask the rulers and political class in Egypt to disobey the principle set forth in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights so this country become a prison seventy years later. Most importantly, the Queen of England did not ask the administrators of the international intergovernmental organization named United Nations to convert this global council into a den of thieves, but to the contrary, it is the administrators of the United Nations who are using this global council as a mean to deny people rights, destroy people's lives and violate the work program that they pledged to obey.

It looks as if the state of insecurity that the world is knowing since 1945 is not entangled in the victors of WW2 (the families/dynasties who control the international order or money supply of the world) lacking leadership to determine policies that has potentials to help mankind reduce fear and want, but rather lack leadership to make the rulers and political class in UN member states and the human development organizations (UN agencies, aid agencies, NGOs, charities, etc.) they unleashed in the social order lead by example.

If the victors of WW2 (the families/dynasties who control the international order or money supply of the world) continue to lack leadership to make the rulers and political class in UN member states including the human development organizations (UN agencies, aid agencies, NGOs, charities, etc.) they unleashed in the social order lead by example (i.e., obey the Universal Declaration of Human Rights), this signify that those powerful families/dynasties cannot prevent rulers and political class in UN member states from relying on genetically modified bacteria or viruses, famine, wars, shortages, etc., to increase death rates to solidify their powers better in the future.

Then again, in the surviving Sumerian version of God stories, when the earth was getting vastly overpopulated, and people were making too much noise that was preventing Enlil from sleeping, He would reduce the population first through famine, drought, pandemic, etc., and then follow it with a flood if people continue to be unprepared to bear with one another.<sup>86</sup>

And so, since we already know that all the distrust, jealousy, anger, impatience, frustration, tribalism, nationalism, corruption, deceit, etc., that emerged in the world since 1945 would have not occurred if Great Britain and the rest of the old powers chose to remain faithful to the work program that the founding fathers of the UN designed and counseled them to obey to solidify their power and ensure lasting peace, we can say that all the malice, deceit, hypocrisy, envy and slander that the world is knowing today could be a result of those old powers preferring securing the maintenance of their strength and security through having the international intergovernmental organization named United Nations and other human development organizations making people stop being prepared to cope as they were doing.

To give an example, the Lebanese were not fighting with each other in 1945 as they are now doing. In 1945 only the rich were fighting among each other over power, wealth and status. Today, in Lebanon, only the dead are not fighting among each other over power, wealth and status. From 1945 to now, the only new exposure that the Lebanese knew has

---

<sup>86</sup> Kramer, Samuel Noah (1961), *Sumerian Mythology: A Study of Spiritual and Literary Achievement in the Third Millennium B.C.: Revised Edition*, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: University of Pennsylvania Press, ISBN 0-8122-1047-6

been the technical assistance that the international intergovernmental organization named United Nations and other human development organizations provided to improve democracy and the rule of law.

If for as long as the victors of WW2 (the families/dynasties who control the international order or money supply of the world) continue to allow the international intergovernmental organization named United Nations and other human development organizations teach people to stop coping unless their leaders and political class shares outcomes with them on equal rights, can those powerful families/dynasties prevent that the noise that people are making not wake up Enlil, and prompt him to wage his wrath on everyone as he was doing according to legends, if the rich nations who are protecting them (such as Great Britain, United States, Norway, Sweden, Denmark) remain apathetic and unprepared to do nothing to “put away all the malice, and all the deceit and hypocrisy, and all the envy and all the slander” that the international intergovernmental organization is provoking in the world since 1945?

Indeed, no one can tell if all flood myth or wrath stories that are usually provoked by a deity or deities as an act of divine retribution to destroy specific people, societies or kingdom have occurred or not. However, what we do know, is that death is natural, and so, whether a person dies from famine, old age, a bullet, biological warfare, falling from a cliff, etc., what changes is the method of death only. In addition, throughout history people have been resizing each other. In fact, humans did not limit the resizing that they always subject each other to confronting to their own culture only, but depicted that this is also how the Gods dealt with each other. For example, when people worshipped multiple deities, the Gods are depicted betraying, stabbing each other, and the victor God is pushed on others by those who gain the most from mixing religion with politics to advance their self-interests. Actually, the decision of the Greeks to get rid of all the gods, and to replace them with a single divinity who assumes the displaced god's attributes and functions, could have resulted from the growing awareness that was ongoing.

Therefore, since for as long as existing people refuse to do as per what the founding fathers of the U/N counselled us to be doing and that is to cooperate based on the principles of equal rights and without distinction of any kind, such as race, colour, sex, language, religion, political or

other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth or other status, it would not matter which country (society) controls the international order or the money supply of the world because people would be always working to resize each other; this means that until our successors manage to do as per what our ancestors agreed to do and that was to do away with all the Gods in favor of keeping a single monotheist God (i.e., the king of Gods), then the social order would remain dynamic. In other words, until people get rid of all the political ideologies for the exception of the liberal interventionism or the self-determination philosophy, but buttressed on the international rule based postwar world order (i.e., the Universal Declaration of Human Rights), the social order would remain dynamics.

Moreover, since as I just said it would not matter which country (society) controls the international order or the money supply of the world, for as long as people are not cooperating based on the principles of equal rights and without distinction of any kind, because people would be always working to resize each other (in other words, nor the rich or the poor would be living with any peace of mind), this means that what is at stakes to avoid that peace and security continue to worsens around the world is not whether or not the Chinese, the Americans, or the Indians control the international order or the money supply of the world, but rather which society today its people have developed enough understanding of themselves that they would not be unwilling to trade this understanding that they gained of themselves in order to start to benefit with it their self-interests instead of the common good.

To put it differently, when the British colonists and other European nationals decided to split from the British Crown in north America in 1776 to create a new country that they called the United States of America, their brothers and sisters in western Europe stayed until 1945 living under social hierarchy and monarchial domination. It was the understanding that the old powers (the western European kingdoms) developed of themselves while observing the United States transform from 1776-1945 what helped them to be ready to give up social hierarchy and monarchial domination in 1945 to embrace liberal interventionism and self-determination as a means to achieve democracy and rule of law.

If people around the world continue to be unprepared to cooperate based on the principles stipulated in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, then mankind could lose, the understanding that the European gained of themselves in those last 200 years, and the ones that the American amassed. At that point in time, mankind would return to living as the case is like now in many nations with no rights and at the mercy of the state (i.e., at the mercy of a small group). In other words, if people (nations) go back to cooperating based on pre-1945 relations, it would be the actual dignity and worth that each person began to profit from as of 1945 what is going to be traded or taken away. This freedom is what our fathers paid the ultimate price during WW1 and WW2 to secure for us.

Therefore, the question that mankind need to answer is not one that centers on knowing whether the Chinese, or the Peruvians, or the Bangladeshi, etc. control the international order or money supply of the world, but rather which society possesses today sufficient understanding of itself to continue this development mission of men that began from the story of the flood, knowing already that there is no other better philosophy to social engineer the international order with, then the one stipulated in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights?

In my opinion, the United States is the only UN member state who qualifies to play the role of king of kings. This is because the United States is the only society (UN member state) who demonstrated that its rules could make citizens happy to the point of being able to forget their distinction thus enabling them to develop afterwards understanding of themselves.

At this juncture, it is important I remind readers that the scope of this work is not to investigate how the families/dynasties who won WW2 should social engineer the world so relations between people improves, nor the scope of this work is to suggest to the powerful families/dynasties who won WW2 what they should do or not do to maintain their strength and stability - No one asked my opinion.

The scope of this work is to investigate if the families/dynasties who won WW2 (the families/dynasties who control the international order

or money supply of the world) and the nations with Great power such as Great Britain and the United States would be able to consolidate their power, wealth and status while the intergovernmental organization named United Nations, international aid organizations operated by governments, NGOs, charities, and all those who believe that they should dedicate themselves to the service of their neighbor are using their awareness to put into question how natural and legal rights should be distributed instead of letting this job be handled solely by governments as suggested by the founding fathers of the UN.

Specifically, I am investigating if we could expect that the administrators of the intergovernmental organization named United Nations would remain a faithful servant to their masters (the families/dynasties who won WW2) including the nations with Great power such as Great Britain and the United States, after those powerful mentioned actors granted to this organization rights to be a coordinating platform and an economic operator who is providing political and economic solutions while enjoying immunities and privileges. In other words, I want to understand if the families/dynasties who won WW2 including the nations with Great power such as Great Britain and the United States would be able to prevent that the power they have granted to the intergovernmental organization named United Nations not become politicized, and starting to serve in the course of time and things other ambitions such as the resizing of those powerful families/dynasties or mentioned nations in order to assume their functions.

To put it differently, I am investigating, if the decision of the families/dynasties who won WW2 (the families/dynasties who control the international order or money supply of the world) to let the intergovernmental organization named United Nations be an economic operator, thus provoking its administrators to start to launder money and practice malice, deceit, hypocrisy, envy, slander, including using UN courts to deny people rights would solidify their power and the power of their heirs, or if this conduct is building to revert their heirs into a simpler form just as this organization is doing to the people who its administrators are victimizing today. I plan to carry out this verification in the upcoming chapters.

## 29

# **Is the world engulfed in a class conflict?**

---

In 1945, the founding fathers of the UN counselled the families/dynasties who won WW2 (the families/dynasties who control the international order and the money supply of the world) to let UN member states determine their own political status including providing the economic and cultural solutions that fits their reality. The families/dynasties who won WW2 decided to disobey the work program that the founding fathers of the UN counselled them to remain faithful to its principles and approved that the international intergovernmental organization named United Nations create UN agencies and bodies to provide parallel political, economic, solutions, and cultural programs to the one governments determines and enforce. Today, hundreds upon hundreds of UN agencies and bodies along with hundreds upon hundreds of human development organizations (aid agencies operated by governments, NGOs, charities, banks, companies, etc.,) are all building the hopes of the families/dynasties who won WW2.

One of the many agencies that the families/dynasties who won WW2 (the victors of WW2) created and hoped that its wisdom be used to reset the problems that beset our world pursuant to the dawn of the atomic age is the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA).

The International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) is an international organization that seeks to promote the peaceful use of nuclear energy, and to inhibit its use for any military purpose, including nuclear weapons.<sup>87</sup> The IAEA was established in 1957. The Agency's genesis was U.S. President Dwight Eisenhower's (1890 – 1969) "Atoms for

---

<sup>87</sup> [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/International\\_Atomic\\_Energy\\_Agency](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/International_Atomic_Energy_Agency)

Peace” address to the General Assembly of the United Nations on 8 December 1953.<sup>88</sup> The IAEA was setup under the aegis of the United Nations.

When we review President Eisenhower’s “Atoms for Peace” speech, we find that his ideas (proposal) to take nuclear weapons out of the hands of the soldiers and to put it in the hands of those who would adapt it to the arts of peace, was buttressed on “convictions that nations will provide a great share of the wisdom, of the courage and of the faith which can bring to this world lasting peace for all nations, and happiness and well-being for all men.” Considering that no UN member states (including the United States) invoked those concepts that President Eisenhower’s expected that people would be doing their share to secure, we can say that the IAEA is today one of the biggest threat to mankind.

In other words, if as President Eisenhower’s said in his speech, that “if the peoples of the world are to conduct an intelligent search for peace, they must be armed with the significant facts of today's existence,” we cannot say that the United States and all other UN member states are arming themselves with “significant facts” about the threat of atomic danger or the weapons which dawned the atomic age, if people are not doing their share of remaining faithful to one another. Most importantly, because the secret to build an atomic bomb or other weapons are possessed by many nations today, the threat that the United States wanted to avoid, and reason why this nation was in favor of using “Atoms for Peace” in the first place, are much bigger today than what the danger that such weapons posed in 1953. This threat of how to avoid any surprise aggression of atomic danger (warfare) is the same today as was the case like in 1953.

Indeed, the large programme of warning and defense systems that nations are sponsoring is a useful way to counter against the fearful material damage and toll of human lives that would be inflicted by surprise aggression, but this strategy cannot guarantee absolute safety.

I have no way of knowing if the tensions of today's world are eliminating from the heart and mind of people desolation against the use of atomic warfare (biological warfare or conventional warfare), particularly that

---

<sup>88</sup> <https://www.iaea.org/about/history/atoms-for-peace-speech>

the number one nation who is leading worldwide efforts to produce and rid the world from such danger, i.e., the United States, was the first nation to use such hopeless finality when it realized that it was going to lose World War Two perhaps. The good news is that no man can condemn the United States for accepting to detonate a nuclear bomb in Japan or for annihilating the heritage of mankind in this part of the world, because history has shown that no army can defeat a mind who perceive that victory is secured by forgoing its own security (martyrdom) thus its own convictions succeed afterwards (zero-sum game). Most importantly, all the religious and the national convictions that has overwhelmed the world since 1945 support that if the United States had not detonated a nuclear bomb to provoke Japan to surrender and end WW2, mankind would have not continued, as we are doing till today, the age-old struggle upward from savagery towards decency, right and justice, but stopped it. In other words, if the United States had not detonated a nuclear bomb over Japan to end WW2, mankind would have stopped this ongoing struggle that the United States is leading since 1945 to move humanity from the dark chamber of horror into the light (i.e., to help mankind use the liberal interventionism idea and self-determination as a mean to improve democracy and the rule of law). Instead, mankind would have been continuing this old tradition of having newborns live with no rights and at the mercy of the state (i.e., at the mercy of a small group). Unfortunately, this strategy is prevalent in most UN member states till today, and most governments for the exception of the government of the United States appear to be in favor of it staying that way.

In the speech on “atoms for peace” that Dwight D. Eisenhower gave in 1953, and in which he proposed the creation of an international atomic energy agency to make atoms work for peace, he said that “if a danger exists in the world, it is a danger shared by all.” Hence, the governments of all UN member states wants to shift away from the “human way of developing the understanding required for confident and peaceful relations,” which Eisenhower considered is imperative to make the world a safer place for our successors, and want to take the United States along in this journey, we can say that the discontent, which is now settling upon the world, will not be aiding societies to seek harmonious relations. To the contrary each country would be seeking to elevate its lot.

We can also say that in the midst of the on-going scramble that nations are evoking to impose themselves or determine who would be band-wagoning with who to form complex web, we cannot be sure that this strategy would be providing far-reaching visions to any of them but shallow visions. This strategy would not change the fact that we do not have an organization who is seeking to promote the peaceful use of nuclear energy, and to inhibit its use for any military purpose, including nuclear weapons that is made up of one national identity (fabric) but a mixture. In other words, this exercise or process is not being managed by people who uphold one nationality, one belief, but of people from all nationalities, religions, beliefs, etc., and of people that the families/dynasties who won WW2 were dominating till 1945.

In addition, because this body (IAEA) is offering advisory service to nations while doing the oversight,<sup>89</sup> which is actually what the majority of the United Nations bodies and agencies are doing (i.e., operating as self-financed economic businesses), it is not possible to know if the observations or recommendations that are being made by the IAEA and others to reduce fear and want are credible, bias, and most importantly, true. This is because it was never demonstrated yet that when an authority appointed a third party to preserve its strength and solidify its power, including ensure providing durable solution to prevent its resizing that no kingdom, empire, company, nation, etc., managed to get its way despite the resistance of others - when its servants were people that they dominated and were buying and selling at the same time.

Indeed, the manner that the victors of WW2 (the families/dynasties who won WW2) are going about to solidify their power and find a durable solution to the many difficult problems facing the world are new and revolutionary. That is to say the victors of WW2 (the families/dynasties who control the international order and the money supply of the world) want atomic energy not fall in the hands of nations who would use this technology to helplessly annihilate with it human progress, using oversight bodies (IAEA and UN member states) that its officials are at the same time working on realizing the full development of their personality. In other words, the victors of WW2 expect to continue to

---

<sup>89</sup> <https://www.iaea.org/>

solidify their powers using oversight bodies that human development organizations (UN agencies, aid agencies, NGOs, charities, etc.) spent the last seventy years teaching its elements (people) that all citizens, without distinction of race or color, shall share outcomes on equal rights instead of teaching them how to practice tolerance to develop the right understanding of themselves thus becoming afterwards able to promote the goals set forth in the UN charter or the Universal Declaration of Human Rights without distinction of any kind, such as race, colour, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth or other status. This is very serious and worrisome.

I have no way of knowing if the families/dynasties who won WW2 possess divination power to gain insight into the past, present or future thus enabling them to know what exactly the officials who are safeguarding them at the IAEA and at the different United Nations bodies and agencies are upholding in their hearts in private, or if they just rely on background checks and on ensuring that only specific individuals have clearance to see or know certain things. Surely, the number of nations who possess nuclear weapons already, and the ones who are working on possessing such weapons, or claiming that they merit possessing one, does not support that the families/dynasties who won WW2 possess divination power or that the background checks they conduct are efficient. In fact, some expert claim that between the United States and Russia each maintain roughly 900 nuclear weapons on prompt-launch status—commonly called high alert or hair-trigger alert—so they can be launched in minutes.<sup>90</sup>

Indeed, this large number of nuclear weapons on prompt-launch status between the United States and Russia only is scary. This large number support that the families/dynasties who won WW2 are either divided or they decided to practice new methods post 1945 to protect their wealth, status and power that previous kings avoided.

For example, before King Nebuchadnezzar placed Daniel in a high position and lavished many gifts on him, including making him ruler over the entire province of Babylon, and placed him in charge of all its wise men, [Daniel 2:48] Daniel had managed to read through what

---

<sup>90</sup> <https://www.ucsus.org/sites/default/files/attach/2015/05/Hair-Trigger-Alert-Policy-Brief.pdf>

King Nebuchadnezzar was dreaming. Likewise, when the Pharaoh put Joseph in charge of the land of Egypt, [Genesis 41:33] Joseph did what Daniel was capable to do.

Sigvard Eklund<sup>91</sup> (1911 - 2000), Swedish physicist, and Hans Blix<sup>92</sup> (born 1928), Swedish diplomat, both served as head of the International Atomic Energy Agency. Those two Swedish nationals managed the IAEA throughout the second half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century (Eklund from 1961 – 1980, and Blix from 1981 – 1997).

I do not know what Sigvard Eklund and Hans Blix interpreted for the families/dynasties who won WW2, so those powerful families/dynasties accept to appoint them as director of the agency that was supposed to ensure that no nation would use nuclear energy for military purposes or develop nuclear weapons post 1945.

Hence we cannot consider that Sigvard Eklund or his successor Hans Blix were inhibiting at the IAEA nations from using nuclear energy for military purposes or developing inter ballistic weapons throughout the second half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century (1961 – 1997) otherwise we would not have today between the United States and Russia each maintain roughly 900 nuclear weapons on prompt-launch status, then one of two scenarios is true. Either the families/dynasties who won WW2 picked the wrong persons for the IAEA from 1961 to 1997, or the families/dynasties who won WW2 are also the ones who control the United States and Russia.

I have no way of knowing which scenario between the afore two is right. However, because before WW2 erupted no king brought a person that was not born in his house (society) and tasked him with transporting a courier that has potentials to threaten his strength and security never mind overseeing that his adversaries are promoting or inhibiting use of nuclear energy for military purposes, this signify that Sigvard Eklund and Hans Blix had to have been the wrong individuals assigned to head the IAEA by the families/dynasties who won WW2, but not outsiders who were brought to be in the service of those powerful families/dynasties.

---

<sup>91</sup> [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sigvard\\_Eklund](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sigvard_Eklund)

<sup>92</sup> [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Hans\\_Blix](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Hans_Blix)

Then again, we have no way of knowing if Sigvard Eklund and Hans Blix were in the service of the families/dynasties who won WW2 while they were heading the IAEA in order to see that the work program that the founding fathers of the UN proposed succeed, or if they had aspirations that extended beyond being a loyal servant to the ideas that the powerful families/dynasties laid out in the UN Charter.

For example, Mohamed ElBaradei<sup>93</sup>, (born 1942) Egyptian diplomat, who succeeded Hans Blix and served as the head of the IAEA from 1997 – 2009, expressed convictions after he stepped down from this position that does not support that he was a loyal servant to the ideas that the powerful families/dynasties prescribed in the UN charter.

In 2012, Mohamed ElBaradei put his name on the ballot to be the President of Egypt during the 2012 Presidential election. During the presidential campaigns trail Mohamed ElBaradei was saying slogans that I found not convincing to support that he was a loyal servant to the ideas that the powerful families/dynasties prescribed in the UN charter. In one of his presidential campaign interviews Mohamed ElBaradei said: “I was born as an Egyptian, I lived as an Egyptian, and I will die as Egyptian.”<sup>94</sup>

There is always a big difference between what candidates for president say on the campaign trail, and the real character that emerge after they are voted into office. However, we have no way of knowing if the convictions that Mohamed ElBaradei expressed are true or false.

If the person who was during his tenure in charge of ensuring that no nation uses nuclear energy for military purposes from 1997 – 2009, wants in 2012 to be the President of Egypt, because “he was born as an Egyptian, he lived as an Egyptian, and he will die as Egyptian,” then there is a good chance that he was not a loyal servant to the ideas that the powerful families/dynasties prescribed in the UN charter. This is very serious and worrisome.

---

<sup>93</sup>

[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mohamed\\_ElBaradei#Possible\\_presidential\\_candidacy](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mohamed_ElBaradei#Possible_presidential_candidacy)

<sup>94</sup> [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=mfgR7l3rFxs&ab\\_channel=AlJazeeraEnglish](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=mfgR7l3rFxs&ab_channel=AlJazeeraEnglish)

The United Nations system employs hundreds of thousands of people presently. If one official among all the people who are working for the United Nations system or the human development organizations (government aid agencies, NGOs, charities, etc.) who are providing parameters for everyday behavior that uphold convictions similar to the one ElBaradei, the former director of the IAEA, voiced when he was on the presidential campaign trail to become the President of Egypt, then mankind is doomed!

This is because in 1945 mankind came together to create a one world order (one history) and not to cooperate in the political, economic, social and cultural field so everyone stays living and dying as an Egyptian, American, Chinese, Lebanese, Israeli, Indian, etc. The purpose of having all people come together on the aftermath of WW2 in order to use the liberal interventionism and self-determination philosophy as a tool to improve democracy and rule of law was to permit that every member of the human family can live free from fear and want and not to make Egypt, or the United States, or China, Lebanon, Israel, India, etc. great, but the whole world.

Then again, considering that no nation for the exception of the United States has been confronting head on the agendas of the forces that gains if the liberal interventionism and self-determination philosophy fail (this is because it enables them to continue to regard themselves exempt from the appeal of obeying the work program prescribed in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights), this signify that if people continue to be against living and dying for the ideas that are affirmed in the progressive human development missions (or milestone) that our predecessors have been paying the ultimate price so we can continue to have freedom, this luxury may not last forever.

In other words, if people continue to be against holding the ideas that are affirmed in the work program of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights as truth, and everyone wants to live and die as Egyptian, American, Chinese, Lebanese, Israeli, Indian, Christian, Jew, Muslim, etc. as a good number of people are expressing in recent years, can the families/dynasties who won WW2 or the United States for this matter be sure that everyone is doing everything that is within his (her) capacity

to ensure that the liberal interventionism and self-determination philosophy does not fail? This is because if one person among all those actors who are providing parameters for everyday behavior is upholding convictions similar to the one ElBaradei, voiced when he was on the presidential campaign trail to become the President of Egypt, then there is a good chance that mankind could be building for social revolution.

And so, the question that begs an answer is not whether or not Sigvard Eklund, Hans Blix and Mohamed ElBaradei failed to prevent nations from disarming because they wanted to live and die based on the tribal convictions that their fathers handed to them, but rather can the United States rely on a human development system (UN system, government aid agencies, NGOs, charities, etc.) that its officials do not use the liberal interventionism and self-determination philosophy as a civilizing mission to reduce the spread of nuclear weapons, but as a tool to help them realize the full development of their personality?

Likewise, can Great Britain protect the Anglosphere from disintegrating and/or ensure that its own sovereignty would not confront surprise attacks if the societies who this kingdom dominated till 1945 but after this date freed and placed its people at its service do not want to live and die as “Babylonians” but want to live and die as Daniel and his friends Hananiah, Mishael and Azariah in the book of Daniel lived preferred to stay as “Israelites”?

In fact, the afore inquest into the likelihood of people appearing to wanting to uphold the tribal values that they inherited from their fathers post 1945 as Daniel and his friends in the Bible in the book of Daniel chose, begs many questions. For one can Great Britain avoid the reversal of the Anglosphere to a simpler form as happened to king Nebuchadnezzar and his heir if this kingdom continues to be preserving the security of the Anglosphere using a human development system that its actors (UN system, government aid agencies, NGOs, charities, etc.) are using the interferences that they are compelling in the political status of nations to realize the full development of their personality instead of the full development of the international rule based postwar world order that was personified in the UN charter?

It looks as if the longer Great Britain delay the resizing of the intergovernmental organization named United Nations, the more this country would be preserving its security based on good fortune rather than by good management. Said differently, if the UN system and the rest of the human development organizations (government aid agencies, NGOs, charities, etc.) are employing disillusioned officials like Edward Snowden<sup>95</sup> (born 1983), an American intelligence consultant, who leaked highly classified information about the domestic surveillance state in the United States and of other nations around the world, can Great Britain the custodian of the Anglosphere protect this sphere from facing the same end that the Babylonians or the Romans on the hands of similar actors. This is very serious and worrisome. If the UN system and the rest of the human development organizations (government aid agencies, NGOs, charities, etc.) are employing officials who are disillusioned with the programs with which they are involved, and they try to raise ethical concerns as Snowden did, Great Britain could be building for its destruction.

It is important that readers keep in mind that the afore concern does not denote the sparking of a Snowden effect that sees many people who are disillusioned with the programs with which they are involved leak classified information as Snowden and others are doing only, but it also include the disillusionment (or Snowden effect) that can happen in the heart and mind of people as well. In other words, if many people begin to believe that it is incumbent on them to raise ethical concerns instead of being devoted to obey the political order that the families/dynasties who won WW2 justify, the distrust the would be growing in the heart and mind of people could make them become unprepared to obey the natural and legal rights that the rich usually legitimize (herein the victors of WW2). Hence the political order (social contract) that the rich (herein the victors of WW2) legitimize is subjective and cannot create balance because people cannot fill the same void space, this means that when people distrust with the political order (social contract) that the rich legitimize grows, the social order would be evolving in the same way how broken relationships cultivates. Broken relationships usually end in a separation (collapse).

---

<sup>95</sup> [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Edward\\_Snowden](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Edward_Snowden)

Then again, hence up what is going to be feeding the decision making process of the families/dynasties who won WW2 until they make up their mind on whether or not they want to apply the power that they have to create a one human family that advances the struggle for democracy, or if they want to use the idea of making people come together to make it much easier for them to increase death rates and ultimately return mankind to living as was the case before 1945 based on religious and ethnic clusters, is a dysfunctional system (i.e., the United Nations system), this means that it would not be possible to inhibit the fittest from getting his way despite the resistance of the others. In other words, it would not be possible for the families/dynasties who won WW2 to avoid using force to achieve nonmilitary goals. Moreover, because the United Nations system is an economic operator who is also buying and selling, this also means that for as long as this body is not dismantled, it would be a potent player in this ongoing rivaling that it would be very difficult to reckon with.

To put it differently, the only entity that possess a strategy today around the world to get its way despite the resistance of others is the intergovernmental organization named United Nations. All the UN member states, starting from Great Britain and the United States, possess communication strategies on human rights, nation building, democracy and rule of law, but no strategy whatsoever on how to practice the old and new values that they tasked the intergovernmental organization named United Nations to preach. This means that for as long as UN member states preach about human rights, nation building, democracy and rule of law but without anyone being ready to follow through, it would be very important for the nations who depend on the idea of human rights and democracy to get their ways despite the resistance of others, such as Great Britain or the United States, to come up with activities that would make nations be ready to follow through on what they are preaching without them doing it to continue to be able to maintain their strength and stability otherwise the efforts that they would be exhausting would be useless.

Said differently, hence two people cannot fill the same void space, all nations cannot be true to the values that they preach. For this reasons all nations are obliged to rely on the idea of good to get their ways despite the resistance of others. The rich nations use a carrot and a stick to get their ways, and the poor nations use emotions and deceit to do the same.

The intergovernmental organization named United Nations gets its ways despite the resistance through using a carrot only.

Interestingly, if we compare how Great Britain or the United States are trying to get their ways despite the resistance of others to the way China does it, we find that China has been more effective by miles. China is not a country who preach human rights, nation building, democracy and rule of law to get its ways despite the resistance of others. In other words, China is capable to get its ways without their being a need for it to even use a stick or a carrot. Great Britain or the United States are using a carrot and a stick to get their despite the resistance of others. Strangely, they are not able to get their ways neither when they use a carrot nor when they use a stick.

I have no way of knowing why China is able to use a carrot and get its ways and then when the United States uses a carrot to get its ways the entire world is on the lookout. What I do know is that when the founding fathers of the UN created the United Nations, the obligations that a nation was supposed to obey in order to be admitted into this family of nations did not include commitments to foster human rights, social justice, nation building, rule of law, but commitments to respect such social arena.

I have no way of knowing why the victors of WW2 changed or shifted the civilizing mission that they invited all the existing societies to join them in building initially, and which was about how to build the same happiness that the American people were capable to achieve by 1945, to include, among other things, tasking the intergovernmental organization named United Nations with ensuring that all citizens, without distinction of race or color, shall be equal in all civil, social and political outcomes.

Indeed, this shift in civilizing mission to ensure that all people of all ages and sexes, rich or poor, race or color, shall be equal in all civil, social and political outcomes has switched mankind's preoccupation from being about how to achieve anyone of the initial goals that the founding fathers of the UN came up with, or the new goals that their successors pinpointed to being about who would be the fastest

(strongest) at telling the slowest (weakest) to consider his opinion before taking action on his own.

I have no way of knowing who would be the victor in this new civilizing mission that the victors of WW2 persuaded all people of all ages and sexes, rich and poor, race or color, to delve on its path, and which its trademark has been so far nothing less than laissez-faire economics, wars, civil strife, disobedience, betrayal, etc. What I do know is that the use of the stick (military force) has not helped the societies who tried this method to get their ways despite the resistance of others. All the wars that were fought since 1945 support that the use of force did not improve accountability and democratic legitimacy between people so our societies change to the better.

If the use of the stick (military force) has not helped any individual (society) in this race (or new civilizing mission) to get his ways so far, this means that the fittest cannot be the one who possess the mightiest military power or the most advanced technology over any other country. This signify the fittest or the mightiest can only be the one who possess the right diplomacy or clever malice.

I have no way of knowing if blending diplomacy or malice into a carrot can secure for an individual the transformations (i.e., goals and strategies) that one seeks indefinitely. In other words, if in the course of time and things, the people who are being asked to be patient and to surrender freedom in exchange for greater access to happiness, would realize that the cost is outweighing the benefits, and would begin to be bound by their personal power and conscience instead, this option is not sustainable.

In my opinion, the state of despair that has trapped the idea of democracy or rule of law in recent years is a consequence of the meddling by the intergovernmental organization named United Nations and human development organization to secure that outcomes are shared on equal rights. This interference made it no longer feasible for any society to improve democracy or rule of law using a carrot (diplomacy or malice) or a stick (force), or through abandoning either approach as the case is like in many countries around the world presently.

In fact, I strongly believe that all the distrust with the ethos of the United States in recent years (i.e., agenda to improve democracy, rule of law, etc.), would have not occurred if the victors of WW2 did not expand the role of the intergovernmental organization named United Nations in arenas such as human rights, economic development, health and education, refugees and trade, etc. thus prompting people to cultivate false expectations about the purpose of the coming together of societies on the aftermath of WW2 to help achieve.

Said differently, the purpose of the coming together of societies at the end of WW2 was not to follow the Golden Rule. As it says in Luke 6:31, “Do to others as you would have them do to you,” but rather to have the weakest consider the opinion of the strongest before taking action of his own as a way to attain the goals set forth in the UN charter.

That is to say, when the old powers (Great Britain and other western European monarchs and nations) were administering the poor societies before WW2 erupted, all the poor societies were surrendering freedom to them (the old powers) against their will. For example, the Lebanese were resisting the authority of France regularly when this country was administering Lebanon. Likewise, the French were subjecting the Lebanese to exploitation and subjugation all the time.

When the victors of WW2 freed the poor societies in exchange for accepting to fight on their side during WW2 and then surrendering freedom to achieve the goals set forth in the UN charter, the poor societies were not required to recognize the authority of the victors of WW2 above and beyond the fulfillment of their obligations to secure the goals that were fixed in the UN charter. Those obligations were mainly to accept to solve disputes before they erupt into open warfare, including “reaffirming faith” in human rights, respecting obligations arising from “international treaties,” and “promoting” social progress. [Refer to preamble of UN Charter for more details]

The challenge with this new civilizing mission that the victors of WW2 began pursuing to improve accountability and democratic legitimacy between people require that all the threats to peace such as corruption, authoritarianism, crimes, etc., be rejected first so democracy, rule of

law, respect of human rights can be practiced. This means that societies cannot just hold discussion about how they are committed to improve democracy and rule of law but need to fulfill the pledges they make. Most importantly, this also means that societies need to be all onboard with such an idea first.

The reason why peace and security diminished post 1945 is mainly due to all the UN member States, starting with Great Britain and the United States, refusing to engage with other UN member states in accordance with the UN charter. For instance, if we take the United States and the intergovernmental organization named United Nations and survey people to find out who they believe is working on improving morality better around the world since 1945, it would be hard to see the United States score high with the political failures that are weighing down on this country starting from as far back as the Israeli-Palestinian war which occurred in 1948.

I have no way of knowing how the nations who depend on the idea of human rights and democracy to get their ways despite the resistance of others, such as Great Britain or the United States, plan to make the societies who are not onboard with their ideas about all members of the human family, without distinction of race or color, shall be equal in all civil, social and political outcomes be accountable to the pledges they make, when to begin with no nation (or a person) is prepared to accept that its (his) role falls below that of being the deputy of God.

For example, Great Britain, France or the United States refuse to give up their seat at the UN Security Council to the Egyptians, Lebanese, Iranian, etc., so those three societies who have been refusing to surrender freedom to the work program set forth in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights since 1948 begin to believe in the mindfulness of Great Britain, France, or the United States about democracy and human rights. Yet, Great Britain, France or the United States expect the Egyptians, Lebanese, Iranian, to surrender freedom to the legal and natural rights that those three countries legitimize such as democracy, rule of law, etc. knowing that law and political order are not natural, but human creations.

It looks as if the challenge of the nations who want to depend on the idea of human rights and democracy to get their ways despite the resistance of others, but without them obeying what they expect others to observe is not any different from the problem that existed in antiquity when the Israelites were refusing to obey the Egyptians.

For example, the Bible claim that the Israelites who were living in Egypt were very fruitful; they multiplied greatly, increased in numbers and became so numerous that the land was filled with them. Then a new king, came to power in Egypt, who said to his people look, “the Israelites have become far too numerous for us. Come, we must deal shrewdly with them or they will become even more numerous and, if war breaks out, will join our enemies, fight against us and leave the country.” [Exodus 1:7-10]

I have no way of knowing why this new king dreaded the Israelites. Evidently, the happiness that the Israelites were knowing played a big role. Then again, the bible says that God was not happy with the way the Egyptians were treating the Israelites, and he decided to bring them up out of Egypt in order to have them go live in a new land. [Exodus 3:7-10] The bible also narrate that God picked a helper (Moses) to help him bring the Israelites out of Egypt. [Exodus 3:11] Most importantly, God made the Israelites elders become disposed to accept to listen to Moses which is a prerequisite to enable God afterwards to get his ways despite the resistance of the Egyptians. [Exodus 3:16]

Indeed, the circumstances that the Israelites knew in Egypt on the hands of the Egyptians, were circumstances that our predecessors were also living before WW2 erupted. Most societies were dominated by the old powers (the western European monarchs and nations), and were living in misery similar to the way the Israelites were living in Egypt. The United States proposed doing to those poor societies who were dominated by the old powers around the world what God did to the Israelites in antiquity. In 1945, the United States decided to rescue those poor societies from continuing of being the slave drivers of the old powers (the western European monarchs and nations).

Most importantly, when we compare how Moses managed to make the Israelites be ready to abandon continuing to live in Egypt to go live in

the new land that he promised to bring them into, we find that this part was handled strictly by God. The Bible says that it was God who convinced the Israelites to leave everything they own in Egypt in order to go live in a new land. [Exodus 3:12,16,18]

In the case of the United States, this country has failed to make the rulers and political class of UN member states listen to its suggestion to abandon the ways they have been doing things and to embrace the ways suggested in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

Furthermore, hence people around the world are no longer working to secure the goals suggested in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights but every member of the human family is regarding himself (herself) responsible to provide parameters intended to secure that outcomes are shared on equal rights (hence everyone has now stakes that this new civilizing mission succeed), this means that the fittest in this new human development mission is the one who would promote himself (herself) as the best unifier.

To put it differently, World War II was the deadliest conflict in human history, but at the same time, a very remediable (curable) milestone to improve human relations in human history. On the aftermath of this global war, all people accepted to live together in the same way birds who are trapped inside of a cage do. The decision of the victors of WW2 to deviate away from the work program the founding fathers of the UN proposed to ensure lasting peace in favor of tasking the intergovernmental organization named United Nations and other human development organization to promote human rights and equal rights resulted in people opening the cage and flying out and becoming free again. There are two ways to bring people back into the cage. The first is through affection, and the second is through the reliance on another global war. Affection is a very powerful and dangerous weakness, and therefore, whoever controls the affection of others can manage to get his ways without the need to resort to force (increase death rates). In other words, the society (nation) who manages to unify societies and to make them be ready to surrender freedom to its ideals, would be regarded as the fittest. This is because when societies comply with what is being asked of them, this condition gives the nation who is taking the lead role

to profit more than everyone else, as was the cases with Moses and his family.

Then again the challenge that rulers and political class are facing to reduce fear and want does not appear to center on the lack of affirmative agenda for human rights or democratic renewal, but rather the problem centers on the unpreparedness of people (societies) to observe the commitments that they say they will be mindful of, or constantly keep in mind to generate tangible gains.

I have no way of knowing if the promises that people (rulers and political class) usually makes and then break contribute to relationship breakdown and the erosion of trust. However, I think this dichotomy seem to be tangled in the unpreparedness of the people who choose to make their living from determining and enforcing parameters for everyday behavior to acknowledge that integrity is a moral principle based on honesty and truthfulness of one's actions. In other words, the people (nations) who fail to do what they say believe that the people who are on the receiving end move on because they say nothing and let things slide.

To put it differently, the people in position of power (rulers and political class) or nations with great power do not want to admit that “trust is a deposit, like money in the bank. We add to the deposits, or we subtract from it according to our actions. If someone repeatedly withdraws from your trust account, and you let it keep it happening, that's on you. If you don't keep your word, that's on you too. In either case, if left unattended, the strength of the relationship will weaken and breakdown.”<sup>96</sup>

For example, the rulers and political class in the United States believes that they can be a successful unifier (or the world's policemen) after their predecessors stained the American ethos with the 'brutal' post-9/11 interrogations (never mind failure of all the wars this country waged to supposedly reduce fear and want), handling of the murder of the Saudi Arabian Journalist Jamal Khashoggi (1958 – 2018) in 2018 by agents of the Saudi government, and thousands upon thousands of positions that does not support that they are leading by example.

---

<sup>96</sup> <https://medium.com/swlh/how-to-deal-with-people-who-dont-do-what-they-say-c6238e61d225>

I have no way of knowing how the rulers and political class of the United States hypothesized that disobeying the legal frameworks established when dealing with disputes and threats on the aftermath of the Sept 11 attacks and to let emotions guide their decision making process, and to wreck two countries that such course would not repel people against the American ideals when mankind does not possess any evidence to disprove that when a person judges, he would not be judged. [Matthew 7:1] It looks as if the decision of the United States to take matters into its own hands on the aftermath of the Sept 11 attacks instead of continuing to let people around the world perceive that the American ideas are the most extraordinary humanitarian rescue mission to promote human welfare of all time, created a problem for this country and for mankind. This fatal mistake persuaded people (nations) around the world to begin to judge the United States in the same measure that it is using to judge others instead of continuing to perceive this country as the most fit to unify mankind. [Matthew 7:2] Most importantly, the decision of the United States to use the idea of good (rule of law, human rights, democracy, etc.) to get its ways despite the resistance of others on the aftermath of the Sept 11 attacks, converted the principles that are defined in the international rule based postwar order, which this country drafted into a ball that people (nations) are kicking just as in a typical soccer game but without any player being able to move the ball into the goal line of the opposing team.

In the gospel of Matthew, Jesus cautioned people to not give dogs what is sacred or throw their pearls to pigs, because whoever does, can risk that such animals trample them under their feet, and then turn and tear the person who persuaded such action to pieces. [Matthew 7:6] I have no way of knowing if the nations who the United States is entangled with them in complex web of alignment and alliances and the ones who its leaders and political class would like to see the US become reverted to a simpler form are thrilled by the manner this country is staying true to its values post 1948 (and especially post the Sept 11 attacks) or if they are going to continue to be devoted to looking at the speck of sawdust in the conduct of the US and pay no attention to the plank in their own eyes. [Matthew 7:6]

Unfortunately, values (democracy and human rights) are a set of rules that man can only serve either rhetorically or by actions. Paradoxically, any person who exhibit mindfulness to promote human welfare but then fails to realize that his words are a bond or demonstrate his truthfulness to improve values in actions, seem to shrink along his power to rely on those two values to get his ways despite the resistance of others. A different way to put the afore, can be said to resemble the case of a person who is handicap or who lost a limb. Most people who lose a limb and gets fitted with a prosthetic body part look normal, but they can never be the fittest.

To put it differently, a person who commits a wrongdoing or admits that he was wrong can never remove (erase) the stain that stamps his character. The wrongful action can never be erased, because no person possess power to reverse history. Man hopes that the mistakes he makes are consigned to history's dustbin, but unfortunately, people get their ways despite the resistance of others by exploiting the wrong that others say or compel. For this reason, no matter how much people try to erase history (or change history) to make it fit their convictions, they never succeed. This is very serious and worrisome.

Said differently, if people get their ways despite the resistance of others by exploiting the wrong that others say or compel, then the United States can never become the fittest after this country made the mistake of dismantling Iraq and Afghanistan without rebuilding them back in the same way the military forces found them if not better after the intelligence that this country used about Iraq working to develop weapons of mass destruction was discovered to be erroneous, and this country refused to try Osama Bin Laden publicly after he was captured so the whole world could believe its claim about him (Bin Laden) being the mastermind of the Sept 11 attacks. In other words, the United States cannot quit from rebuilding Afghanistan or Iraq even if this task takes the who life or make Iraq and Afghanistan become the 52<sup>nd</sup> and 53<sup>rd</sup> state.

To put it differently, the bible does not narrate that God created the universe, and then sat on the sideline, and started to watch how people were subduing the earth and each other. Nor did God create an international organization and tasked it with teaching people about the

importance of cooperating based on democracy, equal rights, etc. In fact, even when he (God) was meddling on earth, he (God) did not meddle in the lives of all the people that were roaming on earth despite how much the bible narrate he was fit. God kept his meddling in the lives of the tribes that Moses was leading to the promised land only.

Therefore, since the families/dynasties who control the United States (i.e., rulers and political class) believe that they can be an effective unifier without doing what God was at all the time doing when he was helping Moses to lead people to a promised land, i.e., in one hand disciplining and in the other building despite all the corruption and betrayal that people were compelling, then either the families/dynasties who control the United States (i.e., rulers and political class) thinks they are invincible or they think that the assertiveness that people would be gaining during the time that they would be doing their own rebuilding would not be a threat to their strength and stability.

Simply put, since we have no way of knowing if the 40 years' period in which the tribes who were with Moses wandering lasted this long because the assertiveness that people were gaining and developing took that long for them to reach to their destination (their goal), or because God was also helping them, we can say that the period of time that it would be taking the United States and the societies who this country wrecked at the start of the 21<sup>st</sup> century and in 2020 decided to stop to rebuild them on ground that the civilian capacity in those two nations is non-existent or corruption in them is malignant longer. This is because the Bible does not say that Moses stopped his rescue mission when he was wandering with the rest of the Israelites.

Furthermore, we can say that the decision of the United States to withdraw from Iraq and Afghanistan after  $\pm 20$  years of military interventions but without any plan to rescue the Afghani or the Iraqi to reach the promised land that this country says its civilizing mission is going to be providing benefits to every member of the human family, signal admittance by the United States of its unpreparedness to let its civilizing mission (moral role) being intended to fully change the societies who in 1945 agreed, in theory, to become united with its ethos to reduce fear and want, but is admittance of it decision to relegate on its aspirations to free people from continuing to live under fear and want.

I have no way of knowing if the United States can tackle the threats that corruption, betrayal, authoritarianism, tribalism, nationalism, etc., can encumber on the maintenance of its strength and stability while this country is preaching about values (democracy and human rights) without showing the same leadership that Moses demonstrated to unify people to be able to get his ways despite the resistance of others afterwards.

In real life, when a predator (e.g., a lion) kills a prey (e.g., an antelope) and eats whatever he needs to get full, he moves away from the carcass so many small scavengers start to feed on the leftovers. If the animal that a lion preyed happened to be alligator or a snake, the lion would not be around to know that the muscles and nerves of such animals continue to move long after they are dead, because lions do not stay next to their prey to watch.

I have no way of knowing if the muscles and nerves of the innocent people who were victims of the United States war in Iraq and Afghanistan continued to move long after they were dead. If the muscles and nerves of those victims continued to move, then it would not be possible to say that they were not continuing to change matter. If the muscles and nerves of those innocent victims were changing matter, then they were continuing to create change. If they were creating change, then they were accelerating the unpreparedness of their loved ones to be tolerant. All the wars and conflicts that people know occur when people stop to be ready to be tolerant. If the impatience of people on earth grows, this then means that it would not be possible for the United States to prevent people from developing assertiveness. If the more people develop assertiveness, the more the United States would become unable to continue to get its ways despite the resistance of others, then the more the United States perceives that its strength and stability is diminishing, the more this country would be persuaded to rely on force to solidify its power. When the United States rely on force to get its ways despite the resistance of others, this country cannot be a unifier. This is very serious and worrisome.

To put it differently, before the US-Iraq war or US-Afghanistan war, the people in those two countries were oppressed by oligarch. When the

United States conquered those two countries, and rescued the Iraqi and the Afghani people from their oppressors, what this country did was exactly what Moses ended the misery of the Israelites and brought them out of Egypt.

If the United States is now saying that it is not obliged to accompany the Afghani or the Iraqi to rebuild because they do not have the civilian capacity (they are hampered by corruption and ineffective government), this means that this country (the US) is saying yes to scavengers (human development organizations) such as the UN system, NGOs, charities, etc. help the Afghani and the Iraqi while they are wandering. Hence the more the human development organizations such as the UN system, government aid agencies, NGOs, charities, etc. (i.e., scavengers) teach the Iraqi and Afghani people to develop awareness about democracy, human rights and rule of law, the more the people in those countries would be developing assertiveness, this means that the more people in those two countries develop assertiveness, the more the United States would be seen as a divider and not as a unifier. This is because the Iraqi and the Afghani are not exploiting the wrong that the UN system, government international aid agencies, NGOs, charities, etc. (i.e., scavengers) are compelling, but rather the wrong that the United States is perpetrating by denying them right to be bound by their personal power and conscience. In other words, the UN system, government aid agencies, NGOs, charities, do not determine natural and legal rights, but the United States and other rich nations who legitimize are the ones who do it. This signify that the eventual fate of Iraq and Afghanistan would not be any different from the one that exists in Lebanon or in Egypt presently if the people in those two countries continue to refuse to be tolerant.

I do not know which social order between the one that exists in Lebanon or Egypt is protecting the best interests of the United States more. What I do know is that the United States is not the only country who uses the idea of good as a tool to solidify its power with such conviction. There are another 192 countries who its entire population are also relying on the same idea. In fact, the employees of the United Nations are economic operators who solidify their power (do business) while enjoying privileges and immunities (UN Charter Article 105), and while possessing right to perform duties without having to seek or receive

instructions from any government or from any other authority external to the organization. Can the United States establish balance with regimes or institutions that its job is to persuade people into believing that the US ideals builds for their own destruction?

Once again, I have no way of knowing how the United States expect that people around the world start to regard its ethos as a unifier, when the more human development organizations (UN system, government aid agencies, NGOs, charities, etc.) teach people to stop to cope unless outcomes are shared on equal rights, the more people have no choice but to become unprepared to obey as the case is like in Lebanon presently. Of course, the alternative to avoid the sentiments that the Lebanese are expressing about the inaptitude of the government to increase their happiness is to adopt a pharaonic approach to unify citizens as the case is like in Egypt today.

I have no way of knowing if the decision of the United States to support or tolerate totalitarian regimes that bans their citizens from protesting over political choices as the case is like in Egypt or Russia is a strategy that represent a potential pathway towards regarding this country as a unifier or towards deepening radicalization and extremism in the world. What I do know is that Amnesty International,<sup>97</sup> a non-profit human rights organization, claimed in an article it published in 2018 that the “Egyptian government unprecedented crackdown on freedom of expression turned Egypt into an “open-air-prison” as of 2014.”<sup>98</sup>

Then again, it is not possible to say that the decision of the United States to let Egypt become a totalitarian country is helping the US to strengthen its power and stability, but the contrary, it should be weakening it at the same time as well. This is because the more Egypt stays peaceful the more this “open-air prison” strategy that the United States is permitting in this country would be helping the Egyptians to be both tolerant and to become fit. This is because such a condition facilitates the right atmosphere for a person to see if the changes that are occurring around him are changing in a positive way or not.

---

<sup>97</sup> <https://www.amnesty.org/en/>

<sup>98</sup> <https://www.amnesty.org/en/latest/news/2018/09/egypt-unprecedented-crackdown-on-freedom-of-expression-under-alsisi-turns-egypt-into-openair-prison/>

If we analyze how the regime (i.e., the military) that has been in power in Egypt since 1950 is transforming this country, we find that this journey seems to consist of a governance structure who rejected the work program set forth in the UN Charter or the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and embraced the reemergence of the Pharaoh days. Indeed, the revival of this Pharaonic heritage (i.e., the civilizing mission) that the leaders of Egypt have been adopting since 1950 has begun to give fruits. The willingness of citizens to be tolerant is not any different than the case was like during the Pharaoh days. Of course, the merging of two key ingredients produced this resilience: religiosity and discipline.

If, in principle, the longer the United States accept to trade starting to train Egypt to begin to integrate in the international work program that this country pledged to exhaust every effort to make it succeed, the deeper the Egyptians would be developing and growing in religiosity and discipline, this means that the longer the United States allows the Pharaonic system that is in Egypt to extend (span), the more the US would be admitting that it has no objection with Egypt continuing to be fit through using religiosity and discipline (i.e., tolerance) as a tool.

This also means that the longer the United States allows the regime in Egypt to be an island, the more the religiosity and discipline (i.e., tolerance) that citizens would be developing, would be compelling them naturally to tolerate living without freedom of expression or right. This also means that the longer the Egyptians accept to live without freedom of expression or right, the more their unpreparedness to disobey would be shrinking (as the case is like in India, China, North Korea, Russia, Norway, Demark, Sweden, etc.).

Likewise, we can say that the longer the Egyptian accept to be prepared to be tolerant, the more the religiosity and discipline that they would be exposed to would be helping them to develop understanding of themselves better. Furthermore, the more their understanding of themselves grow, the more they should become better equipped to distinguish between what is right and what is wrong. The more they become capable to distinguish between what is right and what is wrong, the more their consciousness would be leading them to believe that their values, heritage and culture is richer (which is also true). This is very

serious and worrisome. This is because the more the happiness of citizens in Egypt grows, and the more they discover that when they are accepting to tolerate to surrender freedom to the regime even if it is cracking on their freedom the more they are becoming better equipped to distinguish between what is right and what is wrong, this means that they would not be able to forgo living and dying for Egypt as ElBaradei said during his bid to become the president of Egypt in 2012 to living taking orders from the United States.

That is also to say that if the more Egyptians would be ready to live and die for Egypt (i.e., preserve Egyptian faith, tradition, and heritage) instead of preserving the work program set forth in the UN charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, this should result in many Egyptians demanding respect as the Russians, Chinese, Iranian, Turks are doing. Likewise, the more the Egyptians demand respect, the more the power of the United States should be diminishing instead of increasing. In other words, the longer the United States or rich nations such as Great Britain, Norway, Sweden or Denmark protect the Egyptian regime or allows it to keep the crackdown on freedom last longer, the more the US and other powerful and rich countries such as Great Britain, Norway, Sweden or Denmark would be solidifying the power of the Egyptians, and not their own power as some political commentators interpret their apathy is doing.

Actually, it appears as if the steady critic that the rulers and political class who control the regime in Egypt (i.e., the military) regularly make about the refusal of the religious establishment to modernize Islam is just a rhetoric. It appears as if the rulers and political class who control the regime in Egypt (i.e., the military) are relying on political Islam and nationalism since 1950 to get their ways despite the resistance of others much more than the short-lived regime that came to power in 2012 but a year later they ousted, or the Islamic terrorist organizations that the regime claim is its archenemy.

It looks as if the longer the United States tolerate that the rulers and military class in Egypt return this country to the pharaoh's days instead of to implementing the work program that is set forth in the UN charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the more they are going to find themselves clashing with not only the Jews, the Persians,

Chinese, the Brits, the Japanese, etc. who are working on rebuilding their own civilization-state as of 1945, but they are going to start doing it with the Egyptians as well.

Likewise, this also means that if the leaders and political class in Egypt happens to be smarter than the leaders and political class in Lebanon were from 1945 to now, and decide to make it harder for the United States, Great Britain and other rich nations such as France and Germany to meddle in their political status as the Russian. Chinese, North Korean, Iranian, Cuban, Venezuelan are doing, then the multi-dimensional rivalry and extremism that exist between nations to determine who would be telling the weakest to consider his opinion is going to grow even more. This is very scary because the more the powerful forces who control the international order or the money supply of the world (the victors of WW2) become not knowing if rulers and political class in UN member states are working to secure the goals that are fixed in the UN charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights or working to rebuild their own heritage, the more they would not be capable to know what they would be getting into. This is very serious and worrisome. This is because the more the victors of WW2 become unable to know what rulers and political class in UN member states are up to or become obliged to continuously follow statements made by rulers and political class in UN member states about things that would not be clear in what they are saying what they are going to be doing next, the more the victors of WW2 would be required to take things day by day.

I have no way of knowing if this strategy that the victors of WW2 appear to be adopting since 1945, which seems to be based on “laissez faire” strategies that is buttressed on using sanctions that either seize the assets of the rulers who they (the victors of WW2) want to remove from power to shrink his access to money to pay his followers, or to expose the ruler past intimate relations to destabilize him (her) in front of his own family and constituent, is a smart way to continue to preserve the integrity of the international rule based postwar world order that everyone agreed to obey on the aftermath of World War Two. However, if the fittest is not necessarily the society (nation) who claim that is the most powerful militarily or technologically but rather the one who its leaders and political class are capable to make citizens be tolerant to enable them afterwards to use diplomacy or deceit to promote how they are a unifier,

we can say that Egypt should be ranking in the league of the fittest (among Russia, China, Great Britain, France, Norway, Denmark, Sweden), and the United States should rank in the league of the least fit (with Lebanon, Iraq, Libya, Syria, Israel). This is very scary and worrisome. This is because the afore signify that the United States need to recalibrate the relations of its citizens and its relations with the rest of the world to become not any different from the one that exist in Egypt to stay the fittest. This afore conclusion is very scary, and cannot be true.

To put it differently, it is not possible to say that the nation who crackdown on freedom of expression to make citizens be tolerant could be adopting a unifying strategy that enables it to be the fittest, because this strategy has already conduced the world toward two back to back global wars when our predecessors adopted such convictions. This also means that if societies continue to be polarized and delaying their preparedness to begin to obey the work program set forth in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the faster mankind would be working to build human islands instead of cooperating together to reduce fear and want.

Furthermore, if the more societies continue to be unprepared to obey the work program set forth in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the more this strategy buys time for the fittest, instead of persuading people to be voluntarily prepared to surrender freedom to obey the political order, this signify that the longer the families/dynasties who won WW2 take to decide if they want to build a human family, or build an “open-air-prison” as the case is like today in Egypt and Russia openly, or Great Britain and France clandestinely, mankind could be spiraling down the international order to look exactly like the chaotic situation that exist in Lebanon at large scale, or the United States at smaller scale, i.e., total paralysis and malicious divisiveness.

I have no way of knowing if the low trust in authority that people are expressing would continue to get worse in the future, or if people would start to roll in the same direction by voluntarily surrender freedom to rulers and political class thus overcoming the paralyses and division that has swept most social fabric since 1945. Then again, if the longer the families/dynasties who won WW2 refuse to persuade rulers and political class in UN member states to lead by example to maintain good

order, the harder it is going to be getting for them to continue to solidify their power as the political canvas that exists in Lebanon or Egypt presently support, this means that what is going to be hampering the capacity of the powerful families/dynasties to continue to get their ways despite the resistance of others in the future is going to be centering on how to create a balance between two scenarios. The first is how to keep the societies that protects them (i.e., the United States, Great Britain, China, Russia and France) unified and tolerant but without citizens being motivated to prioritize democracy and equal rights. The second is going to center out how to keep the societies that do not protect them such as the ones that exists in Lebanon, Egypt, Israel, Ethiopia, Sudan, Turkey, etc. divided and intolerant but with citizens being motivated to prioritize democracy and equal rights.

Likewise, we can say that the reason why the families/dynasties who won WW2 are not able to stabilize the international order post 1945 boils down to two reasons. The first centers on the inability of those powerful families/dynasties to take away the motivation of the societies that protect them to secure that outcomes are shared on equal rights. The second centers on their inability to motivate the societies that do not protect them to be ready to be fighting with one another to sacrifice for the idea of democracy and equal rights.

For example, many Americans are disillusioned with the work program of the government and are protesting and arguing all the time about how their rulers and the political class are ignoring the American values and not taken them seriously, but refuse to engulf the country in a civil war to create a new balance. In other words, despite a shared fear of the US government abusing its power, the Americans believe that the prevailing discrimination in social justice would be balanced with legal and ethical duties eventually. Likewise, in Lebanon, despite all the division that exists between the population which has pushed most people in the country into poverty including a severe financial crisis that involve unlawful controls by the government and banks on cash withdrawals and money transfers, the Lebanese refuse to engulf the country in a civil war to create a new balance.

In addition, because the longer the standoff that is existing in the United States or Lebanon between the government and citizen's lasts, the

higher the likelihood of the social order in those two societies converting into becoming authoritarian as the case is in Egypt grows (which is also a threat for the families/dynasties who won WW2 as I said before), this means that the longer the families/dynasties who won WW2 delay engulfing the world in a new global war to reduce desires, or delay persuading the rulers and political class in UN member states to begin to lead by example to reduce the shared fear of governments abusing their power and thus shrinking the number of people who are unprepared to surrender freedom to the political order, the harder it would be getting for the families/dynasties who won WW2 to prevent their collapse in the course of time and things.

Throughout history, the person who was better equipped for surviving was the one who was capable to figure out which choice was the least bad pick among the available alternatives. I do not know if there is a better pick for the families/dynasties who won WW2 to prevent their collapse in the course of time and things beside the one that the founding fathers of the UN suggested to them in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (i.e., multicultural liberal democracies based on a dominant liberal world order buttressed on self-determination philosophy). The multicultural culture that the United States managed to build till the end of 20<sup>th</sup> century using the liberal interventionism and self-determination philosophy as compared to all the other dogmas that were practiced from 1945 to the year 2000 is a good evidence to support that there is no other political system that is capable to produce such standards but the American ideals.

Most importantly, if tolerance or intolerance are a function of truth, and vice versa, then truth, i.e., democracy or rule of law, cannot be used as a ladder to strengthen a person's best interests but to strengthen, the truth. This is very serious and worrisome. In other words, if truth is a natural rule (spooky rule) that man cannot naturally override and no matter how much the mind tries to work around it (manipulate it) to get it to behave contrary to the way the mind was naturally programmed to function (i.e., the truth would always prevail at the end), then if the families/dynasties who won WW2 do not engulf the world in global war to increase death rates (i.e., reduce desires), or create a new political and economic reset (i.e., reduce the impact of technology on jobs including redrawing of national boundaries), it would be a matter of time, before

the number of people who be demanding respect from them would not be limited to the rulers and political class who control authoritarian regimes only, but from every member of the human family irrespective of age, sex or color. In other words, if the families/dynasties who won WW2 think that they can continue to preserve their wealth, power and status by thwarting the truth or trade persuading rulers and political class to lead by example in favor of applying economic, trade, scientific and military sanctions or embargoes that penalize the weak ones but the strong ones stay exempt, they could be building for a future, but without their heirs being in control of the international order or the money supply of the world in it.

To put it differently, if tolerance is capable to achieve order contrary to what the human mind thinks, then the families/dynasties who won WW2 could be fixing political and economic choices that are not any different from how Al-Ghazali<sup>99</sup> (1058 – 1111), a Persian philosopher, defined atheists. Al-Ghazali said: Atheists are like ants on a piece of paper that cannot lift their eyes from the ink or the pen they see before them thus failing to see who is writing.

Once again, I have no way of knowing if the families/dynasties who won WW2 thinks that they are doing the writing or if the truth (a spooky force) is doing it. However, if there is no ideological principle, i.e., weapon that could make the mind surrender freedom except when a person does it voluntarily, and the general anger over political choices that emerged in the world in recent years is due to the families/dynasties who won WW2 preferring continuing doing things using the old ways in the hope of expecting different result, then they must think that they can still write and produce a different result than the one awaited King Belshazzar (son of King Nebuchadnezzar) when he and his thinkers thought that they could do the writing on the wall differently.

Simply put, the families/dynasties who won WW2 could be supposing that between technology and the balkanization of the world, they could make sense of all the bumps that they are knowing to make people surrender freedom to the international rule based postwar world order they laid out in 1945 thus continuing to solidify their power. In order

---

<sup>99</sup> <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Al-Ghazali>

words, the families/dynasties who won WW2 believe they could continue to have dictators protect them in UN member states while continuing to scratch on the surface as they have been doing since 1945 about their mindfulness to reduce poverty, inequality or improve the rule of law and democracy, instead of once and for all, beginning to lead by example to reduce fear and want.

I have no way of knowing if the families/dynasties who won WW2 would be able through the use of technology and the balkanization of the world to see different than what Al-Ghazali said atheist can teach us. What I do know is that there is a famous Chinese proverb that state that “to know the road ahead a person must ask those coming back.”<sup>100</sup> There is no evidence in the literature that existed before the start of the 20<sup>th</sup> century that our predecessors were using technology (computers) to solve the many difficult problems that they were themselves facing, and why their relations collapsed. Likewise, humans do not live forever so those predecessors could provide input.

In the absence of records to assess if the use of technology and the balkanization of the world could help the families/dynasties who won WW2 to solidify their power or not, I think the only tactic those powerful families/dynasties can depend on to continue to get their ways despite the resistance of others is the one maritime pilots depend on to maneuver ships through dangerous or congested waters, such as harbors or river mouths.

Maritime pilots are skilled professionals in navigation who know immense details of waterways such as depths, tides, currents, swells, shoals, and hazards that is not readily identifiable on nautical charts, as well as displaying expertise in handling ships of all types and size.<sup>101</sup>

It looks as if, for as long as, the families/dynasties who won WW2 stay undecided about whether or not they want to create a global family, or if they want to engulf the world in a global war to increase death rates to reduce desires, they need to be able to maneuver people in the same

---

<sup>100</sup>

[https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=HmJFiovPFjo&list=RDQM\\_CS9oWZ8qmw&start\\_radio=1](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=HmJFiovPFjo&list=RDQM_CS9oWZ8qmw&start_radio=1)

<sup>101</sup> [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Maritime\\_pilot](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Maritime_pilot)

way maritime pilots do in harbors to maneuver ships through dangerous or congested waters. That is also to say that if the families/dynasties who won WW2 choose to balkanize the world or as some people spin tales about building an authoritarian socialist world government that the intergovernmental organization named United Nations would rule over occurs, neither strategy would reduce fear and want, but rather complicate matters. In other words, the bottleneck that exist in the world would not ease.

Moreover, if this intense criticism that emerged in recent years of governments being "dictatorships on the march" continue to enlist sympathizers to create the needed change or to improve democracy, this means that the obstacles that the families/dynasties who won WW2 will need to avoid hitting to continue to get their ways despite the resistance of others is going to consist of letting the international order not tilt toward the chaos that exist in Lebanon, or toward the orderly state that exist in Egypt (which is an opportunity for the Egyptians but a threat for the powerful families/dynasties), but stays in the center. This is because when the social order tilt toward either direction (i.e., extreme), this signify that the wealth, power and status of the most powerful families is being slipped away from their grasp.

I do not know how the families/dynasties who won WW2 plan to avoid that the social order continues to not tilt in either one of the afore two mentioned extremes (obstacles) knowing that since 1945, they are piloting the ship (social order) with dictators (governments) who possess total local knowledge of the different societies, and with an assistant (the United Nations system) who possess solution to any problem minus how to hit obstacles.

Then again, I strongly believe that the only reason why pilots manage to maneuver "ships" through dangerous or congested waters without hitting frequently obstacles happens because of the aid of one rule. Pilots maneuver ships in harbors or river mouths, while remaining under the master's authority, and always out of the "ship's command chain."

Indeed, the manner that the families/dynasties who won WW2 are solidifying their power (ruling the world) is totally different from the way pilots maneuver ships in through dangerous or congested waters.

The families/dynasties who won WW2 have tasked the international organization named United Nations and human development organizations (government aid agencies, NGOs, charities, etc.) to provide parameters to citizens in UN member states without being obliged to seek or receive any instructions from any government! In addition, in 2013, the families/dynasties who won WW2 preferred that the Egyptian military go back to maneuvering the population in Egypt to stay away from hitting obstacles instead of letting the regime that was duly elected by the population post the 2011 Egyptian Revolution in which all Egyptians rejected continuing wanting to be ruled military. In other words, the families/dynasties who won WW2 did not have any objection with the Egyptian military orchestrating a coup in 2013 to remove a regime that was duly elected by the population in order to return Egypt into becoming ruled by former military officers! Said differently, what the families/dynasties who won WW2 did is analogous to Moses having returned the Israelites back to Egypt after he brought them out.

Could the reason why the families/dynasties who won WW2 failed to prevent wars post 1945 be because they allowed the United Nations system and human development organization to interfere in the "ship's command chain" including allowing rulers and political class in UN member states consider themselves exempt from the appeal to lead by example?

I do not know the answer to the afore question. What I do know is that the families/dynasties who won WW2 cannot let peace and security deteriorate below a certain threshold, because if many people (governments) start to be bound by their personal power and conscience at the same time, then it would not be possible for them to control the social order. Therefore, to avoid that the social order gets out of control, the families/dynasties who won WW2 may have to engulf the world in a new global war (or increase death rates through a manmade plague) to reestablish equilibrium and avoid that the new map of the world be drawn by the fittest. In other words, the families/dynasties who won WW2 may have to engulf the world in a new global war (or increase death rates through a manmade plague) before the social order gets out of control to permit them to reengineer the balkanization of the world with such exercise. If the families/dynasties who won WW2 wait until

the social order get out of control to try to stabilize the world, then it would be the fittest who would steer this exercise.

Then again, even if the families/dynasties who won WW2 deem that it would be in their best interests to program a new global war to get rid of the dysfunctional global governance and policy choices that they have made, there is no guarantee that this choice would make those who would survive be ready to move the world into becoming more humane or more peaceful. To put it differently, suppose a new global war erupt and 5 billion people become victims instead of 50 million, which is how many people died during WW2, could anyone say that those who would survive would be ready to stop to carry the torch of securing that outcomes are shared on equal rights, which is the principal reason why we are not able to move our world into becoming more humane or more peaceful as of 1945?

Once again, I do not know if the families/dynasties who won WW2 would manage to make people start to surrender freedom to them (i.e., live with no rights and at the mercy of the state) should they choose to reset the social order through engulfing the world in a new global war or to balkanize the world without resorting to a global war.

What I do know is that “through history we can learn how past societies, systems, ideologies, governments, cultures and technologies were built, how they operated, and how they have changed.”<sup>102</sup> History also help us to understand where we are going and what progress looks like. Most importantly, history help us to make projection on how the future could look like in function of the changes of the past.

If history gives us a very clear picture of how the various aspects of society worked in the past, we can then say that history is what helps us to understand why the present is working the way it is now.

To answer why the present-day issues are working the way they are, there could only be one reason. It is because mankind (mainly governments) is wrecking “the good, the bad and the ugly”<sup>103</sup> but then

---

<sup>102</sup> <https://www.nordangliaeducation.com/article/2020/4/29/why-is-it-important-to-study-history>

<sup>103</sup> [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/The\\_Good,\\_the\\_Bad\\_and\\_the\\_Ugly\\_\(theme\)](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/The_Good,_the_Bad_and_the_Ugly_(theme))

failing to replace it with something that would be much better. In other words, governments are wrecking what has been built, instead of trading the bad for the good, as we have been capable to successfully do when it comes to the tools that we rely on to deny each other's right with.

The film "Any Gun Can play," released in 1967, is about a group of cowboys searching for gold, double-leading to double crosses as they continually change allegiances and get the upper hand only to be thwarted by fellow outlaws, mysterious insurance investigators and each other.<sup>104</sup>

Hence the way our global political system is the way it is now, could be because we are living in a world that is not any different than the one described in the plot of the film "Any Gun Can play", this means that the only reason why the present is working the way it is now could be because of all the double-leading that people (mainly governments) of all ages, sexes and color are manifesting for a fistful of gold.

Then again, in 1964, Clint Eastwood (born 1930), an American Actor, starred in a film titled "A fistful of Dollars."<sup>105</sup> This film is about a wandering stranger (a man with no name) who plays two rival families against each other in a town torn apart by greed, pride and revenge. This man with no name (Clint Eastwood) who was selling false information to both sides for his own benefit, the stranger rides away from town in the film's last shot with his fistful of dollars. However, Oedipus Rex,<sup>106</sup> or Oedipus the King, in the play that Sophocles<sup>107</sup> (497 BC – BC 406), a Greek tragedian, performed around 429 BC, the Oedipus the king was not as fortunate as the protagonist who played the role of the stranger in the film "A fistful of Dollars." Oedipus died.

Indeed, the takeaway from the play that Sophocles wrote in 429 BC and the most important takeaway from the film *A fistful of Dollars*, were totally different. In the film *A fistful of Dollars*, the stranger was playing the two families against each other. However, in the play of Sophocles,

---

<sup>104</sup> [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Any\\_Gun\\_Can\\_Play](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Any_Gun_Can_Play)

<sup>105</sup> [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/A\\_Fistful\\_of\\_Dollars](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/A_Fistful_of_Dollars)

<sup>106</sup> [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Oedipus\\_Rex](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Oedipus_Rex)

<sup>107</sup> <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sophocles>

Oedipus was suffering from a split in personality. He was at the same time a killer and a loved king.

I have no way of knowing if mankind (mainly the most powerful families/dynasties) is eschewing from cooperating based on the principles stipulated in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights because man is trapped between his love of greed, pride and revenge for *A fistful of Dollars*, or if the reason why our world and our global political system is the way it is now is because mankind suffers from dissociative identity disorder.<sup>108</sup> In other words, man's personality is split (switches) between two characteristics. One personality aspires to strengthen righteousness and solidarity, and the other personality aspires to deepen despotism and anarchy. And so, since little is known about whether or not people are impaired by any form of split personalities, other than what has been reported in the Bible about the inclination of the thoughts of the human heart being evil at all the time, [Genesis 6:5] then we can say that the saying "as the king, so are the subjects" would be a truth that would prevail until doomsday.

This also means that since we could all be living in a world that is not any different than the one that Paul the apostle mentioned in his Letter to the Romans, where "no one is doing righteous things and everyone is using his body - throat, tongue, lips, feet and eyes to express wickedness," [Romans 3:9-18], this signifies that the families/dynasties who won WW2 may have to pick between the next two choices in order to continue to solidify their power. The first is to do what Paul was counselling the Romans of not doing in his Letter to the Romans. This was to "repay evil for evil" [Romans 12:17] in hope of evil may result in good. The second is to do what Paul suggested to the Romans to start doing instead. This was to "not be overcome by evil, but to overcome evil with good." [Romans 12:21]. This will require that the families/dynasties who won WW2 start doing what the Quran report in Surah Al-Anfal God asked the prophet Muhammad to tell people to start doing. This means that the families/dynasties who won WW2 need to start by changing what is in themselves" [Surah Al-Anfal verse 53] so they could start to overcome evil with good. Surah Al-Anfal verse 53

---

<sup>108</sup> [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Dissociative\\_identity\\_disorder](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Dissociative_identity_disorder)

says that “Allah (God) never changes the Blessing he has bestowed on any people until they change what is with them.”

Furthermore, we could also say that if the families/dynasties who won WW2 choose to “repay evil for evil” [Romans 12:17], or “do evil that good may result,” [Romans 3:8] it would be important that all the immorality, godlessness, wickedness and truth that people are suppressing with sin would not resize them and revert them to a simpler form. This is because they could trap themselves in the same mistake that the people who Moses displaced from Egypt to a new land did. Moses (and his successors) supposed that the laws could protect them against the wickedness of the people. However, the same laws ended up being the motive that provoked their collapse in the course of time and things. In other words, if the families/dynasties who won WW2 believes that they could through technology and the balkanization of the world prevent that people resize them they could be deceiving themselves. This is because there is no difference between using technology to control people or using the laws. If humans by nature are wicked (or impaired by split personalities), this means that they would not keep the works of the laws perfectly. Therefore, since the law reveals just how much we humans are wicked (because it obstructs us from abiding by our personal power and conscience), the more the families/dynasties who won WW2 would be relying on technology or balkanization (law) to solidify their power, the more this tactic would be helping them to continue to get their way despite the resistance of others. However, the more the families/dynasties who won WW2 continue to get their way despite the resistance of others, the more they would be making people agree that they need to sin or to perceive that those powerful families/dynasties who are denying them rights to solidify their power merit to be resized. This is because technology or balkanization (law) are not tools that remove from people immorality, godlessness, wickedness, and therefore, such machinery cannot protect no one against the evil inclination of the human heart or the split personality that man could be impaired with. This is very serious and worrisome.

To put it differently, if reproduction is not serving humanity to improve democracy or the rule of law, but a tool to increase the number of people who want to abide by their personal power and conscience, then this signify that the longer the families/dynasties who won WW2 refuse to

fulfill their part of the social agreement, i.e., to lead by example, so people have no reason to refuse to agree with one another, then it is highly possible that the immorality that is being added could be spreading in the social order in the same way branches split from a tree trunk. This signifies that the divisiveness that this process is creating is complicating the social order faster than the families/dynasties who won WW2 could be perceiving, because it could be also grafting as it is spreading.

Furthermore, hence the choices that the families/dynasties who won WW2 need to make on how they would want to continue to solidify their power, appear to center on whether they would be in favor of conforming to the chaotic patterns (i.e., branches) that the social or political order appear to be growing like as of 1945 in the hope of perhaps continuing to “do evil that good may result,” would allow them to stabilize it (tame it), or to go back to fulfilling the work program that the founding fathers of the UN counselled them to obey to continue to solidify their power and ensure lasting peace; we can also say that if the families/dynasties who won WW2 choose to test to determine if they could succeed at controlling the social order using technology and balkanization (i.e., where others failed), it would be important that all the thinkers, soldiers, administrators, etc. that would be helping them would not be frustrating their aspirations and leading them into their eventual disintegration.

I have no way of knowing if the families/dynasties who won WW2 would manage to control the social order using technology. What I do know is that in 1923, Gibran Khalil Gibran (1883 – 1931) a Lebanese-American writer, poet and visual artist.<sup>109</sup> published, in the United States, a book, titled *The Prophet*.<sup>110</sup> Since 1923, the book was translated into over 100 different languages, making it one of the most translated books in history.<sup>111</sup> In 1933, Gibran’s book *The Garden of the*

---

<sup>109</sup> [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Kahlil\\_Gibran](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Kahlil_Gibran)

<sup>110</sup> [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/The\\_Prophet\\_\(book\)](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/The_Prophet_(book))

<sup>111</sup> Kalem, Glen (2018-06-26). "The Prophet Translated". The Kahlil Gibran Collective. [www.kahlilgibran.com](http://www.kahlilgibran.com). Retrieved 2018-11-21.

*Prophet* which is a sequel to the initial book *The Prophet* was published posthumously.<sup>112</sup>

*The Garden of the Prophet* is a book in which Gibran describes how a person might best live a happy and illuminated life. In the book, *The Garden of the Prophet*, Gibran says: "*Pity the nation divided into fragments, each fragment deeming itself a nation.*"<sup>113</sup> Actually, a lot of the issues that Gibran was cautioning our leaders against breaking (violating), are not a lot dissimilar from what all the nations are confronting in recent years. I have listed all of them next so readers could easily have access to them.

*"Pity the nation that is full of beliefs and empty of religion. Pity the nation that wears a cloth it does not weave and eats a bread it does not harvest.*

*Pity the nation that acclaims the bully as hero, and that deems the glittering conqueror bountiful. Pity a nation that despises a passion in its dream, yet submits in its awakening.*

*Pity the nation that raises not its voice save when it walks in a funeral, boasts not except among its ruins, and will rebel not save when its neck is laid between the sword and the block.*

*Pity the nation whose statesman is a fox, whose philosopher is a juggler, and whose art is the art of patching and mimicking*

*Pity the nation that welcomes its new ruler with trumpeting, and farewells him with hooting, only to welcome another with trumpeting again.*

*Pity the nation whose sages are dumb with years and whose strongmen are yet in the cradle. Finally,*

*Pity the nation divided into fragments, each fragment deeming itself a nation.*"<sup>114</sup>

---

<sup>112</sup> <https://www.consciouslivingfoundation.org/ebooks/12-withcover/CLF%20-%20Gibran%20-%20The%20Garden%20of%20the%20Prophet.pdf>

<sup>113</sup> <https://www.goodreads.com/quotes/744795-pity-the-nation-that-is-full-of-beliefs-and-empty>

<sup>114</sup> <https://www.goodreads.com/quotes/744795-pity-the-nation-that-is-full-of-beliefs-and-empty>

I have no way of knowing what could have prompted Gibran to feel sorry for a “*nation divided into fragments, each fragment deeming itself a nation.*” In other words, I have no way of knowing if the divisiveness that the world was knowing during Gibran’s short lived life influenced him to feel sorry for our leaders (the rich), or if he was actually a Prophet who was sent to our leaders and political class to caution them against fragmenting the world. However, when we look back in time, we find that the families/dynasties who won WW2 did exactly the opposite of what Gibran cautioned in his book *the Garden of the Prophet* against doing on the aftermath of World War 2. In 1945, the world was composed of about 50 nations. The number of the UN member nations is now 193.

Indeed, the poor state of peace and security that exists in the world as of 1945 does not support that Gibran was feeling pity, because he was a person who lacked deeper understanding of truths, and thus his own perceptions prompted him to feel pity for our leaders and political class.

Therefore, since the poor state of the world support that the political and economic choices that our leaders are determining or picking for us are what is creating the experiences that we are knowing, then if people are refusing to surrendering freedom to the political order (natural and legal rights) that our leaders are fixing, the only motive that could be provoking this disobedience cannot be other than distrust. To put it differently, if “to not pity” is to truly honor the strength and truth of another, then “to pity” can only be the exact opposite. This is very serious and worrisome.

If we need “trust” because we realized that we cannot live as a lone entity in this world and that it was better that our survival depended on the survival of every member of the group, but at the same time, we cannot trust those whose primary responsibility and job is to ensure that we do not develop such perception, then it would not be possible to reverse the distrust that people feels for as long as we continue to believe that transitioning into a more modernized life achieves practical results for the greater well-being of society. This is because we use the idea of good or the idea of evil to freeze social space and accumulate material things on cumulative basis and transfer it to designated individuals. If

population growth remains uncontrolled, and if people (mainly our leaders) continue to use the idea of good or the idea of evil, to prioritize self-interests, instead of common good, then distrust should continue to rise rather than to diminish. If distrust continue to rise between people instead of to diminish, then Gibran's preoccupation or motivation to feel sorry for our leaders is much more valid today than before. In fact, the grip of the state over the social order has been diminishing in recent years across the entire globe. Most governments are keeping the social order under control by resorting to repressive measure as a mean. If governments continue to use the criminal justice system to enforce it on the weak only, then people unpreparedness to surrender freedom and obey should be reciprocally growing.

In fact, during a one on one interview that President Barack Obama (born 1961), 44<sup>th</sup> President of the United States, was having with Prince Harry, Duke of Sussex (born 1984), in 2017, the President said that "this generation coming up is the most sophisticated, the most tolerant in many ways; a most embracing of diversity, the most tech-savvy, the most entrepreneurial, but they don't have much faith in existing institutions."<sup>115</sup>

"Trust — or lack of it — is inherent in every action that we take and affects everything that we do."<sup>116</sup> If this generation is having less faith in existing institutions, this could be due to the aspects that Gibran cautioned in 1933 governments to avoid or to the values on which trust rests being violated. This is very serious and worrisome.

If most people believe that the secret to building trust (or faith) depend on the person who wants other to put their trust in his wisdom showing that he has integrity, then the person that wants others to trust him must be able to show that he is capable to love others more than to love himself. Furthermore, if lots of people are not having faith in existing institutions in recent years, this means that the bias of those who are in position of power are not able to balance their interests against the interests of the common good. This is again a lot more serious and worrisome. This is because the people in position of power rely on the

---

<sup>115</sup> <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=XPGHSbJ7lxs>

<sup>116</sup> <https://www.franksonnenbergonline.com/snippets/how-to-earn-someones-faith/>

idea of good as a tool to get their ways despite the resistance of others. If people distrust with institutions continue to grow, this means people's distrust in the idea of good as being a tool to improve peace and security should be diminishing. This also means that people are admitting that living under domination is much better than living under the idea of liberal interventionism or self-determination as a tool to improve peace and security. This is not at all true. If living under domination (including monarchial hierarchical stratification) could improve peace and security, the world would have been in peace by now. This means that there could be powerful forces who are threatening to reverse the democratic institutions that helped to bring the state of the world to what it is like now to satisfy their own propensity.

I have no way of knowing if those powerful forces are from here on earth (i.e., manmade), or if they are evil forces that mankind has no say what so ever in the way how they are dismantling or fragmenting the international order. In other words, those evil forces are programmed to operate or fluctuate on their own based on how much evil or good people inject in the world. Simply put, when evil rise, those evil forces reciprocally rise the level of conflicts in the world, thus prompting the death rates and physical destruction to rise accordingly. Likewise, when people prioritize good, the good forces governs.

That is to say, I have no way of knowing if a spooky hand (i.e., God) set the control of the world's peace and stability lever on autopilot, i.e., when we work to improve the values we deeply care about peace improves, and when we work to sabotage the inalienable rights of all members of the human family to the foundation of freedom, justice and peace, disregard and contempt (evil) rise. I could only explore if there are powerful hands from here on earth who could be threatening to reverse the democratic institutions that helped to bring the state of the world to what it is like now, because the individuals involved believe they would lose much more than gain if people cooperate based on the principles set forth in the universal Declaration of Human Rights.

Could the victors of WW2 (the families/dynasties who control the international order or the money supply of the world) be working on deepening evil in the world in order to stay in power? In other words,

those powerful families/dynasties are strengthening righteousness and solidarity, and deepening despotism and anarchy at the same time.

Humans are motivated to increase their happiness. From antiquity till now, moving good forward has been done only after contempt for human rights resulted in barbarous acts which have outraged the conscience of mankind.

The most powerful families/dynasties (the families/dynasties who control the international order or the money supply of the world) cannot be a force for evil, because those powerful families/dynasties do not win when people withdraw their obligations to obey them. For example, if God decides to send a new prophet, and God tasks this new prophet to improve religiosity, including usage of a new currency, the most powerful families/dynasties would lose. Hence, it is in the best interests of the most powerful families/dynasties that people obey the political order that they own, they cannot be in favor of jeopardizing the philosophy that aids them to play the role of God on earth. If the most powerful families/dynasties gain nothing when the social order becomes dynamic or when people start to withdraw their obligation to obey, then it can only be the people who are deputizing for those powerful families/dynasties who are prompting all the distrust which is making people become impatient.

The people who deputize for the most powerful families/dynasties (the victors of WW2) are governments and the United Nations (the intergovernmental organization). Since 1945, all politics is being determined and enforced by those two bodies (governments and the intergovernmental organization named United Nations) along with many human development organizations (NGOs, charities).

Governments could be a force of evil, but like the families/dynasties who won WW2 (the families/dynasties who control the international order or the money supply of the world) they gain nothing when their dependents begin to perceive that they are not satisfying their best interests. This is because when people's unpreparedness to obey rise, violence rise. When violence rise, this could provoke citizens to change the leadership. Therefore, since it is not in the best interests of governments that their dependents become dissatisfied or disenchanted

thus prompting the security of the individuals in position of leadership to diminish, governments cannot be in the business of making false promises because this strategy would provoke citizens to distrust them. In other words, hence it is increased awareness what makes people become impatient, it would be irrational to suppose that governments want to make promises to their dependents that they cannot keep or mean, because this will fire back at them in the course of time and things. Simply put, governments make promises only because created things are changing the awareness of their citizens and theirs. If people (society) do not rely on created things to rival each other, governments would stop making promises, because they are already controlling violence for their own benefits.

We cannot say that the intergovernmental organization named United Nations including human development organizations (foreign aid agencies that governments operate through their embassies, NGOs, Charities, etc.) are a force for good, because those bodies make promises to people that are not possible for man to naturally obey. In other words, man cannot eradicate the injustice of poverty on earth because two people cannot fill the same void space, and the natural world does not regenerate the resources that man believes increases his happiness at the rates required. Likewise, a man cannot purge from his self his own bias, because man was programmed with biasness. The United Nations system and other human development organizations have been peddling dates to end poverty and injustice before the start of the 21<sup>st</sup> century. The new date that the United Nations system has scheduled to end poverty and injustice in the world is 2030.

Most importantly, we can say that the intergovernmental organization named United Nations and human development organizations (including the foreign aid agencies that governments operate through their embassies, NGOs, Charities, etc.) can all be said to be a force for evil, because the people who staffs those bodies are poor (without status) just like the rest of the poor people who they are working to improve their living conditions. In other words, the United Nations system and human development organizations (government aid agencies, NGOs, charities, etc.) gain a lot when they make promises, and especially when they make people become impatient. In other words, when the United Nations system and human development

organizations make people develop awareness, thus persuading them to stop coping as they are doing preferring to be impatient instead.

In the Bible, it is reported that the sin that led to the fall of the house of Jeroboam i.e., king Jeroboam (who was one of king Solomon's officials before he rebelled on him) started to appoint priests for the high places from all sorts of people. [1Kings 13:33]

I have no way of knowing if the most powerful families/dynasties (the families/dynasties who control the international order or the money supply of the world) are committing the same sin that led to downfall of the house of Jeroboam and their destruction from the face of the earth. What I do know is that if powerful forces are not interfering in the social order as of 1945 thus prompting people to be impatient, then only the false promises and the corruption that the intergovernmental organization named United Nations (including the foreign aid agencies that governments operate through their embassies, NGOs, Charities, etc.) are prompting could be what has prompted this abnormal spike in distrust.

Furthermore, if we factor how all the civil wars that erupted as of 1945 were not motivated because the wealthy demanded to balance their interests against the interests of the common good, but rather it was the intergovernmental organization named United Nations, the foreign aid agencies that governments operate through their embassies, NGOs, international aid agencies, charities, etc. who were impatient and who provoked the poor to be impatient, this signify that mankind could be in the midst of a world revolution (class conflict) that those human development agencies have ignited.

I have no way of knowing if all the socio-economic competition, violence, civil wars and impatience that the world is knowing as of 1945 is a result of the intergovernmental organization named United Nations, the foreign aid agencies that governments operate through their embassies, NGOs, international aid agencies, charities, etc. igniting a class struggle (i.e., political tension and economic antagonism) between the rich and the poor or not. However, what I do know is that if it is possible to show that within the United Nations (the intergovernmental organization) and the foreign aid agencies that governments operate

through their embassies we could find people who are not able to balance their interests against the interests of the common good, because they are not working to satisfy the best interests of society only in the same way the Catholic priests do it but their own as well, then one of two scenarios could be true. Either the world is in the midst of a social revolution (class warfare), or the intergovernmental organization named United Nations, foreign aid agencies, NGOs, charities, foundations, are working on reverting the most powerful families/dynasties (the victors of WW2) to a simpler form.

Once again, I have no way of knowing if people are losing faith in existing institutions because mankind does not know if the world is in the midst of a world revolution, or if the international organization named United Nations and the rest of human development bodies (foreign aid agencies, NGOs, charities, foundations, international aid agencies, etc.) are laundering money, committing malice, deceit, hypocrisy, envy, slander, etc. just as people are doing on the outside of the UN fence. However, what I do know is that human nature has not changed pre WW2 and after WW2.. Likewise, before WW2 erupted and after this global war erupted, man amass power from two sources: wealth and human power (work or energy produced from the human body). Before WW2 erupted, Great Britain was the mightiest country (monarch, empire) in the history of the modern world. This empire had built the most powerful military. Great Britain dominated the second millennium in its entirety, and during the second half of the second millennium controlled the entire sea practically.

Ships are built in shipyard (in dry-docks or dockyard) that lies very close to the sea and not on land away from the sea. Likewise, all the countries that existed before WW2 were operating national security agencies. The monitoring, collection, processing of information and data for foreign and domestic intelligence and counterintelligence purposes did not start after WW2 ended, but existed throughout history. Said differently, in the same way the identity of the physicists who are developing the nuclear program for Iran today are known by the American, Russian, Chinese, Israeli, etc., the same thing was happening before WW2. Great Britain had informants and spies who were conducting mass data collection about people and countries in all the territories that this empire was administering or rivaling just as this country is doing today.

Great Britain knew more about the politics in Europe and around the world more than any other nations before WW2 erupted as well.

The afore begs many questions. For one, why before WW1 erupted Great Britain did not permit any country to possess battle ships that could rival its power. However, this empire had no objection with the United States building a powerful navy before WW2 erupted when throughout the entire second half of the second millennium this empire had prevented any society to have a powerful military!

Then again, it is highly possible that Great Britain used the United States as a safe haven before WW2 erupted to prepare for the war (build all its ships) since the United States was away from the eyes of the enemy and far from the theater of the war that Great Britain knew was being fermenting in Europe. That is also to say that is highly likely that it was the ships of Great Britain who transported the famous physicists who were in Europe working on developing the atomic bomb to the United States to help this country be able to develop such a bomb faster.

Indeed, the need by Great Britain to prepare for World War Two in the United States is much safer and makes sense. However, what I am not able to find a convincing answer for is why did Great Britain decide to make the United States play the global policemen role post 1945 when this empire was against any country playing this role during the second millennium, and this monarch had won WW1 and WW2.

I do not subscribe to the view that experts promote or articulate about the power of Great Britain having diminished on the aftermath of WW2. To the contrary, I strongly believe that the families/dynasties who control Great Britain are one of the families/dynasties who control the international order and the money supply of the world. The families/dynasties who control Great Britain are part of a network (a web) of families/dynasties who programmed World War One and World War Two, who won both, and who together play the deputy of God role. Great Britain is the lead country who front for the families/dynasties control the international order or the money supply of the world. Likewise, I strongly believe that the British royal family/dynasty act as front man for the families/dynasties who control the international order and the money supply of the world on behalf of

those who stays invisible. As of 1945, the families/dynasties who control Great Britain and the families/dynasties who are entangled with them in their closed network (or web) to control the international order and the money supply of the world are the ones who “all the nations and peoples of every language dread and fear them.” Those families/dynasties are the ones who decide those they want to put to death, he would be put to death; those they want to spare, he would be spared; those they want to promote, he would be promoted; and those they want to humble, he would be humbled,” as king Nebuchadnezzar profited from.

Then again, I also believe that the decision to hand the global policemen role (baton) to the United States when WW2 was supposedly regarded to have ended in 1945, was not because Great Britain (or the British royal family/dynasty who act as front man for the families/dynasties who control the international order and the money supply of the world on behalf of those who stays invisible) were weakened. To the contrary, I strongly believe that the wealth and power of the British royal family and the rest of the families/dynasties who with them they control the international order and the money supply of the world is immensurable. That is also to say that I strongly believe that families/dynasties control the international order and the money supply of the world promoted the United States to play the global policemen role for the service this country did to them to enable them to prepare for World War Two safely, and not because they were weak.

Yet, in as much as those powerful families/dynasties are invincible, I also strongly believe that they have been the biggest losers since 1945. This is because they managed to own everything minus the readiness of the heart of most people to be lenient on them or the preparedness of the mind to surrender freedom to them. To put it differently, those powerful families/dynasties waged on everything minus the values that Gibran Khalil Gibran cautioned in his book *the Garden of the Prophet* of falling victim off. I strongly believe that the families/dynasties who won WW2 waged on technology to *weave the cloth they wear*, and waged on technology to *harvest the bread they eat*, and now found themselves and with the entire human family who they brought along with them on this civilizing mission without the knowhow required to sewing the clothe everyone is wearing, or know how to plant the food everyone is eating.

Most importantly, they created an unquantifiable danger when they used *dumb to be their sages*. In other words, when they agreed with their thinkers (i.e., economists, UN experts, etc.) to make people abandon their values in order to be modernized so created things do not go to waste. All what this strategy has produced so far is the formation of a culture who not only does not know how to sew the clothe it wears or plant the food it eats, but one that everyone involved consider himself/herself exempt from the appeal to obey the principles set forth in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. In other words, everyone believes that it is incumbent on him/her to be devoted to legitimizing how natural and legal rights should be determined and enforced, including being dedicated to fight for their neighbor's right, or to ensure that their neighbor is obeying the rule of law.

Indeed, no one knows if all the noise that the families/dynasties who won WW2 prompted in the world after they decided to deviate away from the work program that the founding fathers of the UN counselled them to be faithful to its principles in favor of having the United Nations (intergovernmental organization) and other human development organization interfere in the social order to attain the ends stipulated in the UN charter and new goals that its tentative date of completion keep on being extended, is waking up Enlil (ancient Mesopotamian God who acted as the chief deity of the Sumerian pantheon) from his sleep and rendering him impatient to the point of compelling him to take actions against mankind as he was doing in antiquity. If Enlil decides to interfere in the social order, the outcomes that would result may play against the best interests of the families/dynasties who won WW2.

Then again, I have no way of knowing if Enlil would take into account the sacrifices the families/dynasties who won WW2 (the families/dynasties who control the international order and the money supply of the world) have done to reduce fear and want on earth and are still doing, and chooses to give them time to determine if they are mightier than him or the other scenario is the case.

In other words, Enlil could say, for example, that the understanding that the families/dynasties who rule Great Britain have shown after 1000 years of upholding social hierarchy (which it does exist till today somehow) and which translated into them being willing to change their

behavior and to start to be in favor of working for the common good – and not any common good but the one that aims to see that outcomes becomes shared on equal rights by 2030, is a worthwhile initiative that merits He (Enlil) grants them time to achieve their goal despite all the noise they are making and permitting people to make.

Then again, since no society (nation) sacrificed the most for the idea of good, or in order for the idea of good to succeed more than the British people (Great Britain) in the history of the world, there is a good chance that Enlil may have a different opinion on how to control the noise that people are doing. In other words, Enlil may choose to let people themselves deal with all the noise they are doing without their being a need for him to intervene.

For example, Nelson Bunker Hunt (1926–2014), an American billionaire whose fortune collapsed after he and his brothers tried to corner the world market in silver but were prevented by government intervention,<sup>117,118</sup> and not by the Gods.

Hence, we have no way of knowing if the families/dynasties who control Great Britain and who as I said earlier the British royal family front for them manifested this mindfulness about human rights for the purpose of reducing fear and want in the world or to achieve the goals that Nelson Bunker Hunt and his brothers were pursuing, we can say that if this consciousness that those families/dynasties manifested on the aftermath of WW2 is not genuine, they could end up becoming the biggest losers just as happened to the Hunt's brothers if people perceive that their passionate yearning for freedom is to solidify their interests and not the interests of the whole world.

To put it differently, hence no kingdom in the history of the world, including God, has done for mankind more than what Great Britain has done after this country won WW2. First, handing to another country the role of playing global policemen of the world. Second, agreeing to grant all the poor nations independence. Third, and most importantly, switch from being in favor of all members of human family cooperate based on the principles of equal rights as the founding fathers of the UN

---

<sup>117</sup> [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Nelson\\_Bunker\\_Hunt](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Nelson_Bunker_Hunt)

<sup>118</sup> [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/William\\_Herbert\\_Hunt](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/William_Herbert_Hunt)

suggested, to wanting that all humans cooperate so outcomes be shared on equal rights including setting dates to achieve this goal, then one of two scenarios is true: Either the families/dynasties who control Great Britain are competing with God (in other words, they want to see who would do good for man more than the other), or the families/dynasties are letting *dumb be their sages*, which is what Gibran Khalil Gibran cautioned people in position of power against doing in his book *the Garden of the Prophet*, to avoid that they become reverted to a simpler form.

I have no way of knowing what motivated the families/dynasties who control Great Britain to deviate away from the work program that the founding fathers counseled them to remain faithful to its principles in order to let the United Nations (intergovernmental organization) start to spread false expectations that we know are far from the way humans establish relations. What I do know is that the United States obtained its independence from Great Britain; and the two countries use the same law, the common law, to this date. What is very strange though is that the US Constitution is in black and white, i.e. it's a written document, while the British Constitution, on the other hand, is unwritten and doesn't have a proper codified form.<sup>119</sup> It makes sense in my opinion that the British Constitution is unwritten, because Great Britain is fronting for the families/dynasties who are playing the deputy of God role on earth as I said before. Besides, it is the United States who separated (defected) from Great Britain and not the other way around. And so, if what Jesus said about a son not being able to do nothing by himself is true, [John 5:19] then this means that the United States could have not been able to become a great power if it was not for the father [Great Britain]. In other words, the United States would have stayed as India stayed from 1776 to now, or as per the way the people who live on the African continent stayed from 1776 to now waiting on Great Britain and its close neighbors to teach them how to fish.

Therefore, since it would be Great Britain [the father] and its close neighbors (the western European monarchs and nations) who stand to lose the most if the liberal interventionism and self-determination

---

<sup>119</sup> <https://www.ucl.ac.uk/constitution-unit/what-uk-constitution/what-uk-constitution#:~:text=Britain%20is%20unusual%20in%20that,be%20explained%20by%20its%20history.>

philosophy that the United States [the son] has been striving since 1945 to ensure that such principles do not lose track, we can say that if peace and security continue to deteriorate and societies go back to becoming ruled as was the case like before WW2 erupted whereby the state decide which expression a person can say or not, we have no way of knowing for sure if the families/dynasties who control Great Britain, the western European monarchs, and the United States would be continuing to get their ways despite the resistance of others as they have been doing since 1945.

To put it differently, in the book *The Politics* (Book 1 Section 1259a) of Aristotle, it is reported that Thales of Miletus<sup>120</sup> (624 – 548 BC), a Greek mathematician, astronomer, and pre-Socratic philosopher, cornered the market in olive-oil presses to prove that it is easy for a poor philosopher like him to be rich if he chooses.<sup>121</sup>

Since 1945 Great Britain and its close neighbors (Norway, Denmark, Sweden, France, etc.) have been the loudest defenders of human rights, and the biggest financiers of programs and projects that are destined to empower the poor to secure that the rulers and political class in UN member states who control regimes share with citizen's outcomes on equal rights. If peace and security continue to deteriorate and societies go back to becoming ruled as was the case like before WW2 erupted whereby the state decide which expression a person can say or not, and among those societies happen to be mathematicians and astronomers, and they decide to prove that it is easy for a poor to corner a computer, algorithm, market, bank, etc., then Great Britain and the western European monarchs, could confront the same challenge that Aristotle claim Thales of Miletus compelled when his used his human intelligence to prove to the rich that it was possible for a poor to be rich if he chooses to.

This is very serious and worrisome. This is because if the society(ies) who could decide to prove that it is easy for them to revert the United States to be poor if they choose to happen to be individuals who do not

---

<sup>120</sup> [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Thales\\_of\\_Miletus](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Thales_of_Miletus)

<sup>121</sup>

[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Cornering\\_the\\_market#Thales\\_of\\_Miletus\\_\(c.\\_6th\\_century\\_BC\)](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Cornering_the_market#Thales_of_Miletus_(c._6th_century_BC))

subscribe to the Anglo-American ideals, then there is a good chance that the Anglosphere may be reverted to a simpler form.

I have no way of knowing if there are societies (powerful forces) who are really working to weaken the liberal interventionism and self-determination philosophy, and/or can predict if when such scenario happens and the victors happen to be subscribing to non-Anglo-American ideals if they would be in favor of reverting Great Britain and its close neighbors (Norway, Denmark, Sweden, France, etc.) to a simple form, or keep on granting them the same power that they have been benefiting from since 1776.

To answer this afore hypothesis, it is important to develop an idea first on whether or not the money that Great Britain (and its rich neighbors) are channeling through the intergovernmental organization named United Nations and many human development organizations (foreign aid agencies, NGOs, charities, foundations, etc.) instead of channeling it through governments as the founding fathers of the UN counselled them is solidifying their power and the power of the families/dynasties who control those kingdoms, or if this money is accelerating their reversal to a simpler form much faster than they imagine.

In other words, it is important to determine first if this money that Great Britain (and its rich neighbors) are channeling through the intergovernmental organization named United Nations and many human development organizations (foreign aid agencies, NGOs, charities, foundations, etc.) is preparing children to grow and be a good child as the United States has been since 1776 (i.e., Cain in the eyes of God), or as provocative as the Lebanese, the Iraqi, the Libyan, the Israeli, the Palestinian, etc. and the rest of the UN member states have been from 1945 to now (i.e., Abel in the eyes of God). I will carry out this investigation in the next chapter.

## 30

# The Threats challenging the Anglosphere

---

The old powers (Great Britain, France and other western European monarchs and nations) along with a good number of the nations who were already regarded as industrialized nations before WW2 erupted such as the United States, Germany, Japan, Turkey, etc., have been providing financial aid to rescue the poor nations from the misery that they subjected its societies to contend with throughout the second half of the second millennium or as of the date when WW2 was regarded to have ended. The founding fathers of the UN did not council the old powers or the nations who benefited from an industrial type economy to rescue the poor societies as they started doing (showering them with humanitarian projects), nor they suggested to them to let the international organization named United nations and human development organizations provide parameters for everyday life to those societies. The founding fathers of the UN counselled to let governments determine and enforce political and economic status in UN member states.

Today, besides the intergovernmental organization named United Nations with all its bodies and agencies, we have millions if not hundreds of thousands of NGOs, government run aid agencies, international aid agencies, charities, foundation etc. who are all tirelessly working for humanity. The progress in human development that this rescue mission has produced has been dramatic and very impressive.

Nonetheless, because humans do not rely on the idea of good (the legitimization of natural and legal rights) to deepen good in the world only, but as a way to enable them to get their ways despite the resistance of others at the same time, this signify that it is much easier to spot who is working to help build a just and peaceful world, from who is using this mindfulness to create conditions of stability and well-being and peaceful and friendly relations to serve demonic goals.

To put it differently, because there are many people and entities who are planning and executing projects and programs that are destined to make the world become a more hospitable and livable place, this makes it necessary that people get closer and to collaborate. The more people get closer, the easier it gets to spot (discover) who is the false teacher from who is the genuine one.

For example, the intergovernmental organization named United Nations and the Department for International Development (this body was replaced by the Foreign Commonwealth & Development Office in 2020)<sup>122</sup> which is part of Great Britain are regarded by many human development experts as the hawks in this ongoing civilizing mission to end poverty and injustice in the world. Those two organizations do not have to worry about how to have access to funding among the fierce competition for funding between the different human development organizations, because in the case of the first (the UN), this organization serve the agenda of the rich nations by virtue of being the primary formal organization coordinating activities between states on a global scale, and in the case of the second (FCDO), this organization is financed by one of the wealthiest nations the world has known.

Then again, Great Britain is not the only old power who consider that its strength and stability would be better served on the aftermath of WW2 if it (this country) attempt to rely on the idea of good (democracy and rule of law) as a mean to get its ways despite the resistance of others instead of continuing on terrorizing weaker societies as it was doing with the rest of the old powers, but everyone switched and started relying on the same approach. China, for example, who in 1945 was regarded as possessing an emerging economy but now has become an

---

<sup>122</sup> <https://www.gov.uk/government/organisations/department-for-international-development>

industrialized economy by all standards, appear to have executed the most successful humanitarian rescue mission among all those nations who in 1945 started using the idea of good as a tool to solidify their power, wealth and status so far. What is very astounding in the ongoing aspiration of China to save the world is that this country transitioned from being an emerging economy in 1945 into becoming a superpower basically in 2020, without this country preaching a word about democracy, freedom, human rights, rule of law etc., or for this matter form an empire first.

On the other hand, I strongly believe that this laissez faire approach that began in 1945 to rescue the world from the avarice of man, which every nation and even every member of the human family seem to be taking part in and has a solution for today, is not a result of a Eulerian<sup>123</sup> approach to change (variations are described at all fixed stations as a function of time), but rather a deterministic<sup>124</sup> process (no randomness involved). That is to say, I do not believe that the major wars (blood) that the United States started spilling around the world since 1950, were wars that this country was fighting to deepen its hegemony, but rather they were wars that were orchestrated to weaken the United States (the American ideals). In other words, powerful forces used the virtuousness (purity) of the United States (the American people) to entangle this society in philosophical and religious wars that its aim is to weaken this country thus creating an opportunity for other societies to overtake this country.

To put it differently, when a lion cub is raised in the wilderness, the cub change from being a helpless lion or lioness to a deadly hunter. However, when a lion cub gets raised in accredited breeding facilities, these killers exhibit different behaviors. The United States did not show the behavior of a wild cat before WW2 erupted or from 1776 to 1945. To the contrary the Americans showed the behaviors that exists in South Korea, Malaysia or Indonesia today before WW2 erupted. If the

---

<sup>123</sup>

[https://eng.libretexts.org/Bookshelves/Civil\\_Engineering/Book%3A\\_All\\_Things\\_Flow\\_-\\_Fluid\\_Mechanics\\_for\\_the\\_Natural\\_Sciences\\_\(Smyth\)/05%3A\\_Fluid\\_Kinematics/5.01%3A\\_Lagrangian\\_and\\_Eulerian\\_descriptions](https://eng.libretexts.org/Bookshelves/Civil_Engineering/Book%3A_All_Things_Flow_-_Fluid_Mechanics_for_the_Natural_Sciences_(Smyth)/05%3A_Fluid_Kinematics/5.01%3A_Lagrangian_and_Eulerian_descriptions)

<sup>124</sup> [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Deterministic\\_system](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Deterministic_system)

Americans (the United States) stopped to express the behavior that they were demonstrating before 1945 erupted, and became a deadly hunter and a rampant and careless animal “country” on the aftermath of WW2, this change has to have occurred as a result of two scenarios. The rulers and political class in the United States started aiming too high, or they were persuaded.

To put it differently, when a mature cat hunt, the big cat takes its young cubs along, or bring the prey while still alive to them to teach them how to hunt. Great Britain and the rest of the old powers (the western European powers) were not taken the United States with them on their hunting spree to dominate the world before WW2 erupted, but kept this country isolated. This signify that the United States did not know nothing about the art of killing before WW2. Said differently, the United States became a great power like China (in recent history) without forming an empire. This country (the US) was like a “cat” who grew up in an accredited breeding facility. The rulers and political class in the United States could not have started to aim high on the aftermath of WW2, because they were not brought up while being persuaded into solidifying their power based on how high they are able to get on social pyramid scale.

If the Americans are beginning to behave in ways never seen before, this can only be because the old powers (Great Britain and the rest of the western European monarchs and nations) stopped to depend on them (the Americans) to produce the goods they need post 1945. In other words, if the Americans stopped to tolerate each other and to tolerate other societies, this can only be because they are not able to tolerate that the role that they were playing in producing the goods that the old powers (Great Britain and the rest of the western European monarchs and nations) were using be taken away from them.

To put it differently, in the animal kingdom, big cats usually hunt and bring their prey to their cubs. However, when a cub reaches adulthood or separate from his mother, he is required to hunt on his own. When a big cat hunt on its own, it must learn when to make its attack and when to hide or run away.

If all the attacks (i.e., wars) that the United States has been entangled with since 1945 have ended in defeat (i.e., no country adapted the American ideals), then one of two scenarios could be prompting this outcome. The first is if the United States does not know how to plan and execute, and the second is if the United States is being backstabbed.

Said differently, if big cats know how to coordinate and set traps (ambush) when hunting so that when one misses and is running after a prey another one could be waiting up ahead to do the kill, then it is not possible to say that animals strategize better than human beings. That is to say, it is not possible to say that the United States does not know how to strategize (select goals, plan and execute). Said differently, it is not possible to say that the United States does not know how to read into the future to know what is worthwhile fighting for and pursuing, and what is not. Simply put, it is not possible to say that the decision of the United States to oust the Iraqi regime or the Taliban was programmed to have access to middle east oil or rare earth materials that exist in Afghanistan, because this country is working on projects that are looking into how to establish permanent settlement on other planets, and I don't think that such commodities would be useful to it on such space explorations.

Humans wage wars to legitimize their own natural and legal rights in the country they conquer or to reaffirm faith in fundamental human right. The natural and legal rights that the United States uses are not any different from the one that the founding fathers of the UN set forth in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Irrespective of the motives that compelled the United States to inflict the destruction or mass killing that this country caused in the wars that it fought since 1945 so far, if none of the interferences (wars) that this country compelled succeeded at freeing the societies that was living under the mercy of its own rulers and political class so its methods be used instead, then one of two scenarios could be prompted this failure. The first is if the societies that the US meddled in their political and economic status are blind, thus they are unable to distinguish between what is right from what is wrong. The second is if the usual allies that this country (the United States) brings along on its wars, and is entangled with them in a complex web of alliances are backstabbing its ideals. I cannot think of any nation or group of nations who stand to lose the most if the wars that the United

States has been waging since 1945 succeed at stabilizing the international environment then its principal allies the old powers (i.e., Great Britain and the rest of the western European monarchs and nations).

Said differently, in the wilderness, when big cats hunt as team they double their chances of success. Furthermore, the only time when big cats fail to make a kill is when each lion or lioness involved in the hunt does not know its role during the ambush.

The United States did not wage its major wars in Korea, Vietnam, Iraq or Afghanistan and all others as a loner but assembled a team. In other words, every one of the nations who went along with the plan of the United States to invade Korea, Vietnam, Iraq or Afghanistan and all others was going to get a share of the spoils, just as Moses used to divide spoils after the wars he was waging on his way to the promised land.

If all the major (and minor) wars that the United States fought since 1945 ended up in a defeat (i.e., in Korea, Vietnam, Iraq and Afghanistan), then one of two scenarios could have prompted this repeated outcome (i.e., no country adapted the American ideals). The first is if the United was backstabbed. In other words, the United States was fighting to win control of a territory that one of the nations that the US brought along to help it win (change its methods) was already controlling this space but without the United States being aware of that. The second is if the United States did not possess the right soldiers.

I have no way of knowing which scenario between the afore two alternatives could have compelled the repeated defeats of the United States in the major wars that this country fought since 1945 to deepen the American ideals. What I do know is that in the wilderness, peace between big cats never lasts long. The quest for power, mating rights and territories forces big cats into extremes constantly. The complicated social life of big cats forces them into living either as roaming loners or as part of a pride.

Indeed, the way our own international order is evolving since 1945 does not seem to be any different from the way big cats live. For example, before WW2 erupted we had few roaming rulers running loose on their

own, and most chieftains belonged to a pride that a single king defended its security and the territory that it was controlling. On the aftermath of WW2, we now have a situation in which, the roaming rulers and the chieftains who belonged to a pride initially but who were granted independence when WW2 was regarded to have ended are all using the idea of good as a hunting strategy to get their ways despite the resistance of others and to defend the territory that each one controls.

Then again, despite how much rivalry is complicating the social lives of big cats, they seem to be able to keep in check their tempers. Actually, when humans stopped making hunting them an easy as was the case before WW2, their number is growing according to experts who do this kind of monitoring. Humans, on the other hand, have not been able to manifest the same force since 1945. In other words, neither the societies who are joining forces to force their values on others are being successful (United States, Great Britain, and NATO war against Iraq and Afghanistan), nor the societies who are joining forces to defend their values are able to be successful (Iraqi and Afghani standup against the United States, Great Britain, and NATO).

Furthermore, since there has been nothing that has captured our imagination more than impatience since the dawn of evolution, we can say that for as long as our leaders and political class continue to be focused on how to legitimize natural and legal rights that are intended to defend tribal ideas and territories instead of the ideas that are proclaimed in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, then the longer we would be living not any different from the way big cats and all the rest of the animals have been doing since antiquity: prey on each other.

I have no way of knowing how the old powers (Great Britain and the rest of the western European monarchs and nations) and the rest of the new powers who emerged on the aftermath of WW2 are rationalizing that it would be possible for any one of them to get its ways despite the resistance of the others, or absent of relying on the values that are prescribed in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the American ideals, the religious values, etc. What I do know is that in the animal kingdom, when big cats fight among each other, the first thing after an intruding pride attack a neighboring pride, the victors kill the cubs. That

is to say that all those rulers and political class who are not genuinely defending the values that are prescribed in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the American ideals, the religious values, etc. (i.e., the ideas of freedom) are going to have to be doing to continue to get their ways despite the resistance of others, is live all the time trying to avoid fights, or ganging on their rivals, or sneaking on their rivals to avoid that they kill their heirs just as big cats protect their cubs.

Indeed, the unpreparedness of the young in the United States to be tolerant in recent years can serve as evidence to support that the American ideals are on the decline. I have no way of knowing for how long the United States will be able to influence young people to defend the American ideals (US constitution) when the rulers and political class in this country appear to have been infected with the hatred and venom that their predators (rulers and political class of other nations) rely on to get their ways despite the resistance of others. This venom is the mistrust in the idea of freedom as a tool to reduce fear and want. This is because when the idea of freedom (i.e., the American ideals) stops to be the most important determination or determining factor to quantify the human worth, man returns to be living not any different than the way animals establish relations with one another. This rule is based on the fittest.

I have no way of knowing how fit are all the powerful forces who are working to paralyze the work of the United States (the global policemen of the world) to deepen democracy and the rule of law around the world. What I do know is that Sudan is a poor country who Great Britain dominated before WW2 erupted, but on the aftermath of WW2 this country began to rescue it from its own pre WW2 political choices. Since 1945, Great Britain has been bequeathing financial aid to the people of Sudan to help nationals improve their social conditions, in return for avoiding that the power of other nations such as the United States, China, France, Italy, Saudi Arabia, Russia, Egypt, etc. who are also doing the same in this country grow.

Great Britain disburses its development aid money in Sudan either through the intergovernmental organization named United Nations, its Department for International Development (now called Foreign Commonwealth & Development Office), and many charities, NGOs, etc. We cannot discard (cast out) that the intergovernmental

organization named United Nations is building power in Sudan, if Great Britain is not only using its money to increase the happiness of the Sudanese people but that of the employees of the intergovernmental organization named United Nations as well. Furthermore, we cannot cast out that the intergovernmental organization named United Nations could become *in the course of time and things* a potent engine as George Washington also claimed in his letter to the American public in 1796 if Great Britain and other nations granted right to this intergovernmental organization to buy and sell in Sudan at the same time.

This also means that Great Britain cannot prevent the intergovernmental organization named United Nations from resizing its power *in the course of time and things* in Sudan and on the international scale if its own [Great Britain] problem with Russia, China, and other nations (i.e., big cats) is not about the unwillingness of the poor in those nations to cooperate based on the principle of equal rights, but how to make the factions who control those societies who its leaders and political class refuse to relinquish control of the regime to the voting public to improve human rights first.

It is important that readers keep in mind that the idea of freedom, democracy, human rights, nationalism, tribalism, equality of opportunity, etc., are all tools (slogans) that leaders and political class use to get their ways despite the resistance of others. For example, the United States relies on freedom to solidify its powers. China uses on Socialism, Great Britain on hierarchy and human rights, etc. In addition, among all those nations and human development organizations (UN system, charities, NGOS, etc.) who are using the idea of freedom, human rights, democracy, etc. to get their ways despite the resistance of others, there are false teachers and genuine ones. In other words, it is not possible to know who is the genuine, and who is the phony because they are all preaching about freedom, human rights, democracy, etc. without supporting that mindfulness in actions including the Vatican.

And so, if Great Britain is empowering the intergovernmental organization named United Nations so its officials can buy and sell in Sudan using financial and procurement rules and regulations that this intergovernmental organization drafted or were handed by Great Britain to this intergovernmental organization to use, we cannot be certain that

Great Britain would be able to prevent that its power in Sudan be reversed to a simpler form if its money is financing that the intergovernmental organization named United Nations build power based on residence rather than kinship!

I do not know if the money that Great Britain has spent in Sudan since 1945 through the intergovernmental organization named United Nations or its Department for International Development or DFID (now called Foreign Commonwealth & Development Office or FCDO) has helped the Sudanese to develop tolerance or to have faith in their existing institutions or in Great Britain.

The decision of the people of Sudan to oust the serving President in 2019 does not support that the money that Great Britain (and others) disbursed in this country through Dfid (now FCDO), the UN, the Sudanese government, NGOs, Charities, etc., till this date had persuaded the Sudanese to embrace the foreign policy agenda that Great Britain was bequeathing its money to help attain. Likewise, the decision of the people of Sudan to oust the serving President does not support that this money that was bequeathed deepened the preparedness of the Sudanese to cooperate based on the principles of equal rights and fair equality of opportunity which are cardinal when cooperating based on the self-determination philosophy.

It is impossible to argue that the Sudanese government was working to sabotage its own happiness or the happiness of its own people, because no builders destroys what he builds but rather builds on top. If governments gain power by working against the best interests of their citizens, then the British monarch who has been in power for the last 1,000 years, would have been engulfing this country in civil wars regularly. Likewise, if whenever citizens withdraw their obligation to obey, this conduct helps the individuals who control a given society, then the families/dynasties who control Great Britain would not be vigilant to ensure that property rights, free and open markets, and rule of law be weakened in the country.

If the Sudanese people were not putting their trust in the leadership of their leaders and political class leading them to withdraw their obligation to obey in 2019, this means that it is either the officials of the

Department for International Development (now called Foreign Commonwealth & Development Office) along with other government aid agencies who provoked the unpreparedness of the people of Sudan to be tolerant, or the officials of the intergovernmental organization named United Nations (along with the rest of the NGOs, international aid organizations, and whoever believes that he/she should dedicate himself/herself to the service of his/her neighbor) who are doing it. This is because it is only the Department for International Development (now called FCDO) and the intergovernmental organization named United Nations (and others) who are in Sudan impacting happiness that its return would not stay in the country. In other words, the officials of the Department for International Development (now called FCDO) and/or the intergovernmental organization named United Nations in Sudan are not Sudanese in their entirety but are made of expatriate as well. This means that the happiness that those expatriate gain is not one that they fully expend in Sudan but in their home country as well.

This also signify that because the happiness of the officials of the Department for International Development (now called FCDO) or the officials of the intergovernmental organization named United Nations and the happiness of the Sudanese people are not one and the same, i.e., in the case of the contentment of the Sudanese this feeling remain in its entirety in Sudan, but in the case of the officials of the Department for International Development (now called FCDO) or the intergovernmental organization named United Nations, only a portion of it gets spent in this country, this signify that because the officials of the Department for International Development (now called FCDO) or the officials of the intergovernmental organization named United Nations do not find their full happiness in their home countries (but in both countries), then it is important that those officials preserve their actual jobs (or role) hence it is the mean from which they sustain their happiness.

This also means that the monarch of Great Britain is not getting best value for money when it is injecting its money in Sudan through the intermediary Department for International Development (now called FCDO) or the intergovernmental organization named United Nations as compared to this money passing through the intermediary of the Sudanese government (even if its corrupt). This is because the happiness

of the people who this money is being passed through them is not in Sudan but in Great Britain, and elsewhere. In other words, if Great Britain needs the Sudanese military to go to war on their behalf, it is not the officials of Dfid (now FCDO) or the UN (organization) who are going to enlist soldiers to go to die on behalf of Great Britain but the Sudanese chieftains.

Actually, the decision of the monarch of Great Britain to inject any money in Sudan through the intermediary of the Department for International Development (now called FCDO), the intergovernmental organization named United Nations, or any human development agency is erroneous, and does not help this monarch whatsoever to protect its best interests, but the contrary, weakens its strength and stability faster.

The money that Great Britain is bequeathing is getting split between Great Britain's implicit aims and which is to bind the Sudanese people to be loyal to this kingdom, and the explicit aims that this monarch tasked its Department for International Development (now called FCDO), the intergovernmental organization named United Nations, and others to start teaching the Sudanese.

The ideas or principles that the Department for International Development (now called FCDO) or the intergovernmental organization named United Nations are teaching the Sudanese centers on improving democracy, human rights, equality of opportunity, freedom, rule of law, guided capitalism, etc. In other words, the monarch of Great Britain is paying officials of the Department for International Development (now called FCDO) and officials of the intergovernmental organization named United Nations to be devoted to teaching the Sudanese why they should stop to accept to cooperate with any British national in the future unless this relation is done on the principle of equal rights!

It looks as if the more this monarch (Great Britain) injects money in Sudan, the more its best value for money is going to be either producing a zero sum game, or weakening this monarch strength and stability.

Then again, I have no way of knowing why the "actual wise man" in Great Britain believe that deviating away from the work program that

the founding fathers of the UN suggested at the end WW2 could preserve the Anglosphere better than letting the Sudanese freely choose their political status with no interference whatsoever as their predecessors suggested. The self-determination ideology is cardinal in the interpretation of the UN charter, which British “wise man” wrote during WW2!

Then again, Thomas Woodrow Wilson (1856 –1924), the 28<sup>th</sup> president of the United States from 1913 to 1921 is regarded as one of the fathers of the self-determination ideology,<sup>125</sup> (or Wilsonian idealism<sup>126</sup>) which has cast a long shadow over the American foreign policy since WW1 as well.

I have no way of knowing if Woodrow Wilson was counselling under the Wilsonian idealism that people be devoted to creating human development organizations that would be dedicated to teaching democracy, human rights, freedom, rule of law, guided capitalism, etc. or he expected that when people begin to practice equality of opportunity democracy, human rights, freedom, rule of law, etc. such idealism would follow. This is because the idealism that is stipulated in the Wilsonian ideology is not a lot different than the idealism that is included in Judaism, Christianity, Islam, Confucianism, Buddhism, etc. Not to mention, the individuals who preach those afore mentioned faiths leave mainstream society and dedicate their life to God, and are not like the officials of Dfid (now called FCDO) or the officials of the intergovernmental organization named United Nations devoted to teaching democracy, human rights, freedom, rule of law, guided capitalism, etc. while they are pursuing the realization of the full development of their personality at the same time!

That is to say, I have no way of knowing how the “wise man” in Great Britain are capable to balance between their obligations to pursue the best interests of Great Britain in Sudan through the individuals who this monarch is keeping on the payroll at Dfid (now called FCDO) or at the intergovernmental organization named United Nations, and the ongoing determination of those afore mentioned humanitarians to realize the full development of their personality!

---

<sup>125</sup> <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Self-determination>

<sup>126</sup> <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wilsonianism>

I have no way of knowing how the “wise man” in Great Britain are capable of preventing United Nations officials in Sudan and elsewhere from resorting to unprincipled means when applying the UN procurement and financial rules and regulations in the service of the British people (or her Majesty) if this organization is buying and selling in the same way people in business do it on the outside of the UN fence. Most importantly, I have no way of knowing how the “wise man” in Great Britain are capable of preventing the officials of the intergovernmental organization named United Nations from cunning the officials of the Department for International Development (now called FCDO) to do wrong in Sudan and elsewhere thus aiding those individuals involved in such irregular behavior to gain power, status and wealth faster?

Then again, I have no way of knowing if the idea of good (humanitarianism) is the right tool for any society to get its ways despite the resistance of others, or if this strategy builds for the destruction of the individuals who bunker under its auspices to solidify their powers. This is very serious and worrisome. This is because if the idea of good (humanitarianism) is not the right tool or approach to enable a faction to get its ways despite the resistance of others, and the wise man (rulers and political class) in Great Britain, for example, are tapping into this idea to solidify their personal power and not the common good, they could be subjecting the Anglosphere to the risk of being reverted to a simpler form in the course of time and things.

To put it differently, if technical assistance is a tool that deepens awareness, then Great Britain has been building the awareness of the Sudanese people and the awareness of the officials of the intergovernmental organization named United Nations with the money that this country injected already in Sudan. This is because the salary that the UN officials is deduced from the money projects) that Great Britain inject in the country.

If Great Britain has been dividing the money that it is injecting in Sudan in technical assistance that improves the awareness of the Sudanese people and the awareness of the UN officials, and after seventy years of interventions, the Sudanese revolted against their leaders and political

class, then there is a good chance that the officials of the UN (and other human development organizations) revolt against leaders and political class in their own home countries if human nature is a constant.

Most importantly, if all what Great Britain recovered from the technical assistance that its money was buying in Sudan, after seventy years of interventions, was a rise in the level of corruption, betrayal, backstabbing and scandals by Sudanese officials, then the same level of corruption, betrayal, backstabbing and scandals should be prevailing at the intergovernmental organization named United Nations and other human development organizations if human nature is a constant.

Evidently, the only reason why the scandals that the officials of the intergovernmental organization named United Nations and other human development organization compel are not as exposed as the one leaders and political class in UN member states compel, because the UN officials do not direct their violence in the same way governments do by denying people rights, but rather they using the idea of good as a mean to control violence for their own benefit just as clergyman do. Said differently, lots of accusations are regularly levelled against clergy involved in sex-abuse scandals, because it is not possible for the church to cover up such cases since they involve a third party. However, all the acts of corruption, crime, misconduct, etc. that clergyman commits while performing their duties, hardly any one of it is made public, because the individuals who are involved in such irregular acts operate in the same way organized crime do by maintaining a code of silence. In addition, those clergymen who are caught are disciplined through the church own code of conduct (there is no third-party system to guarantee an independent and impartial tribunal). The way UN officials run criminal operations and the way this organization discipline UN official is very similar to the one the Catholic church operate its business.

Indeed, the rich in UN member states can continue to let the UN system interfere in the social order and undermine the implications that such meddling can be encumbering on their strength and stability, when already the Roman rulers tested with the same idea in antiquity when they legalized Christianity, which they later paid dearly for. Said differently, the church is regularly creating canonical policies to develop policies for ensuring proper restriction of sexual misconduct by

clergymen, but every now and then new people find the courage to report the sex-abuse that priests put them through thus supporting that the problem is much bigger than people think.

I have no way of knowing if Great Britain and the rest of the great powers are studying the threats that the intergovernmental organization named United Nations could subject the Anglosphere to contend with or studied the impact of Christianity on the collapse of the Roman Empire to make a comparison. Surely, no one can consider what the serpent was advising Adam and Eve to do as narrated in the book Genesis was erroneous. Yet mankind is still paying to this day for this gaffe.

Then again, if we compare how the world evolved from the story of the fall of Adam and Eve to now, we find that rulers and political class continue to make the same mistake that their predecessors did, and listen to their own convictions instead of listening to the truth thus falling in the same trap.

For example, at the start of the 20<sup>th</sup> century the rulers of the political class in the Soviet Union began to use the idea of communism as a way to get their ways despite the resistance of others. However, in 1990, this ideology along with the faction who was profiting from considering themselves exempt from obeying the principles that they were preaching were reverted to a simpler form. Therefore, instead of the rulers and political class using this lesson of the fall of the Soviet Union to recognize that moral ideas are not ideas that can be reckoned with, a big number of them, starting with the rulers and political class of the United States, continue to be preaching one thing and doing another thing.

For instance, some historians consider Elihu Root<sup>127</sup> (1845 - 1937), an American lawyer who served as Secretary of State under President Theodore Roosevelt and as Secretary of War under Roosevelt and President William McKinley, as the architect of US global power and the liberal international order.<sup>128,129</sup> Instead of the rulers and political

---

<sup>127</sup> [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Elihu\\_Root](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Elihu_Root)

<sup>128</sup> <https://ushistoryscene.com/article/elihu-root/>

<sup>129</sup> [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Elihu\\_Root#United\\_States\\_Senator](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Elihu_Root#United_States_Senator)

class in the United States spend the last seventy years (from 1945 to the present) upholding the paternalistic approach to the societies that were freed on the aftermath of WW2 emphasizing democracy, rule of law, freedom, etc., the rulers and political class of the United States favored delegating this paternalistic approach to the intergovernmental organization named United Nations, and began to focus on how to become an empire when this country was already the most successful empire the world has known.

To put it differently, instead of the thinkers who architected the foreign policy of the United States such as Zbigniew Kazimierz Brzezinski<sup>130</sup> (1928 – 2017), Henry Kissinger<sup>131</sup> (born 1923), or Robert Gates<sup>132</sup> (born 1943) advising leaders and political class in the United States on the aftermath of WW2 to focus on how to exemplify the ethical standards of the Progressive Era around the world, they all focused on how to succeed at what Great Britain failed at doing. In other words, they focused on how to control the sea and the Islamic belt that divide Eurasia and Africa instead of controlling the way the awareness and knowledge of people on land was changing.

I have no way of knowing if the strategy that US leaders and political class are adopting in recent years to redirect or reshuffle the way goods are produced (i.e., TPP<sup>133</sup>, TTIP<sup>134</sup>, US trade war with China<sup>135</sup>) will help this country to prevent its decline since those afore mentioned initiatives achieve nothing but drain Asia from its economic substance and direct the production of goods to the United States (or other parts of the world) but would not direct the heart and mind of the people who are living in Asia along. Empires are built by winning hearts and minds and not by winning wars or by shifting and reshuffling the location from where goods are produced!

It looks as if the longer the victors of WW2 take to engulf the world in a global war (manmade famine or pandemic) to create a new reset (i.e.,

---

<sup>130</sup> [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Zbigniew\\_Brzezinski](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Zbigniew_Brzezinski)

<sup>131</sup> [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Henry\\_Kissinger](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Henry_Kissinger)

<sup>132</sup> [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Robert\\_Gates](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Robert_Gates)

<sup>133</sup> [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Trans-Pacific\\_Partnership](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Trans-Pacific_Partnership)

<sup>134</sup> [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Transatlantic\\_Trade\\_and\\_Investment\\_Partnership](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Transatlantic_Trade_and_Investment_Partnership)

<sup>135</sup> [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/China%E2%80%93United\\_States\\_trade\\_war](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/China%E2%80%93United_States_trade_war)

bring the odometer back to zero) and thus continue to get their ways using this same approach that man has been relying since antiquity to solidify his powers, the weaker the power of their global policemen (the United States) is bound to be getting.

Then again, hence the issue at stakes for the victors of WW2 to continue to solidify their power does not appear to be tangled in determining where the locus of geopolitical power should be located (China, United States, Zimbabwe, Haiti, Hungary, etc.), but rather the ideological interplay principally, it looks as if the choices on the way forward are clear if they (the victors of WW2) choose to put the idea of engulfing the world in a global war on hold for now. The first is to continue to divide the world as the case is like now thus accelerating in so doing corruption, betrayal, scandals, etc. which would make it imperative to engulf the world in a new global war to create balance. The second is to stop this mission to rescue the world using the intergovernmental organization named United Nations and other human development organizations (NGOs, charities, etc.) and to go back to implementing the work program that the American leaders and political class did during the progressive era. This will require that UN member states close all the humanitarian agencies that they approved that the intergovernmental organization named United Nations create on the aftermath of WW2 such UNDP, UNICEF, WFP, WHO, etc. including humanitarian organizations who are working on saving mankind to reduce all the corruption or misconduct that those actors are compelling, or to transfer and integrate within governments those UN agencies, charities, NGOs who are already installed in huge numbers in UN member states.

In fact, to show how it is highly likely that mankind is pursuing a totally different work program, then the one the founding fathers of the UN counseled the victors of WW2 to be faithful to its program to maintain their strength and stability and ensue lasting peace, or how this shift could have compelled the disregard and contempt that exist in the world today, let us compare how many people are dedicating themselves to the service of God and their neighbor through using the idea of religion as a tool, to the number of people who are dedicating themselves to the service of building a just and peaceful world (which is what also God

wants) and their neighbor through using the idea of the United Nations as a tool.

In 2017, there were a total of 414,582 priests worldwide in the Catholic church.<sup>136</sup> A priest in an individual who dedicate himself to the service of God and humanity.

Article 71 of the United Nations Charter state that “the Economic and Social Council may make suitable arrangements for consultation with non-governmental organizations which are concerned with matters within its competence. Such arrangements may be made with international organizations and, where appropriate, with national organizations after consultation with the Member of the United Nations concerned.”<sup>137</sup>

According to *Non-profit Action*, an NGO who state that its mission is to connect nonprofit organization with technology and to develop their online presence claim that there are approximately 10 million NGO worldwide in 2015 working on social or political issues around the world.<sup>138</sup> Oxford dictionary define an NGO (nonprofit organization) as being an organization that operates independently of any government, typically one whose purpose is to address a social or political issue.<sup>139</sup> This means that the above number does not include the number of people who the UN system is employing, the foreign aid agencies of governments, etc., which is also in the millions.

It is important to keep in mind that the UN officials whose number could be a quarter of a million or perhaps little less (all type of contracts) are building a just and peaceful world but “without seeking or receiving instructions from any government or from any other authority external to the Organization when preparing people” as specified in Article 100 of the UN charter, and while enjoying privileges and immunities as Article 105 of the UN Charter specify.

---

<sup>136</sup> [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Priest\\_shortage\\_in\\_the\\_Catholic\\_Church](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Priest_shortage_in_the_Catholic_Church)

<sup>137</sup> <https://www.un.org/en/sections/un-charter/un-charter-full-text/>

<sup>138</sup> <http://nonprofitaction.org/2015/09/facts-and-stats-about-ngos-worldwide/>

<sup>139</sup> <https://www.lexico.com/en/definition/ngo>

I have no way of knowing how the families/dynasties who won WW2 are counting on preventing that their strength and stability does not get weakened in the future while so many people are like them playing the deputy of god role on earth. What I do know, is that the decision of the families/dynasties who won WW2 to grant right to aid agencies to provide political, economic, social and cultural solutions to accelerate people awareness does not seem to be aiding the societies that they freed or the one they were controlling already to be in favor of being tolerant, but the contrary, everyone seem to want to increase his happiness today instead of tomorrow.

The word mission is defined as “an assignment carried out for political, religious, or commercial purposes.”<sup>140</sup> I have no way of knowing what kind of changes the families/dynasties who won WW2 were seeking in the world when they decided to grant the poor nations independence. If the objective of the families/dynasties who won WW2 from granting the poor nations independence was to continue to dominate them (i.e., consider their opinion before taking action of their own), common sense dictate letting them reinvent themselves, and not to have aid agencies rendering them impatient. If the objective of the families/dynasties who won WW2 from granting the poor nations independence was to build a safer world, common sense dictate not embedding among them human development agents who are teaching them about democracy, rule of law, while they are simultaneously pursuing the realization of the full development of their personality. Priests do not teach people to take but to give! Most importantly, if the goal of the families/dynasties who won WW2 from granting the poor nations independence was to reduce fear and want, common sense dictate bringing a “wise man” to help them out who does not make his call to order dividing nations into less developed, mid-developed, and very-developed as the intergovernmental organization named United Nations did when the whole purpose of making people (or nations) become united was to stop newborns from perceiving that not all people were equal!

It looks as if the decision of the families/dynasties who won WW2 to let the intergovernmental organization named United Nations and human development organizations interfere in the social order has fragmented

---

<sup>140</sup> The definition was obtained from google search

the readiness of people to manifest the crucial factor that led the families/dynasties who won WW2 be in favor of freeing people in the first place. This element was the preparedness of people to be patient. Most importantly, it looks as if the most powerful families/dynasties have succeeded in fracturing the determination of existing people to be ready to make every effort to build a better world for our successors. Instead of nations focusing on how to reduce fear and want, most governments are working on balkanizing our fragmented societies in order to begin to let people to start to see themselves as separate, distinct individuals, who are not interacting to achieve a common purpose but to elevate the individual (national) good.

Indeed, the only change that we can say that the decision of the families/dynasties who won WW2 to let the intergovernmental organization named United Nations and humanitarian organizations (NGOs, charities, government agencies, etc.) interfere to rescue the world has achieved after 70 years of programming is nothing but to make under their watch all the possibilities become possible.

Actually, the manner the families/dynasties who won WW2 are letting the UN system, governments, NGOs and others resolve on our behalf all the political, economic and social factors as of 1945 makes any observer begin to get worried that our basic understanding of property rights, free and open markets, and rule of law is also at risk, and not just the institutional norms that our predecessors developed and depend on to attain those basic rights.

In other words, if all what humans do is explore to increase their happiness (first) and (then) provide practical results for the greater well-being of society; and if as of 2015, there were 10 million NGOs in the world in addition to the UN system working on social and political issues to accelerate the force of good in the world, can the Egyptian government be blamed if the military rulers in Egypt converted this country into an “open-air prison”? Put differently, can the Egyptian government be blamed for being tough on human rights and freedom of expression, if as of 2015 there were more than ten (10) million NGOs alone (not including the UN system) getting together, and ruthlessly fighting it in order to get in control of the violence-wielding apparatus that the leaders of this government controls? Likewise, can the Egyptian

government be blamed for being tough on letting the United Nations roam free in the country buying and selling (i.e., providing social and political assistance in social and economic matters), and without seeking or receiving instructions from any government or from any other authority external to the Organization.

Surely, the new strategy of the victors of WW2 (the families/dynasties who control the international order or the money supply of the world) to build a just and peaceful world by delegating to human development organizations right to be involved in establishing balance with their adversaries is unheard of in the history of the world, and revolutionary as well.

Then again, what is bewildering with the way the families/dynasties who won WW2 want the intergovernmental organization named United Nations and human development organizations scramble to deepen democracy, human rights, freedom, getting rid of poverty and injustice, etc. in parallel to governments is that this strategy blocks governments from protecting those powerful families/dynasties in the first place.

Deterrence theory is “the idea that an inferior force, by virtue of the destructive power of the force's weapons, could deter a more powerful adversary, provided that this force could be protected against destruction by a surprise attack.”<sup>141</sup> In simple terms, the theory of deterrence state that the threat of using strong weapons against the enemy prevents the enemy's use of those same weapons.

Can governments protect the victors of WW2 (the most powerful families/dynasties) from the people (i.e., the poor) when the victors of WW2 granted right to human development organizations (UN system, international aid organizations, NGOs, and whoever believes that he/she should dedicate himself/herself to the service of his/her neighbor) to teach the poor to be devoted to using the same weapon that they are denying them from so they could use it against them or to fight them back with? This weapon is democracy, human rights, freedom, etc. In other words, the victors of WW2 solidify their power by denying the poor democracy, human rights, freedom, etc. The apparatus that the

---

<sup>141</sup> [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Deterrence\\_theory](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Deterrence_theory)

victors of WW2 (the rich) depend on to deny the poor democracy, human rights, freedom, etc. is the legal entity we call “government.” If the victors of WW2 (the rich) want human development organizations (UN system, international aid organizations, NGOs, and whoever believes that he/she should dedicate himself/herself to the service of his/her neighbor) to enlist the poor in the service of good, then one of two scenarios is true: The first is if the victors of WW2 (the most powerful families/dynasties) are working for their destruction. The second is if the victors of WW2 believe that they can replace the role governments have been playing for thousands of years in providing social and political assistance in social and economic matters to the intergovernmental organization named United Nations so this global council with technology form a world government.

Once again, I have no way of knowing what is it exactly the victors of WW2 (the most powerful families/dynasties) are trying to accomplish from having both governments and the UN system (and NGOs) provide political, economic and social solutions without each faction seeking authority from the other, when the founding fathers of the UN delineated in 1945 the role the UN (the organization) was supposed to play and the one governments are supposed to be doing to secure the ends stipulated in the UN Charter or the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

Actually, the founding fathers of the UN did not only delineate in 1945 the role the UN (the organization) was supposed to play and the one governments are also supposed to be doing to secure the ends stipulated in the UN Charter or the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, but they even resolved all the political and social gridlock that leaders and political class are busy resolving at the UN Security Council.

Said differently, rulers and political class are not resolving at the UN Security Council what they need to be doing to reduce conflicts between them, because the founding fathers of the UN already defined this part. Rulers and political class are resolving at the UN Security Council how to enable them to continue to get their ways without having to obey the work program that the founding fathers of the UN defined in the UN Charter or the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

Then again, what is bewildering with the way the families/dynasties who won WW2 are going about to solidify their power through allowing UN member states and the international organization named United Nations create regularly bodies, institutions, unions, coalitions, agreements and contracts between those units of authority, is that the more bodies, institutions, unions, coalitions, agreements and contracts those units of authority create, the more the number of individuals who would start to consider themselves exempt from cooperating based on the principles set forth in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights would grow. This is because if the individuals who administer the existing bodies, institutions, unions, coalitions, agreements and contracts obey the work program that exist in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, there would not be any need for all these bodies. This is very serious and worrisome.

In other words, if the only reason why the international organization named United Nations and governments create bodies, institutions, unions, coalitions, agreements and contracts is to reduce the gap between the rich and the poor, and the same bodies, institutions, unions, coalitions, agreements and contracts act as a source from which the individuals involved increase their happiness, then what the families/dynasties who won WW2 could be working toward recouping is the reversal of their heirs to a simpler form.

In other words, hence there cannot be anything to be gained from having all those numerous bodies, institutions, unions, coalitions, that are working to build a just and peaceful world except to render the world into becoming more dynamic than what the case is like now (as the past seventy years has shown), this signify that if the families/dynasties who won WW2 do not reset the United Nations (international organization) and go back to cooperating based on the work program that the founding fathers proposed, the only return they are going to recoup is going to be their reversal to a simpler form.

Then again, I do not know if the international order can withstand that tens of millions of people between the UN system, governments, NGOs, etc., be offering to others and to each other political and social technical assistance when the founding fathers of the UN already resolved all the political and social gridlock that all those actors are busy resolving in

1945? Let us not forget the social and economic assistance that technology (artificial intelligence) and computers are also offering.

That is to say, that if there does not appear to be a weapon that is capable to make a person become ready to surrender freedom except if this action is done voluntarily or through the usage of force, then the families/dynasties who won WW2 could be taking a big risk if they continue to let the international order be weighed by many people offering to others and to each other political and social technical assistance but without being prepared to obey the work program proposed in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

For example, if the families/dynasties who won WW2 continue to be in favor of letting the intergovernmental organization named United Nations be an economic operator who provide political and economic solutions to nations while enjoying privileges and immunities, and without its officials seeking to receive instructions from any government or from any other authority external to the Organization, this then signify that what the victors of WW2 (the most powerful families/dynasties) would be continuing on doing is giving their non-objection to happening is that the officials of the intergovernmental organization named United Nations continue to be granted privileges that would not be any different to the one they uphold. In other words, the right that the families/dynasties who won WW2 are granting to the officials of the intergovernmental organization named United Nations to be an economic operator who provide political and economic solutions to nations while enjoying privileges and immunities, grants them access to the same level of power that they wield. In mathematics, we call this act equating.

Great Britain and the United States are two nations who are regarded as principal victors of WW2. I have no way of knowing if the decision of the victors of WW2 to equate themselves with UN officials who are in the Democratic of the Congo pursuing the Congolese government to approve using the UN bank account as a mean to allow them to launder money help the idea of Freedom to prosper. Likewise, I have no way of knowing if the decision of the victors of WW2 to equate themselves with Dfid (now called FCDO) officials who are violating the UN financial rules and regulations in Sudan help the Anglosphere to grow.

Read Motive that propelled the author to prepare this work at the beginning of the book to learn more about how those two organizations are weakening the idea of freedom, rule of law, and democracy.

That is also to say, I have no way of knowing if the decision of the victors of WW2 to delegate to organizations whose administrators have converted its ground into becoming a den of thief will help them to continue to solidify their powers, or if the administrators of such organizations are increasing fear and want in the world, and would eventually sell them in the same way Juda sold Jesus for a few dollars (i.e., the UN fee). What I do know is that domination generates a feeling of humiliation during learning, and the employment of leniency generates a feeling of courage. If the victors of WW2 continue to let the intergovernmental organization named United Nations be a force for evil in the world, people's trust in the international rule based postwar world order that those powerful families/dynasties want people to surrender freedom to enable them to continue to get their ways despite the resistance of others would diminish.

Put differently, operant conditioning is a type of associative learning process through which the strength of a behavior is modified by reinforcement or punishment.<sup>142</sup> In contrast, classical conditioning involves "involuntary behavior based on the pairing of stimuli with biologically significant events."<sup>143</sup> Those two learning techniques are at the core of behavior analysis and are employed in the study of all type of social psychology. Those two techniques are used to clarify certain phenomena related to false consensus effect. In psychology, the false consensus effect, is a pervasive cognitive bias in social inferences, which people tend to "see their own behavioral choices and judgements as relatively common and appropriate to existing circumstances."<sup>144,145</sup>

---

<sup>142</sup> [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Operant\\_conditioning](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Operant_conditioning)

<sup>143</sup> [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Classical\\_conditioning](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Classical_conditioning)

<sup>144</sup> [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/False\\_consensus\\_effect](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/False_consensus_effect)

<sup>145</sup> Ross, Lee; Greene, David; House, Pamela (May 1977). "The 'false consensus effect': An egocentric bias in social perception and attribution processes". *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*. 13 (3): 279–301. doi:10.1016/0022-1031(77)90049-X

This signify that if the victors of WW2 or their actual heirs continue to allow the intergovernmental organization named United Nations to be a force of evil, people would be putting their trust in the strength and morality of their governments (tribal or national power). When people begin to lose faith in existing institutions as a tool to improve democracy and the rule of law, they begin to fear their governments less, and start to rely on their self-help more. If governments resort to employing the same “open-air prison” policies that the Egyptian government is employing in Egypt, this would make people become fearless and stressed more as the case is now in Egypt. This is because people are interpreting the behavior of their government as a form of domination especially while the UN system is preaching good, and other neighboring nations project that they adopt no censorship on free speech in their societies. This also means that because humans would be interpreting the behavior of the intergovernmental organization named United Nations as a reward and the one of the government as a punishment, it would be impossible to control people behaviors.

Said differently, because human choices are motivated by the desire for happiness, the more restrictions governments employ, the more the unpreparedness of people to surrender freedom to obey increases. Likewise, when people become unprepared to surrender freedom, this makes governments become unprepared to relinquish control to the voting public of their regimes. This happens because governments have no way of knowing if the demand of the people to change the leadership is politically motivated or because the people are convinced that the government is not being able to satisfy their best interests. This means that by having within the system (i.e., a country) two forces preparing people, whereby the intergovernmental organization named United Nations is perceived as a reward and the government as a punishment (only by the faction who refuses to surrender freedom to live under the mercy of the state or to accept that the state decides which expression a citizen could say), the net gain is zero. This means that mankind could be in the midst of a world revolution without knowing, as I said before. Moreover, this also means that if the intergovernmental organization named United Nations is not stopped from providing any political or economic solution in any country and the families/dynasties who control the international order or the money supply of the world (the victors of WW2) make everyone adhere to the working program that the

founding fathers of the UN prepared, people would continue to lose faith in existing institutions until mankind would be reenacting the world history in reverse order with WW1 (or WW3) being the first stop. In the book. *“Thoughts on how the socio-cultural patterns that emerged post WW2 are a regression to reconstruct the in-bound world events in reverse order”*<sup>146</sup> I explain how this regression is happening.

Throughout history, morality either broke the courage or enhanced the submissiveness that develops in the perception of people. Einstein claimed that “Insanity is doing the same thing over and over again and expecting different results.”<sup>147</sup>

The victors of WW2 or their actual heirs can let the intergovernmental organization named United Nations remain an economic operator and a force for evil in the world and expect a different result, or steer this collective sentiment or great awakening that has swept mankind by being a real force for good as the American rulers and political class did during the progressive era. In so doing, those powerful families/dynasties would prevent people from employing their sentiments to fight for their interests or their place in the world. In other words, the victors of WW2 or their actual heirs have to pick between two choices. The first is to let the people who believe that they deserve to live in a society that cooperate based on the principles of equal rights secure this goal without having to be obliged to become guided by the courage or cowardice that exist in every person to force such change on governments. The second is to nurture an environment where people would use their awareness to develop moral fear and docility. This fear only develops when people perceive that their leaders are just and moral. An example of that is when governments begin to relinquish control of the regime to the voting public, or when governments stop to run corrupt judicial system who punish only the poor.

I have no way of knowing how the victors of WW2 or their actual heirs plan to stop people from continuing to rely on their self-help to improve democracy and the rule of law. Indeed, there is no difference between what is happening in the world today and when the patriots rebelled against the British crown in the Americas in 1776. The idea that made

---

<sup>146</sup> <http://www.centermpa.com/>

<sup>147</sup> <https://quoteinvestigator.com/2017/03/23/same/>

most people rebel against the British Crown was centered on this sentiment which Thomas Jefferson (1743 – 1826), 3<sup>rd</sup> President of the United States,<sup>148</sup> penned in 1776 during the beginning of the American Revolution on “all men are created equal.”<sup>149</sup> The British Crown had two choices in 1776: The first was to resist and the second was to grant independence to the American separatists.

The same civil war that the British Crown fought in 1776 in the Americas seem being re-enacted today but against the families/dynasties who won WW2 (the families/dynasties who control the international order or the money supply of the world) but its theater is happening all over the world. After the families/dynasties who won WW2 made the war aims to be about how to secure the aspirations that are stipulated in the UN charter or in Article 1 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights which says that “All human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights,” this work program became a sister declaration to the one that the patriots pronounced in 1776 to become a force or to make the British crown go back on its insistence against giving in to the separatists.

The only difference is that the families/dynasties who won WW2 or their actual heirs do not have the luxury the British Crown in 1776 enjoyed. In 1776, the British Crown seceded to the separatists in North America and granted them rights to create a new country. This time around, the choices that the families/dynasties who won WW2 or their actual heirs are confronting are different. Those powerful families/dynasties can cede nothing. They have already ceded to the poor people their natural wealth (i.e., granted them independence). The only choice the families/dynasties who won WW2 or their actual heirs can resist or can cede their wealth, power and status.

The price of resistance would be returning the international order to function as was the case pre 1945. The price of ceding without governments being prepared to relinquish control of the regime to the voting public and instituting reforms similar to the one the United States employed during the progressive era does not prevent that the international order function as was the case pre 1945.

---

<sup>148</sup> [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Thomas\\_Jefferson](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Thomas_Jefferson)

<sup>149</sup> [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/All\\_men\\_are\\_created\\_equal](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/All_men_are_created_equal)

Hence either option leads to forgoing freedom, there is no other option ahead of the families/dynasties who won WW2 (the families/dynasties who control the money supply of the world) but to test with going back to cooperating as was the case pre 1945 in the hope that such strategy would buy them time to create a balance and in this way avert a global war. But again, because the world population is double what it was between WW1 and WW2, it would be necessary to increase death rates through famines or biological warfare. This is because the distrust that people are perceiving based on the political choices that their leaders and political class are taking is making them think twice before becoming ready to pay the ultimate price. In fact, after people all over the globe witnessed how the United States, Great Britain and their allies pushed on everyone how religious radicalization (especially Islam) is endangering the stability of the world, and then backed out from creating the conditions that they promised to the Iraqi or Afghani people to make them sell their leaders, most people, around the world, prefer to live in an open prison as the case is like now in Egypt over being ready to transform their country into becoming another Iraq, Afghanistan, Syria or Libya. This is very serious and worrisome!

Indeed, the future of democracy and freedom does not look promising, if people around the world continue to distrust the United States. I have no way of knowing if democracy and freedom are declining because the power of the United States has declined, or if the reason is entangled in something that is totally different.

If mankind is in the midst of a world revolution that is very similar to what occurred during the American Revolution,<sup>150</sup> this means that the United States may not be able to prevent democracy and freedom from resizing its grip on power even if its leaders and political class are the one who are defending those two ideas. This is because the families/dynasties who won WW2 (the families/dynasties who control the international order or the money supply of the world) are invisible and it is this country (the US) who plays the global policemen role on their behalf. Therefore, just as happened during the American revolution when the British Crown ceded and granted the patriots independence

---

<sup>150</sup> [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/American\\_Revolution](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/American_Revolution)

(right to freely dispose of their natural wealth and resources), a chunk of the power of the United States would be taken away. Of course the size of the chunk of power that would be taken away from the United States would depend on how long this world revolution that is perhaps ongoing takes.

For example, in the case of the American revolution the revolt started in 1776 and ended in 1783. This short span of time made the toll that the British crown had to pay small. Not to mention that this revolution occurred in North America and not in Great Britain, thus the poor in Great Britain were kept totally in the dark.

If the world is in the midst of a revolution, and its circumstances started in 1945, then its end would remain indeterminate for as long as people do not begin to share outcomes on equal rights (hence already people are freely disposing of their natural wealth and resources), or be engulfed in a new global war to create new balance.

Then again, peace and security would have not diminished in the world had the families/dynasties who won WW2 remained faithful to the work program that was set forth in the Universal declaration and human Rights by the founding fathers of the UN. Therefore, since the longer the families/dynasties who won WW2 take to reset the economic and social world order (including persuading governments to lead by example and limiting the role of the UN to a coordination function as initially proposed), the more they are going to be obliged to arrange that the “head” of the United States (i.e., the idea of freedom) be the one that would be placed on a “plate” and delivered to them so the international order stabilizes and in this way they can continue to solidify their powers, I plan to check if those powerful families/dynasties can survive this wave of intolerance that people of all ages, sexes and color are manifesting to secure that outcomes are shared on equal rights. In other words, I want to check if the families/dynasties who won WW2 would be able to ride this wave of noncooperation that emerged in the world pursuant to their decision (the powerful families/dynasties) to grant the intergovernmental organization named United Nations right to become an economic operator who buy and sell in the same way people are doing on the outside of the UN fence while teaching people to not cope unless outcomes are shared on equal rights, or if they would face the

same fate that Herod Antipas<sup>151</sup>, ruler of Galilee under the Roman Empire had to yield to after he ordered that John the Baptist beheaded to satisfy his desires. I plan to check this afore question in the next chapter.

---

<sup>151</sup> [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Herod\\_Antipas](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Herod_Antipas)

# 31

## A man reaps what he sows

---

Historians claim that Jesus began his ministry at around AD 27 -29.<sup>152</sup> The ideas that Jesus preached and the ideas that the United States is now preaching are not different to each other when it comes to how people should interrelate to ensure a lasting peace on earth. If Jesus was crucified for preaching good, then this means that there is good chance that the United States could face the same end, because what got Jesus killed is his decision to preach good.

Not all the people who preach good are resized in the same way Jesus was made to pay by the people who were against his ideas. For example, when a US national who was working for the United Nations refused to prioritize his self-interests as his supervisors were doing in order to prioritize the war aims (the ideas) that Great Britain and the United States laid out at the end of WW2 to end fear and want in the world, he paid a big price. The United Nations did not kill this US national but used its power to revert him to a simpler form. Read Motive that propelled the author to prepare this work at the beginning of the book to learn more about details.

If everything is relative, i.e., when Jesus was preaching good he was killed; and when the US national who was working for the United Nations refused to prioritize his self-interests as his supervisors wanted him to be doing preferring to prioritize the ideas that Great Britain and the United States laid out at the end of WW2 to end fear and want in the world, he was reverted to a simpler form (i.e., he lost his job, his

---

<sup>152</sup> [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ministry\\_of\\_Jesus](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ministry_of_Jesus),

pension, his health insurance), then if the United States is preaching good, this country must face the same end.

Likewise, historians claim that after Jesus death, the families/dynasties who were ruling the Roman Empire collapsed. Once again, if everything is relative, i.e., after Jesus was killed, the families/dynasties who were ruling the Roman Empire collapsed, then if the United States is resized, this means that the victors of WW2 or their actual heirs, would face the same end in the course of time and things. In other words, the victors of WW2 or their actual heirs would be reverted to a simpler form so new families/dynasties absorb their wealth, status and power. Simply put, the intergovernmental organization named United Nations or a country would absorb the victors of WW2 or their actual heirs in the same way the Christian (Catholic) Church absorbed the families/dynasties who were ruling the Roman Empire.

I have no way of knowing how this disintegration would happen. However, what I do know is that if the social order continues to evolve in the direction that it has been taking so far, i.e., grave distrust in the international rule based postwar world order that the victors of WW2 laid out as war aims to enable them to continue to transform the conditions and outcomes that matters to them, then only two scenarios could create balance and stabilize peace and security. The first would be the ganging of UN member states against the United States starting with its allies to resize it (i.e., to stop it from using the liberal interventionism idea and self-determination as a mean to improve democracy and the rule of law or get its ways despite the resistance of others); that is of course, unless the different UN member states would begin to relinquish control to the voting public of their regimes starting with its principal allies. The second would be a stalemate between the United States and the different UN member states who refuse to relinquish control to the voting public of their regimes in the hope that the status quo would resolve itself with one faction weakening the other before a war between the United States and those UN member states break out to create a new balance. Of course, the factor that would determine if the United States would win or not in this second scenario, would depend on whether its principal allies (i.e., Great Britain, France, and the rest of the western European countries) would deem that their self-interests are better served with the United States or elsewhere. For

example, when Judas sold Jesus, he was convinced that his self-interests were safer with the people who were prioritizing their self-interest (the idea of evil) over the common good (the idea of good). Likewise, when the United Nations (and its own court system) used its power to dismiss the application of the US national for compensation and reverted him to a simpler form, because he did not do as the United Nations (his supervisors) wanted him to do, and that was to prioritize few dollars over the ideas (or war aims) that Great Britain and the United States laid out at the end of WW2 to end fear and want in the world, the UN administrators and judges were convinced that their self-interests were safer with the people who were increasing their happiness (giving them power, status, money) instead of being with the truth.

Once again, I have no way of knowing if the events that occurred to Jesus or the families/dynasties who were controlling (ruling) the Roman Empire would also happen to the United States and the victors of WW2 or the heirs of those powerful families/dynasties on the hands of the intergovernmental organization named United Nations or another nation. Then again, historians claim that during the Age of Enlightenment a good number of French philosophers such as Voltaire<sup>153</sup> (1694 -1776), Rousseau<sup>154</sup> (1712 – 1778), Montesquieu<sup>155</sup> (1689 – 1755), advocated that “men were born free and equal.” This later led to the “French Revolution of 1789 and the concept of Human Rights (Droits de l’Homme in French).”<sup>156</sup>

In 1776, an exact phenomenon happened in the United States. At the start of the American Revolution, Thomas Jefferson, John Adams (1735 – 1826), Robert Livingston (1746 – 1813), Roger Sherman (1721 – 1793), all leaders of the American Independence, built their movement the slogan that all “men are born free and equal.”<sup>157</sup>

---

<sup>153</sup> <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Voltaire>

<sup>154</sup> [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Jean-Jacques\\_Rousseau](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Jean-Jacques_Rousseau)

<sup>155</sup> <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Montesquieu>

<sup>156</sup> [https://fr.wikipedia.org/wiki/Droits\\_de\\_l%27homme](https://fr.wikipedia.org/wiki/Droits_de_l%27homme)

<sup>157</sup>

[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/All\\_men\\_are\\_created\\_equal#Origin\\_of\\_Thomas\\_Jefferson's\\_use\\_of\\_the\\_phrase](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/All_men_are_created_equal#Origin_of_Thomas_Jefferson's_use_of_the_phrase)

In 1945, all members of the human family, began to implement a new project this time around. The slogan started out to build a world that all its members would use the liberal interventionism and self-determination philosophy to strengthen democracy and the rule of law (i.e., the Universal Declaration of Human Rights). However, for one reason or another, the victors of WW2 decided to deviate away from the work program that the founding fathers counselled them to remain faithful to its work program to continue to solidify their power and ensure lasting peace. The victors of WW2 tasked the formal organization they formed to coordinate activities between states on a global scale with creating UN organizations so those bodies interfere in the preparation of societies (nations) to transform the conditions and outcomes that matters to them faster. In fact, the victors of WW2 were so much convinced that what they are doing was right, they granted the UN system rights to foster human rights to eradicate poverty and injustice in all its form on earth.

The new reprogrammed date that the victors of WW2 and the UN system fixed to eradicate poverty and injustice in all its form on earth is 2030. In other words, the new project that the victors of WW2 are pursuing is no longer about having people cooperate collectively to practice tolerance and equal and fair rule to create peace and security, but the victors of WW2 want the intergovernmental organization that they named United Nations to prepare people around the world to share on equal rights outcomes.

The unpredictable state of the world today captures a synopsis of the multiple crises facing humanity as a result of this shift in mission from the one that the founding fathers of the UN initially counselled the victors of WW2 to stay faithful to its principles, as compared to what the social order would have been like if those powerful families/dynasties obeyed their counsel.

Then again, this abnormal rise in corruption and waste that emerged in the world after the victors of WW2 and their heirs decided to spin off from the initial mission of having nations come together to prevent wars through collective security and negotiations into one that has taken them into numerous directions is not the issue that I am interested to get to its bottom in this work. In other words, I am not questioning the decision of the victors of WW2 to improve the social and economic inequalities

that existed in 1945, which appear to be worse after people pledged to collectively fight to improve. That is to say, I am not questioning the decision of the victors of WW2 to convert the social order into a workshop to improve morality and human rights even if such move imperils peace and security in the world to the point of making it worse than the case was like before WW2 erupted. That is also to say, that I am not questioning the decision of the victors to create UN agencies and bodies to improve morality and human rights as well. Indeed, life improved immeasurably since the victors of WW2 or their actual heirs doubled the rate of interference in the social order to accelerate human rights or morality in the world despite all the setbacks that still exists. Surely, the decision of the victors of WW2 to convert the social order into a workshop to improve morality and human rights (i.e., create UN agencies, NGOs, foundations, international aid agencies, etc., etc.) is priceless.

In this work, I am only interested in comprehending how the wise man (the thinkers) who architected for the families/dynasties who won WW2 reached that granting rights to UN agencies and bodies to improve morality or human rights without seeking or receiving instructions from any government or from any other authority external to the Organization would help them to reach their implicit goals. This is because this strategy puts the UN agencies and UN bodies at the same level of government, and not under the direction of governments. In other words, when the United Nations became an economic operator in the social order, which is what government really are, the rate of corruption and waste starts to double in the world. If we add the corruption and waste that the interventions of international aid agencies operated by governments, NGOs, foundations, charities, corporation (social responsibility), etc. are also effecting in the social order, the damages that all those actors are compelling in the name of morality, human rights, freedom, democracy, becomes immensurable.

It is important to keep in mind that the existing nations came together on the aftermath of ww2 to prevent wars through collective security and disarmament and settling international disputes through negotiation and arbitration. The existing nations created an intergovernmental organization which they named United Nations to coordinate their work or efforts to maintain international peace and security, and uphold

international law. The existing nations did not come together on the aftermath of ww2 to create a formal organization who would be tasked with coordinating their work and offering social programs (human rights protection, deliverance of humanitarian aid, promotion of sustainable development) as the case is right now.

Therefore, since the victors of the UN switched the mission of the intergovernmental organization named United Nations from one that was intended to coordinate the work of nations to preserve world peace, to one that involve providing solutions in political, economic, social and cultural development, then this signify that they switched the role of this organization from being primarily to offer monitoring, reporting and confidence-building roles to one that behaves not any different than the different social movement efforts that people organize on the outside of the UN fence.

A social movement is defined as “organized effort by a large group of people to achieve a particular goal typically a social or political one. This may be to carry out, resist or undo a social change. Social movements have been described also as organizational structures and strategies that may empower oppressed populations to mount effective challenges and resist the more powerful and advantaged elites. They represent a method of social change from the bottom within nations.”<sup>158</sup>

If the intergovernmental organization named United Nations is no longer a force for coordinating the efforts of nations to improve peace and human development, and is undertaking a wide variety of complex tasks in the social arena that ranges from fostering human rights, to economic development, health, education, poverty reduction, gender equality, etc. then this signify that this intergovernmental organization that the victors of WW2 named United Nations is working to undo the social or political order. This is very serious and worrisome.

If the intergovernmental organization named United Nations is working to solve urgent problems, fight for development and bring an end to all political, social and economic crises, then the United Nations is not

---

<sup>158</sup> [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Social\\_movement](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Social_movement)

pursuing anything that is different than the goals that were pursued during the French and American revolution.

If each time when man applied a philosophical slogan to improve the idea of good, its users resized the political canvas in the country that it was applied, then it is highly possible that the reuse of the same idea that the intergovernmental organization named United Nations is committed to achieve (reduce poverty and injustice, etc.) as of 1945 could produce the same outcome. In other words, the resizing of the victors of WW2 or their actual heirs (i.e., the families/dynasties who control the international order or the money supply of the world).

It is important to note that during the American revolution, the patriots did not kill the British Crown and revert the family/dynasty that was controlling this monarch to a simpler form. The families/dynasties who were controlling France were not as lucky. Furthermore, since the victors of WW2 or their actual heirs are pursuing a project that seeks to change the way people all over the world cooperate with one another (i.e., a project that is not any different than the one Jesus was pursuing except in the case of Jesus, his movement was working to resize the rich, and not as the case is like now, where the rich (victors of WW2 or their actual heirs) are financing social movement through organizations such as the UN system, NGOs, charities, etc., to revert them to a simpler form), then it would not be possible for the rich (victors of WW2 or their actual heirs) to escape unharmed. In other words, the only choice the victors of WW2 or their actual heirs have is either to be killed as happened to King Charles I of England<sup>159</sup> (or be exiled as happened to Herod Antipas, ruler of Galilee under the Roman Empire), or to control the people who are refusing to obey and want to resize them.

To put it differently, when the American national who was working for the United Nations in the Democratic Republic of the Congo and Sudan refused to prioritize his self-interests in order to prioritize the values that are set forth in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, it was the administrators of the United Nations who reverted him to a simpler form to get the fee that they were going to gain from the Department for International Development (now called Foreign Commonwealth &

---

<sup>159</sup> [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Charles\\_I\\_of\\_England](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Charles_I_of_England)

Development Office). Hence the victors of WW2 or their actual heirs are financing the intergovernmental organization named United Nations thinking that this organization is prioritizing the values that are set forth in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, but in reality, the administrators of this intergovernmental organization are prioritizing their self-interest at this body and not if the world would become more peaceful or not (in other words, teaching people why they should not be tolerant unless their governments share with them outcomes on equal rights), then the victors of WW2 or their actual heirs stand a good chance of being resized by the staffs of this intergovernmental organization, or the people who this intergovernmental organization is teaching them why they should refuse to be tolerant unless their governments share with them outcomes (created things) on equal rights, or together. That is of course, if the law of relativity is true.

As I said before, I strongly believe that if the intergovernmental organization named United Nations continue to be an economic operator, and everything is relative, that the victors of WW2 (the families/dynasties who control the international order or the money supply of the world), cannot expect a different result than the one the American national had to yield when he prioritized the values that are set forth in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights over his self-interests.

Likewise, I strongly believe that if the intergovernmental organization named United Nations does not resize the victors of WW2 (the families/dynasties who won WW2), and everything is relative, then the people who the UN is teaching them why they should refuse to be tolerant unless their governments share with them outcomes (created things) on equal rights, would do it, because the United Nations is not teaching anything different than what Jesus was teaching. The movement that the people who were adhering to the Christian faith resized the rulers of the Roman Empire. In other words, it would be the courage and conviction that the UN is planting in the heart and mind of people about why they do not need to be any longer tolerant on their governments to secure their best interests what would be pushing them to doing it.

Furthermore, since neither the victors of WW2 (the families/dynasties who control the international order or the money supply of the world), nor the governments who are deputizing for them (including the United States) are leading by example, then unless the powerful families/dynasties resize the poor first, the sentiment that the UN is preaching to make people become devoted to end poverty, social injustice, and inequality thus persuading the poor to develop extremism, a prerequisite to resize the rich and to create a new balance. For example, throughout history all conflicts against the state divided people into two groups. Those who believe that all men do not have the same rights but should live at the mercy of the state formed one group, and those who believe in the idea of all men being created equal formed the other. Later, the people who were supporting the state betrayed their master (the rich).

I do not know how the families/dynasties who control the international order or the money supply of the world plan to avoid that the poor resize them, when history is full of example that shows that most of the people who tried to increase the awareness and knowledge of the people they want to dominate were resized (reverted to a simpler form). If so, we cannot expect a different fate to await the victors of WW2 that Einstein said prompt insane people to all the time do if those powerful families/dynasties (the rich) want to increase the awareness of the poor in freedom, democracy, human rights, but while regarding themselves exempt from the appeal to cooperate based on what they are preaching.

Then again, I have no way of knowing how the victors of WW2 can avoid their disintegration if every time the idea of good (improving morality and human rights) was used as a slogan to preserve world peace (improve the idea of good), its outcome led to the disintegration of the individuals or rulers who do not hold themselves to the standards that they are preaching.

For example, when the French penned the slogan about all human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights in the 18<sup>th</sup> century, the French did not stay faithful to this idea or kept in mind constantly. This has kept France to this day unstable, and a country that cannot be trusted because of its reliance on double standards to get its ways despite the resistance of others. To the contrary, when the American penned the

same slogan, they remained faithful to this day, and their faithfulness is what made the American people be the happiest till 1945, and to a great extent till the end of the 20<sup>th</sup> century.

It looks as if the victors of WW2 or their actual heirs need to decide if they want to be custodians to the idea of freedom as per the way the French have behaved in the last two centuries, while backstabbing, betraying, and with double standards, or be like the Americans who managed to convert this country from being in a state of mess after their independence (i.e., in the same way the South Sudanese are since 2011) to one of the successful societies that mankind managed to build since the idea humankind began to develop cities.

Once again, I have no way of knowing how the victors of WW2 or their actual heirs plan to continue to transform the conditions and outcomes that matters to them after they delegated to the intergovernmental organization named United Nations right to determine and enforce behavioral parameters while the administrators of this organization are buying and selling in the same way organized crime enterprises plan, conduct and control its criminal activities.

Indeed, the social order that emerged in the world as of 1945 pursuant to the decision of the victors of WW2 or their actual heirs granting right to the intergovernmental organization named United Nations to offer social programs on a global scale (human rights protection, deliverance of humanitarian aid, promotion of sustainable development) has not produced any social standards that are different than the ones that emerged on the aftermath of the French revolution. To the contrary, the political corruption and money laundering operations that the intergovernmental organization named United Nations has provoked during the last 70 years around the world has increased distrust, malice, deceit, hypocrisy, envy, slander, etc. worldwide.

The victors of WW2 or their actual heirs could continue to be in favor of allowing the intergovernmental organization named United Nations to consider itself exempt from obeying the appeal to obey the principles set forth in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and to continue to revert to simpler form other people as this organization did to the US national to obtain few Euros from the Department for International

Development (now called Foreign Commonwealth & Development Office) of the British government. However, I am sure those powerful families/dynasties know that it has been said that “a man reaps what he sows”. [Galatians 6:7]

If the one who sows to please his sinful nature, from that nature will reap destruction, [Galatians 6:8], then the victors of WW2 or their actual heirs cannot be reaping from the intergovernmental organization named United Nations nothing but destruction.

I have no way of knowing how the victors of WW2 or their actual heirs would reap the end that the book of Galatians suggests awaits any person who prioritize sinful habits. However, if we consider that the disenchantment that people are manifesting in recent years is mostly not a bid that is prompted to obtain independence, but rather to prompt government to build a just and peaceful world, this fact makes it hard to judge if this ongoing outcry is really to build a just and peaceful world, or to resize the holders of the political powers to control different violence-wielding apparatuses for their own benefit.

For example, the movement that emerged after Jesus was killed started out demanding that the social order be reset to build a just and peaceful world, but then, the movement was politicized, and the Christian Church behaved worse than the rulers of the Roman Empires. Likewise, the faction who replaced the families/dynasties who were controlling France after the French revolution started out penning democratic ideas the behaved worse than those rulers who were removed. As of 1990, the faction who replaced the families/dynasties who were controlling the Soviet Union after the collapse of this bloc are behaving worse than those rulers who were removed. Only the rulers of the United States have adopted a civilizing mission since the American revolution that stayed true to the idea of democracy, rule of law, human rights, freedom, etc.

Actually, the challenges that are confronting the victors of WW2 or their actual heirs are much more complex than the one that the rulers of the Roman Empires confronted.

For example, when the Christian movement was active, its leaders were not interesting sympathizers or converters to Christianity by penning to them that they were going to gain lots of material things when they become a Christian in this life, but in the afterlife. The intergovernmental organization named United Nations is teaching people to be unprepared to surrender freedom to their leaders if they do not share outcome with them on equal rights. In other words, the intergovernmental organization named United Nations is interesting people in its work program so people increase their happiness in their lifetime and not in the afterlife.

Likewise, when the French or American Revolutions were fought or afterwards, the leaders of those two revolutions did not go and create an organization and tasked it to thrust their nationals to be devoted to making their dependent people prioritize their self-interest and/or to establish an egalitarian nation. The revolutionary leaders of those two revolutions began to prepare their dependent people in the political, social, and economic field on their own, as Fidel Castro<sup>160</sup> (1926 – 2016) and his comrades did in Cuba.

In other words, even if developed countries go ahead and build a fence around their nations and then force citizens to sustain themselves from the natural resources that exists within the fenced boundary, the people are not going to be prepared to live under the mercy of the state or to accept that the state decide which expression a citizen could say if there is no religiosity in their hearts, or are not forced into doing it as the case is like in Egypt or in Cuba. The people who live in those developed nations are going to want that the government cooperate with them based on the principles that exists in constitutions or the legal rights that the United Nations is telling people they need to exercise such as democracy, human rights, etc.

It should be noted that people in Egypt or Cuba accept to tolerate to live under the mercy of the state because the faction that controls those two countries are either protected by a more powerful force, or the powerful force that wants them out, does not dare to do it because of the serious implications it would have with the nation who is protecting them. That

---

<sup>160</sup> [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Fidel\\_Castro](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Fidel_Castro)

is also to say, the only reason why the regime in Cuba did not collapse on the aftermath of the Soviet Union in 1990, is either because Russia is still controlling this island or whoever is controlling this island (such as the United States, Great Britain, Spain, the Vatican, etc.) is keeping the regime in power for political reasons.

As the afore shows, the decision of the victors of WW2 or their actual heirs to change the project that the founding fathers of the UN counselled them to be faithful to its program, and which was to teach people tolerance, into one that is intended to secure that outcomes are shared on equal rights, created a much bigger problem for those powerful families/dynasties. We now have a situation that is not any different than the one that exists in antiquity when the Greeks were denying each other rights in the name of Gods. In our case, we now have many people who are playing the role of deputy of God just as was the case with the Greeks in antiquity.

Most historians suggest that the Greeks were perpetrating unparalleled cruelty in the name of the Gods. In addition, historians suggest that it was only a mixture of reliance on natural science and logic including the subordination to Roman rule what aided the Greeks to stop to legitimize the interference of the Gods in their relations. This is very serious and worrisome.

In other words, if according to historians the Greeks were able to rely on ideas of rational progress and secular values including the power of the Roman Empire supplanting the Greek Gods to stop people from denying each other rights in the name of Gods, then if existing people continue to consider themselves exempt from the appeal to cooperate based on the principles stipulated in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and want to regard themselves as the deputy of God, the victors of WW2 or their actual heirs need to rely on putting in place irrational ideas to prompt people to obey, or arrange that the power of those who are considering themselves exempt from the appeal to cooperate based on the principles stipulated in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights be absorbed by another growing power who would create the required control.

The victors of WW2 or their actual heirs cannot use irrational ideas to make people be ready surrender freedom voluntarily to them. The most the victors of WW2 or their actual heirs could do is bunker under the idea of technology in the hope that the restrictions that such tools would be securing would be making people start to trust governments.

I have no way of knowing if whenever machinery (artificial intelligence or automation) decides which doors is to be opened and which one is to remain closed, that people would be ready to start to put their trust in their government and obey thus shrinking crime and violence within our societies. What I do know is that if machinery and technology could control the human mind, then the people who are locked up in prisons would have stopped to fights with one another, and would have become civilized.

Considering the slim chance that machinery (artificial intelligence or automation) stands to alter people behavior, then it is possible that the irrational idea that the victors of WW2 or their actual heirs would adopt to prompt people to obey would be both a construct of the mind, and one that the mind would act out (implement). This is very serious and worrisome.

Throughout history, all the disregard and contempt that mankind ran into occurred because the human mind want to be the measure of all things. The mind does not know how to improve human rights or morality except through legislating rules which this aptitude (the mind) later refuses to obey by considering itself exempt from the appeal that it legitimizes so every member of the human family surrender some freedom and to submit it to the decision of the majority (or a government) in exchange for protection of its remaining rights. Accordingly, the more the mind rely on backstabbing, betrayal, corruption, deceit, slander, etc. to delegitimize the social contract that this aptitude (the mind) posit to prioritize its own propensity, the more the inclination of the thoughts of the human heart stays evil at all the time.

In the book *Social Improvement and Human Security: Collateral Damage*, I show using calculus that crises and conflicts are a function of social improvement and vice versa, as I said before. In other words,

if the mind continues to come up with laws that this aptitude (the mind) refuses to enforce to improve accountability and democratic legitimacy, the more the chains of events that such an action would be perturbing would be amplifying undesired outcomes.

A chain of events is a number of actions and their effects that are contiguous and linked together that results in a particular outcome. In the physical science, chain reactions are a primary example.<sup>161</sup>

A chain reaction is a “sequence of reactions where a reactive product or by-product causes additional reactions to take place. In a chain reaction, positive feedback leads to a self-amplifying chain of events. Chain reactions are one way that systems which are not in thermodynamic equilibrium can release energy or increase entropy in order to reach a state of higher entropy.”<sup>162</sup>

To put it differently, the social order that exists today in Lebanon (at the micro scale), the middle east (at the regional scale) and the world (at the macro scale) are the effect of each chain of event. However, the actions that occur at each level of horizontal chain of event are all intertwined with each other, as a fabric and affect the actions that occurs at the vertical chain.

For example, the decision of the victors of WW2 to convert Lebanon into a stateless country on the aftermath of the Lebanese civil war, led to the governments operating today not any different than the way organized crime run and operate their turfs. In the organized crime world, it is the leader of each organization who decides who lives and who dies. The values that this ineffective and corrupt approach that the victors of WW2 allowed in Lebanon led to the development of a system of governance that does not legislate, that does not enhance transparency and one that does not monitor. Since 1975, all what the Lebanese government has done is transform the country into a theater in which its actors (the leaders that the victors of WW2 are allowing to be in power), to write, produce, direct, and act out acts that does not engage the civil society to improve accountability and democratic legitimacy, but rather to continue to extend the ongoing systemic failure.

---

<sup>161</sup> [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Chain\\_of\\_events](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Chain_of_events)

<sup>162</sup> [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Chain\\_reaction](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Chain_reaction)

In ethics, intrinsic value is a “property of anything that is valuable on its own. Intrinsic value is always something that an object has "in itself" or "for its own sake", and is an intrinsic property. An object with intrinsic value may be regarded as an end, or in *Kantian terminology*<sup>163</sup>, as an end-in-itself.”<sup>164</sup>

I do not know what benefits the victors of WW2 expect to reap from allowing that the Lebanese warlords (or their agents in government) who are ruling this country convert Lebanon into a den of thieves, whereby legislators are not able to deliver on the promises or the laws that serve the best interests of the tribal unit they defend never mind the common good of the entire country.

Then again, in value theory, chain of events is defined as “the amount of cause and effects of the chain of events before generating intrinsic values that separates high and low grades of instrumental values.<sup>165</sup> If we compare the chain of events that are manifesting at the micro scale level (in Lebanon), to the one that is manifesting at the regional level (the middle east) or the macro level (the world), we find that that same fabric of events and or effects is evolving.

For example, the chain of events that led to the eruption of WW1 and WW2 were related to political, territorial, economic competition, militarism, complex web of alliances and alignments, the growth of nationalism, and power vacuum created by the decline of the Ottoman Empire (during WW1) and the old powers (during WW2). And so, if the chain reactions that were ensuing around the world (human cognition and behavior, decision and action) served as a cause for bringing the chain of events duration (i.e., the time it takes to reach the terminal event) or the ethic value duration (the time it takes for a natural object to reach its low grade instrumental value or terminal value intensity) to the outbreak of WW1 and WW2, can the victors of WW2 or their heirs prevent the world from spiraling into a new global war when man does not know if the outcomes that evolves are causally determined by an unbroken chain of events or not?

---

<sup>163</sup> <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Kantianism>

<sup>164</sup> [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Intrinsic\\_value\\_\(ethics\)](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Intrinsic_value_(ethics))

<sup>165</sup> [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Chain\\_of\\_events#In\\_value\\_theory](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Chain_of_events#In_value_theory)

To put it differently, the Lebanese are not able to reach a lower energy (improve peace and security), because the warlords (or their agents in government) are not able to naturally take a path that would enable them to prioritize the common interests over their self-interests, or to control the distrust that people awareness prompted. This dilemma has now prompted the war lords who control the country to steer their complex web of alliances and alignments to support that it is the unpreparedness of people to obey what is not enabling the government to improve accountability and democratic legitimacy. In other words, the warlords (or their agents in government) are conspiring against the population. The warlords (or their officials in government) cannot enhance accountability, because this process would kick a snowball effect (or a chain reaction) that would start to grow until finally it becomes an avalanche effect. Consequently, the more the warlords (or their agents in government) restrict enhancing transparency, the more the stored energy (disenchantment) that the Lebanese people would be withholding in their hearts would be growing. If disenchantment is an energy that seek a path to be released in the same way friction causes a path in the natural world, the signify that the longer the victors of WW2 allow the disenchantment or distrust in the hearts of the Lebanese to expand, the longer this delay would be building potential. In the physical science, the higher the potential energy rise, the bigger its destructive power, reciprocally, gets. That is also to say, that if such potential that is visible at the micro level (in Lebanon) is also happening at the regional level (the middle east) or the macro level (the world), then the victors of WW2 or their heirs could be building the same divisiveness, disregard and contempt that exist in Lebanon at the global level.

Having said that, the questions and answers that the victors of WW2 or their heirs need to pose and answer in as far as of what they should do or not do to avoid that the international social order grows into becoming uncontrollable and chaotic as the case is like in Lebanon today, are not questions that I or anyone else could raise or answer. In other words, the only people who need to prevent that the international order become out of control are the individuals (families/dynasties) who are playing the deputy of God role on earth (i.e., the one who control the international order or the money supply of the world), and the ones

who stand to lose the most if a new global war erupt. Simply put, it is the victors of WW2 or their heirs who would lose or gain if peace and security in the world reaches the low level that exists in Lebanon or if the world plunges into a global war, and no one else. This is because it is the victors of WW2 or their heirs who “all the nations and peoples of every language dread and fear.” They (the victors of WW2) are the ones who “put to death, whoever they do not want alive, spare the one they want be spared, promote the one they want be promoted, or humble the one they want humbled,” and who everyone else wants be resized to possess their power, wealth and status.

That is also to say that all what people like myself can do is to speculate on what could happen to the victors of WW2 or their heirs if the chain of actions that they are determining and enforcing to preserve world peace via the UN system, NGOs, charities, international aid agencies, private philanthropies etc. would not fulfill their hopes of continuing to be able to transform the conditions and outcomes that matters to them. For example, the United States, Great Britain and their allies invaded Iraq and Afghanistan at the start of the 21<sup>st</sup> century to help improve morality and human rights, and till today they got it wrong.

And so, what if the victors of WW2 or their heirs got it wrong about being able to control the world if they continue to be against resetting the world order in accordance with what the founding fathers of the UN suggested to them to solidify their power and ensure lasting peace? In other words, could the victors of WW2 or their heirs get it right and prevent their collapse if the security situation in the world continues to deteriorate? All the kings who tried to maintain double standards failed. I do not know if the victors of WW2 or their heirs would get it right and would not be as unfortunate as their predecessors were.

To put it differently, I do not know if the United States, Great Britain and their allies decide to return to Iraq to get it right but without leading by example they could stop the backstabbing, and betrayal that the Iraqi confronted them with reason why they got it wrong in the first place. And so, if the United States, Great Britain, and their allies would not be starting to get it right until they start to lead by example, or increase death rates, could they get it right if crises and violence communicate with the heart of people and not with the human reason? In other words,

could the victors of WW2 or their heirs make people around the world build trust in the United States, Great Britain, and their allies when those countries who are securing on their behalf this mindfulness are using two agents (the intergovernmental organization named United Nations and governments) who consider themselves exempt from cooperating based on the appeal that the founding fathers cautioned the victors of WW2 to be faithful to its work program to reduce betrayal or backstabbing and in this way solidify their power and ensure lasting peace? Simply put, can the victors of WW2 or their heirs count on the power of the United States, Great Britain, and their allies to prompt people to stop to have view of the world that is out of sync with modern times, if the lifestyle that they are imposing on people is based on building truth by fighting the evil that threatens their best interests and not the evil that threatens the welfare of others, which is injustice and poverty? Said differently, can the victors of WW2 or their heirs get it right by continuing to allow the United States, Great Britain, and their allies to form complex webs of alliances and alignments to fight radical Islamism when more than 1.6 billion people today know that Islam does not weaken morality or human rights, but improves it?

Specifically, Schizophrenia is a serious mental disorder in which people interpret reality abnormally.<sup>166</sup> Schizophrenia is a disorder that affects a person's ability to think, feel, and behave clearly. It is not known what causes schizophrenia. Most importantly no one knows or can tell if the distinct behavior and emotions that people manifest (i.e., imagination, delusion, disordered thinking, etc.) is a result of every one of us being impaired with Schizophrenia or not. This is because humans have no way of knowing what they do not know. Therefore, since all people do not know if they are impaired with Schizophrenic or not, it is possible, for example, for the US government, the British government, and their allies (i.e., the leaders of the pack - cowbell) to enlist the emotions of every member of the human family to be ready to go to war to prevent radical Islamism or those who are ambitious at increasing fear and want in the world from succeeding.

But, if the political situation that exist in Iraq, Afghanistan, Lebanon, Russia, France, etc. is what the cowbell (the US government, the British

---

<sup>166</sup> <https://www.mayoclinic.org/diseases-conditions/schizophrenia/symptoms-causes/syc-20354443>

government, and their allies) have to show far after people became ready to surrender some of their freedom to them in order to help build, the question that begs an answer boils down to one. There is a proverb that says: “fool me once, shame on you; fool me twice, shame on me”, which mean that after being tricked once, one would learn from one's mistakes and avoid being tricked in the same way again.<sup>167</sup> If what this proverb says that most people try to avoid falling victim off is true (i.e., being tricked), can the victors of WW2 or their heirs count on the readiness of the herd (the UN member state) trust the cowbell (the US government, the British government, and their allies) when they make sound so everyone follow them, after their interference in Iraq and Afghanistan did not support that it was intended to improve morality and human rights in the world, but rather to deepen distrust?

Once again, I have no way of knowing if all the UN member states would be surrendering freedom to the lead cowbell (the US government) in good faith after this country started penning in 2016 that it was working to make “America Great Again” (partisanship), and not to make “the world Great Again” (international bipartisan consensus). What I do know is that when the herd stops to want to follow the sound that the lead cowbell is making, then the herder either replace the cowbell with another animal (cow or sheep), or the herder (the shepherd) slaughter the lead cow or sheep of the flock.

To put it differently, hence the United States is the one who is playing the global policemen role on the aftermath of WW2 (the lead cowbell), and it is no longer Great Britain and the rest of the old powers (i.e., the monarch of western Europe) who are doing it, the victors of WW2 could not reuse Great Britain or the old powers to play the global policemen role should they decide to relieve the United States from this role. In other words, the victors of WW2 could not have the western European Monarch (the countries who the United States built with them a complex web of alliances and alignments in good faith in the last seventy years) telling China, Brazil, Turkey, Russia, etc. (i.e., countries with large population and relative military power) what to do after they weakened the European Union rather than to play the nation building role which those other ones are playing, mainly China, Russia, Turkey, Egypt, etc.

---

<sup>167</sup>[https://en.wiktionary.org/wiki/fool\\_me\\_once,\\_shame\\_on\\_you;\\_fool\\_me\\_twice,\\_shame\\_on\\_me](https://en.wiktionary.org/wiki/fool_me_once,_shame_on_you;_fool_me_twice,_shame_on_me)

Most importantly, because the victors of WW2 or their heirs are relying on the idea of good (such as nation building, improving morality and human rights) to obtain people's preparedness to surrender some of their freedom to them and to obey, and the only way to secure this readiness is if the victors of WW2 continue to rely on this persuasion to make people be ready to come together to collaborate together with them in the economic field, only China fits this criterion today or possess the right knowhow to play the new cowbell role in front of the herd. Simply put, only China possess today this knowhow in nation building or in building socialism and communism which the world needs more of today as compared to strengthening democracy or hierarchical doctrines pursuant to the repeated failures of the United States in showing how liberal interventionism and self-determination can preserve world peace.

Then again, since it would be highly unlikely that the United States would be ready to accept to voluntarily let China starts to play this cowbell role, then it is highly possible that the victors of WW2 or their heirs start to let the countries who the United States built with them a complex web of alliances and alignments in good faith to start to back stab and isolate this country. When the United States is weakened, the liberal interventionism and self-determination idea would be weakened, and not the idea of democracy or rule of law. Most people would be living with no right and at the mercy of the state, when the liberal interventionism and self-determination idea is weakened and this philosophy stops to be used as a mean to improve democracy or the rule of law. All the monarch and all the nations that are autocratically controlled desire and end to the liberal interventionism and self-determination idea being used as a mean to improve democracy or the rule of law, and not only the families/dynasties who control the international order or the money supply of the world.

Once again, I have no way of knowing if there are powerful forces who are working to deepen the polarization (division) that exist between people through trying to blame the liberal interventionism and self-determination idea (i.e., the United States) for everything that has gone wrong with the world in the hope that when mankind returns to living with no right and at the mercy of the state the best interests of those powerful forces would be served better. Then again, the victors of WW2

or their heirs can grant right to rulers and political class in UN member states to consider themselves exempt from the appeal that the founding fathers of the UN made to have every one cooperate based on the principles set forth in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights to reduce fear and want. However, if courage and conviction are inherent values, the victors of WW2 or their heirs would not be able to prevent people's conviction to strengthening democracy and freedom to deepen morality. In verse 30 of Surat al Rum in the Quran, it is also written that "good" is an instinct.<sup>168</sup>

Said differently, if the victors of WW2 or their heirs believe that because people obey the laws which they legitimize on how natural and legal rights should be managed and distributed, this also means that they are controlling (or have a say over) the natural or original inborn inclination that every man is born with as the Quran says is the case, they could be waging wrongly. This is because till today this natural disposition has shown that good triumphs at the end. This also means that the victors of WW2 or their heirs are going to decide if they want to build on this inherent instinctive disposition that the Quran says all newborns are born with before false teachers corrupt it, or continue to test with letting governments, UN agencies and bodies, international aid organizations, NGOs, charities, foundations, etc., be teaching people why they need to stop to be tolerant and to be devoted to end poverty, social injustice, inequality, etc., while deepening distrust, malice, deceit, hypocrisy, envy, slander, etc. This is because if all those aforementioned actors were cooperating based on the principles set forth in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, a good number of the wars that were fought since 1945 could have been avoided. And so, if the victors of WW2 or their heirs do not start to do something to reset the world order so people begin to put the work programs that figures in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights before profit, could they get it right and be sure that the world would not continue to spiral out of control thus leading to their disintegration in the course of time and things? Put differently, could the victors of WW2 or their heirs count on the weakened conditions of the people who were engulfed in civil wars already agreeing to eventually surrendering freedom to them, when courage and conviction are not known to be qualities that individuals

---

<sup>168</sup> <https://quran.com/30/30>

who are accustomed to luxury and to indulgence know about, but mainly, the people who live in hardship and depression? Simply put, if the more awareness people develop, the more fragile and remote do the ways and means of courage and conviction become to them, could the victors of WW2 or their heirs make the soldiers of any UN member state become fearless and to develop docility when the United Nations is teaching people to believe in courage and conviction and not in what the founding fathers of the UN counselled that people be taught, which is tolerance?

Indeed, when Moses, Christ, Muhammad, etc., were teaching goodness, their teaching was not diminishing their fortitude, but was making them possess greater power. The people who were restraining themselves were not doing so because Moses or the others were providing them with political, economic or social solutions. In fact, those three said that their teaching was revealed to them from God, which could be totally false. And so, this begs many questions. For one, could the families/dynasties who won WW2 or their heirs manage to prevent their collapse and the collapse of the idea of freedom (i.e., the United States) along with them after they started to tolerate that many governments do not rule by example, and UN agencies and bodies, international aid organizations, NGOs, charities, foundations, etc., corrode people tolerance, knowing that the ideals that they want that everyone adhere to them to ensure lasting peace are not laws and percept from God but from them?

In fact, to show how the rules that man (i.e., governments, UN agencies and bodies, international aid organizations, NGOs, charities, foundations, etc.) is determining and enforcing as of 1945 are competing with the idea that are in the different religions, let us compare how the ideas that Muhammad single handedly was preaching transformed the social order in Mecca, and how the interference of so many “cooks” in the social order of Egypt has changed this country from 2014 till now.

For example, all the close companion (a handful) of Muhammad observed the religious laws that he was preaching to them, and were not using it to determine and enforce for their neighbors political, social or economic solutions. Both Muhammad and his close companion understood and obeyed the revelation that came in Surat al Shuraa in

verse 6, which state that God informed Muhammad that he was a prophet and not the “manager” (administrator) of people.<sup>169</sup> This philosophy that Muhammad and his close companion (including the four Rashidun) adopted when they were spreading this new faith has not diminished the fortitude of this faith from 632 AD, when Muhammad died, to now. In fact, Muhammad’s fortitude and the fortitude of his close companion (including the four Rashidun) is strong today as it was 1400 years ago. From 2014 to now, in Egypt, the Egyptian government who is composed of a parliament, and military and civil institution, over twenty ministries, many religious institutions, and is being helped by UN agencies and bodies, international aid organizations, NGOs, charities, foundations, etc., have so far converted this country from being one that its citizens were entirely ready to cooperate in accordance with the principles stipulated in the Universal Declaration of Human rights to an open prison according to Amnesty International, as I said before.

Throughout history, societies revolted against rulers and political class who saw their role as “managers” instead of shepherd. For example, the fall of the Umayyad and Abbasid Caliphate (Empire) occurred because the rulers of those two caliphate shifted their political choices from being about how to continue to be a shepherd to Islam as the Rashidun Caliph were to how to be “managers.” Likewise, the societies who were ruled by a civil government and switched to military dictatorship, always declined the power of the state afterwards. For example, the military complex has managed to stay in power in Egypt since 1950, but against a price. Before 1950, Egypt was a major exporter of rice, sugar, cotton, wheat and many other commodities but now this country rationalize most staple food. Evidently, this tradition or “manager” role that the Egyptian government (military) has been playing since 1950 will not end the cycle of military coups that this country continually knows. That is also to say that the frequency of military coup should rise in Egypt after the country complete its ongoing militarization of its economy. In other words, if this country does not find a market for the goods the military complex is producing, the competing interests that would be developing within the military complex would have no choice but to split in the course of time and things. When the competing

---

<sup>169</sup> <https://quran.com/42/6>

interests within the military complex in Egypt splits, the individuals involved would either wage on a coup to solidify their power, or on dividing the country.

Actually to show how the Egyptian government, UN agencies and bodies, international aid organizations, NGOs, charities, foundations, etc., are all wrecking the social order in Egypt as of 1945, let us compare how those afore mentioned actors are preserving peace in this country as compared to how Ali<sup>170</sup> (601 – 661), cousin, son-in-law to prophet Muhammad and the fourth caliph of Islam from 656 to 661 AD was doing it in Kufa. In 661, Ali was assassinated. Some Historians and scholars argue that Ali was assassinated because some people concluded that the situation of the Muslims at the time of his reign as a Caliph (i.e., division, corruption, etc.) was specifically due to his errors.<sup>171</sup> May be Ali was not a politician (saying one thing and doing something different), but many historians agree that Ali was among the handful of just rulers that the world has known to date.

If the encouragement that Ali was getting to be a just ruler was something that he was gaining from the Quran (or God→ Muhammad →Quran), and this fortitude made him immortal, and if the encouragement that the Egyptian government, UN agencies and bodies, international aid organizations, NGOs, charities, foundations, etc., are getting is both from the Quran (i.e., God→ Muhammad →Quran) and the UN Charter (i.e., the war aims of the families/dynasties who won WW2), and so far all what the Egyptian government (and UN agencies and bodies, international aid organizations, NGOs, charities, foundations, etc.,) have to show for in Egypt since 1945 is the conversion of this country into becoming an “open- air-prison,” then either there is an error in the laws that those actors are enforcing, or there is an error in the approach that those afore mentioned actors are using to attain the goals that they are after.

Then again, since we cannot accuse the Egyptian government of violating the rights of any Egyptian or for converting Egypt into becoming an “open-air-prison,” because the government will bunker under the argument that these measures are required to improve morality

---

<sup>170</sup> <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ali>

<sup>171</sup> [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ali#Assassination\\_in\\_Kufa](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ali#Assassination_in_Kufa)

and human rights, this means that it is not possible to controvert if all the restraining that the Egyptian government is adopting in Egypt is intended to attain the objectives that are stipulated in the UN Charter or the Quran, or if it is to benefit the individuals involved. Still, since the tool that the Egyptian government depend on to get its way despite the resistance of others emanate from the laws that the government legitimize, and the laws that man enact are the criteria that provoke the eventual collapse of any authority, this means that if the victors of WW2 or their heirs do not stop the UN agencies and bodies, international aid organizations, NGOs, charities, foundations, etc., from interfering in Egypt to stop the government from coming up with laws in the same way God stopped to giving to Moses, Jesus or Muhammad, Egypt and mankind in its entirety stand a chance of being doomed. This is because man derive laws in function of the changes that the environment is knowing and the created things that human ingenuity is developing, and since those two parameters are always changing, then if governments and companies continue to use the intergovernmental organization named United Nations (international aid organizations, NGOs, charities, foundations, etc.) as a courtyard to buy and sell as Jesus found people doing in the synagogues, then this strategy can collapse over their head possibly if they do not increase the death rates dose or pause those human development organizations from interfering in the preparation of people.

Once again, I have no way of knowing how the victors of WW2 or their heirs are counting on continuing to solidify their powers while the UN system, international aid organizations, NGOs, charities, foundations, etc., are teaching people why they need to stop to surrender freedom to their government until outcomes are shared on equal rights! What I do know is that all the transformations that the families/dynasties who control the international order or the money supply of the world are spearheading are programmed to provide benefit to their heirs as well as society at large as Moses or the Pharaoh were doing in antiquity.<sup>172</sup> However, when the pharaoh converted Egypt into becoming an open-air prison, the bible says that God decided to bring judgment on all the gods of Egypt (people) by counting on a destructive plague to carry out his will. God decided to take his revenge on Pharaoh and his aids for the

---

<sup>172</sup> <https://www.biblegateway.com/passage/?search=Exodus+12&version=NIV>

way they were treating the poor, by striking down every firstborn of both people and animals. The biggest loser was the pharaoh because the destructive plague killed his firstborn – his heir. In fact, the bible also states that when the Pharaoh and his officials, and all the Egyptians found that their first born was killed, their hearts hardened and decided to take revenge on Moses and his followers. According to the Bible, God's hatred of the Egyptian Kings (people) did not stop at killing the heir to the throne of the Pharaoh, but also included killing him and along with him all his armies when he decided to take revenge on Moses and his followers. In other words, when the pharaoh decided to want to exploit Moses and his followers instead of letting them determine their own political, economic and social relation.

The lesson to draw from the afore story is that the victors of WW2 or their heirs could easily continue to be in favor of letting the UN system, international aid organizations, NGOs, charities, foundations, etc., interfere in the social order thus prompting people to increase competition and in this way increase crises and death rates. However, what those powerful families/dynasties cannot guarantee is that their first born (or heir) would not succumb to the same fate that Pharaoh had to yield to when he decided to convert Egypt into becoming an open-air prison. Furthermore, if those powerful families/dynasties who won WW2 or their heir continue to let governments bend the will of people, they could risk becoming crushed and killed in the same way Pharaoh and his army were resized when they decided to take revenge on Moses and his followers for their losses.

In fact, even if the victors of WW2 or their heirs do not get crushed as happened to Pharaoh and his soldiers after Pharaoh (and his aids) converted Egypt into becoming an open-air prison specifically to solidify their power, if they continue to preach about how they are improving morality and human rights (i.e., reduce political corruption, money laundering, malice, deceit, hypocrisy, envy, slander, etc. just as the UN system and the rest of the human Development bodies claim their teaching is programmed to help improve) but the opposite is happening between human relations, then it may not be possible for them to escape from the fate or wrath that encumbered the people that Moses brought out of Egypt. Can the victors of WW2 avoid the fate that awaited the people who Moses was leading to the promised land if

governments and the UN agencies and bodies are both considering themselves exempt from cooperating based on the principles set forth in the Universal declaration of Human Rights?

For example, in 1975 Lebanon was engulfed in a civil war. The atrocity of the civil war did not provoke the inhabitants of this country to change the parochial political system that is considered the principal cause leading to Lebanon becoming engulfed in a civil war. Since 1975, the inhabitants of this country continue to be against letting the restraint that they need to aid them to support liberal and democratic institutions come from themselves, or from the encouragement and discouragement that the Bible or Qur'an provide particularly since they are divided based on religious lines. Since 1975, the citizen of Lebanon continues to wait on the UN system, the United States, France, and others to help them develop the restraint. Most important, from 1945 to now, the Lebanese continue to refuse to admit that all the disregard and contempt that they have known it is their own hands (i.e., mind) who produced.

However, the biggest insanity that the Lebanese are impaired with is that this society refuses to change its own behavior and is waiting on the UN system, the United States, or France to teach them how to support liberal and democratic institutions when the intergovernmental organization named United Nations, the United States and the French are going to be preparing them on how to sustain national entity using principles extracted from the Bible or Quran that their ancestors wrote on the land surface that they are occupying!

Hence this insanity that has swept Lebanon cannot be cured except if the people who are inhabiting this country are either killed, or the power withdrawn from their hands as happened to the people that Moses was leading from Egypt, can the victors of WW2 or their heirs prevent that they stumble on the same challenges that the Lebanese are knowing if they continue to allow the UN system, international aid organizations, NGOs, charities, foundations, etc., teach people to observe principles that themselves they are not obeying and man hand the social space and the material things that he accumulates on a cumulative basis to designated people?

To put it differently, if all the political chaos that exist in Lebanon in the last 75 years was prompted pursuant to the Lebanese trading their values and traditions in favor of adopting the values and traditions that they were borrowing from the UN system, can UN member states get it right and prevent that the teaching of this intergovernmental organization break the fortitude of their citizens when man cannot naturally control his desires, and this organization is corroding citizens by teaching them why they should prioritize the importance of seeing that outcomes are shared on equal rights instead of teaching them to be tolerant?

Indeed, the decision of the victors of WW2 or their heirs to be in favor of letting the United States and the rest of the rich nations finance the intergovernmental organization named United Nations so this organization teach the Lebanese and others about how not to restrain themselves instead of directing this organization to teach people around the world to develop restraint is now haunting them. Their decisions to disobey what the founding fathers of the UN counselled them to obey (or let me say what Andrew Jackson, (1757 – 1845), 7<sup>th</sup> President of the United States, and Thomas Jefferson. (1801 – 1809), 3<sup>rd</sup> President of the United States cautioned against disobeying is not helping them to develop the fortitude that the United States acquired from 1776 to 1945. Instead the decision of the victors of WW2 or their heirs to be in favor of letting the United States and the rest of the rich nations focus only on what Alexander Hamilton (1789 – 1794), Caribbean-born American statesman and one of the founding fathers of the United States, and Woodrow Wilson (1856 – 1924), 28<sup>th</sup> President of the United States, taught them to continue to get their ways despite the resistance of others, helped the intergovernmental organization named United Nations stashing in the bank account of the organization a couple of billion dollars in cash to cover its operations and the Lebanese people stockpiling the equivalent amount in debt. Most importantly, this strategy helped the intergovernmental organization named United Nations to become virtual centre for global governance, but without the mandate.

Can the United States and the rich nations prevent the intergovernmental organization named United Nations from absorbing their power and/or to revert them into a simpler form when this general organization is preaching what Alexander Hamilton and Woodrow Wilson were

teaching to solidify its power and get its way despite the resistance of others, instead of what Andrew Jackson and Thomas Jefferson were counselling? It looks as if the United States and the rich nations are building toward arranging for an eventual takeover of their power by the intergovernmental organization named United Nations so this general organization could begin to exercise jurisdiction over the entire human world!

Once again, I have no way of knowing if the victors of WW2 or their heirs can manage to make the Lebanese and others be ready to develop the fortitude that the American people managed to develop from 1776 to 1945 while the UN system is teaching them the philosophy of Alexander Hamilton, and Woodrow Wilson. However, what I do know is that the political philosophical evolution of the United States changed in the following sequence: from Alexander Hamilton (government intervention in business) → Thomas Jefferson (self-determination) → Andrew Jackson (isolationism) → Woodrow Wilson (democracy and human rights). Most historians and observers agree that when the United States began to employ the philosophical ideas of Woodrow Wilson without leading by example, the fortitude of this country began to diminish. In other way, we have no way of knowing if the United States would have developed the same fortitude that this country developed from 1776 to 1914 had its leaders started to adopt a philosophy that promote human rights and democracy, or as per the way the US began to finance the intergovernmental organization named United Nations so all UN member states begin to obey such philosophy post 1945. For example, the teaching that the UN system evoked since 1945 to teach the Lebanese and others to cooperate based on prioritizing human rights and democracy have been disastrous so far.

If the victors of WW2 or their heirs continue to be in favor of letting the intergovernmental organization named United Nations interfere in the social order using the ideas of Woodrow Wilson to make the Lebanese and others develop the same fortitude that the American people managed to develop from 1776 until Woodrow Wilson began to spread his teaching, which is also when the fortitude of the United States started to diminish, then the victors of WW2 or their heirs have no choice but to return the UN member states to practice isolationism. When nations start to practice isolationism, then there is a good risk that the people

who are in position of power begin to rely on their personal power and conscience (self-determination) to legitimize natural and legal rights. When people start to rely on their personal power and conscience (self-determination) to legitimize natural and legal rights, then there is good chance that man return to living at the mercy of the state (government intervention in business).

Humans do not live forever and so we would not know if the victors of WW2 or their heirs would continue to be the one who would be playing the role of principal deputy of God on earth in the future, or if another more powerful authority would absorb them. There is an old Arabic proverb that says: if power is something that could be preserved, power would have not reached the person who is exercising power. In other words, power is an article of trade like a baton that people hand to each other similar to how runners in relay racing<sup>173</sup> do.

Then again, Ibn Khladun suggest that “history is information about human social organization, which itself is identical with world civilization.” Perhaps the message that Ibn Khaldun was drawing our attention to was how politics could be regarded as an art. In other words, politics is not something that one can learn. Simply put, we cannot take history as a reference and try to do things exactly as per the way we learned it from others. For example, Lebanon and Malaysia are two countries that obtained their independence post 1945. The two countries evolved differently post 1945. Malaysia counted on its fortitude and has become very developed since 1945, and Lebanon remains a nation that unfortunately its evolution does not differ than the one the Jews dealt with when they were lost in the wilderness after they counted on the fortitude of the UN system to lead them to the promised land. As the afore example shows, one nation managed to use history to its advantage and the other to its destruction. That is also to say that when the Jews placed their fortitude in the word of God, they managed to get to the promised land. Can the victors of WW2 or their heirs expect the intergovernmental organization named United Nations to lead them to any end other than to the disregard and contempt that the Lebanese people are knowing today?

---

<sup>173</sup> [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Relay\\_race](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Relay_race)

Bushidō is a moral code concerning samurai attitudes, behavior and lifestyle.<sup>174</sup> One of the virtues of bushido is finding death. I have no way of knowing if the victors of WW2 or their heirs are expecting that the UN system, international aid organizations, NGOs, charities, foundations, etc., could manage to teach people to not rely on their own natural fortitude to develop fear and docility, and that humanitarian experts could find durable solution to the many difficult problems facing the world, thus making it possible for those powerful families/dynasties to test to determine if they could defy death or not. In other words, use sarcasm as a mean to get their ways despite the resistance of the others. That is to say, those powerful families/dynasties believe that they can deviate away from implementing the blue print the founding fathers of the UN counselled them to be faithful to its principles, and still be able to solidify their power and ensure lasting peace.

Then again, it would be anti-logic to suppose that the founding fathers of the UN programmed that an international financial institution (i.e., World Bank/IMF) be created so nations obtain financial aid to address social and economic programs, but rather to use such resources to teach and educate newborns on how to develop tolerance. In other words, it would be anti-logic to suppose that the founding fathers of the UN devised war aims on behalf of the victors of WW2 that seeks to improve democracy, injustice, or poverty based on the way the UN system, international aid organizations, NGOs, charities, foundations, etc., are doing it. This is because this strategy improves rivalry. The trade war that exist between all the UN member states today is the outcome of this strategy. Nor it is logical to suppose that the founding fathers of the UN programmed that UN agencies and bodies build roads and bridges in poor nations. It would be anti-logic to suppose that the founding fathers of the UN did not know that most of the knowledge that the UN member states possess it is the Phoenicians and the Egyptians who developed its heritage.

On the other hand, there could be only one reason why the victors of WW2 or their heirs would be in favor of deviating away from the blue

---

<sup>174</sup>[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bushido#:~:text=Bushid%C5%8D%20\(%E6%AD%A6%E5%A3%AB%E9%81%93%2C%20%22the%20way,the%20European%20concept%20of%20chivalry.&text=Bushido%20is%20best%20used%20as,and%20principles%20of%20samurai%20culture](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bushido#:~:text=Bushid%C5%8D%20(%E6%AD%A6%E5%A3%AB%E9%81%93%2C%20%22the%20way,the%20European%20concept%20of%20chivalry.&text=Bushido%20is%20best%20used%20as,and%20principles%20of%20samurai%20culture).

print that the founding fathers of the UN counselled them to be faithful to its principles, in order to have UN agencies and bodies prepare people in the political, economic and social field. This reason is to strip away from those people who the UN agencies and bodies are helping them the knowledge or skills that their fathers passed onto them by virtue of the extension of culture or heritage. Simply put, the goal from having UN agencies and bodies takeover from people the know how that their fathers passed onto them on how to build road and bridges is to create the same blank that the old powers created in Africa when those colonizers invaded this continent.

Once again, I have no way of knowing if the decision of the victors of WW2 or their heirs from having UN agencies and bodies stop to make people in UN member states depend on their own fortitude is part of a plan to make the intergovernmental organization named United Nations become a centre of global governance as Francois Hollande (born 1954), President of France from 2012 to 2017, suggested.<sup>175.176</sup>

Then again, the architect of the new international rule based postwar world order (the founding fathers of the UN) could not have proposed that a new authority (UN systems) be created so its agents take separate action to teach people about the difference between good and evil when governments and religious institutions are already doing it. In other words, it would be anti-logic to suppose that the founding fathers of the UN programmed to have governments and the intergovernmental organization named United Nations be providing solutions in the social, economic, education, trade, health, etc. and/or to be preparing people to cope and in two manners that are totally incompatible to each other. This is because this strategy can only lead into one force becoming a force for evil (government) and another one being a force for good (the UN systems) evil, as we are witnessing more and more occurring today (i.e., a zero sum game).

Hence it would be irrational to suppose that the founding fathers of the UN could have programmed to have in each nation one authority to be

---

<sup>175</sup><https://web.archive.org/web/20131202234056/http://www.franceonu.org/france-at-the-united-nations/the-united-nations/france-s-role-at-the-un/article/france-s-role-at-the-un#7>

<sup>176</sup> [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/United\\_Nations#Evaluations](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/United_Nations#Evaluations)

devoted to preaching morality (i.e. government), and the other devoted to preaching why people should replace their current values, traditions and emotions with thoughts and actions that convert legal rights into becoming an interest right instead of remaining a will right so one can improve his own chances and have access to more material things (i.e. the UN), the decision of the UN member states to create UN subsidiary organizations to increase people's awareness to prioritize created things has to have been taken in the years that followed the creation of this formal organization named United Nations. In other words, the founding fathers of the UN could not have been the ones who proposed that UN agencies and bodies interfere in the social order of nations, so three authorities would be working on improving morality in the world: governments, the UN system and all the humanitarian aid agencies, and the religious institutions. Could all this abnormal rise in intolerance that emerged in the world post 1942 be due to the gridlock or bottleneck that all those afore mentioned actors are prompting to improve morality but without anyone of them being faithful to the work program that was stipulated in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

The challenge with having UN subsidiary organizations maintain relationship with the formal intergovernmental organization named United Nations who the victors of WW2 tasked with coordinating activities between states on a global scale is that this strategy makes it impossible for governments and the UN subsidiary organizations of the formal organization to coexist, and to expect that mankind could manage to balance good and evil when those two are determining and enforcing separate laws, in the same way governments and religion managed to do it despite periods that was perpetrated by lots of competition. This is because the laws that governments and the UN subsidiary organizations of the formal organization are wanting people to depend on to build fortitude are manmade. Whereas the laws that on its premise religion build fortitude most people perceive its programming is inherent from God. Hence we cannot have the UN subsidiary organizations of the formal organization be a force of religion because its employees would be competing with religion, and we cannot have the UN subsidiary organizations of the formal organization become a force for morality because they would be competing with governments, then unless one authority cede to the other, it would not be possible to create any balance.

Once again, it looks as if this decision of the victors of WW2 to want that the domestication of people be carried out by both existing governments, religion, and the UN agencies whereby the latter is emphasizing the importance of individualism over moral and governments are emphasizing the contrary, could be resulting in a zero-sum game, as I just said. In other words, if the more the UN subsidiary organizations of the formal organization raise people's awareness to achieve equal standards, this means that competition (or rivalry) to share on equal rights resources and wealth would reciprocally grow. When competition (or rivalry), then it would not be possible to expect that people would be able to obey the political order. As I said before, a "Government" is an idea that was created so individuals protect themselves from each other to minimize conflict, which would otherwise arise in a state of nature. All governments need to prioritize moral over material to avoid that everyone would have unlimited natural freedoms, including the "right to all things" as Thomas Hobbes (1588 - 1679) suggested would happen in the absence of political order and law.<sup>177</sup> If the net gain from having the UN subsidiary organizations of the formal organization interfere in the social order is zero, it is evident that neither the heirs of the families/dynasties who won WW2 nor the UN member states would be able to make progress on their goal to make the world become a safer place ahead for our successors. This also means that if the UN subsidiary organizations of the United Nations are not stopped from continuing to make people prioritize material over moral, existing government would have no choice but to keep on shrinking the idea of liberal interventionism and self-determination to maintain law and order to avoid their resizing. This is very serious and worrisome.

Technology (or knowledge) is like a coin. It has two sides. On one side, it makes a person emphasize the importance of individualism over collectivism, and on the other, it makes a person depend on collectivism to aid the individual to achieve one's goals and desires (i.e., individualism).

---

<sup>177</sup> [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Social\\_contract](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Social_contract)

The application of scientific knowledge for practical purposes, reduces the amount of work that the human body exhausts to sustain survival needs or to satiate his earthly desires. However, as people dependence on technology (science) grows, humans (the mind) would have no choice but to reinforce biasness more, and most importantly, lose the inherent mindfulness that the mind relies on to make distinction. First the deeper biasness that the mind starts to develop would be coming from the free time that the mind gained after machinery started to do the work that the human body was supposed to be setting to sustain survival needs or to satiate his earthly desires. Second the deeper impairment between what is right and what is wrong that the mind would start to develop, would be caused by the gradual decline in knowhow. This is because there is a big difference between real knowhow and virtual knowhow. The ingredients to make dough are flour, water and yeast. A baker spends years to develop the right skills to make dough rise correctly. The knowhow that the mind gained about how dough is prepared from reading about how it is done or watching a video about it, and the knowhow that the person encounters when he prepares dough are totally different. The knowhow that the mind gained virtually has no connection with the truth.

Furthermore, when newborns start to communicate with their parents through the intermittence of a physical tool (i.e., social media) in contrast to allowing this relationship to be done directly on a one-to-one basis, children would not be developing the restraining relationships that parents naturally serve, because the telephone or the computer does not punish children when they make mistake or behave immorally. Most importantly, children (humans) lose the “electromagnetic” force that the soul perhaps transmits or radiates into others through the human body. The same can be said about how relations between employees and employers. Farmers do not plant fruit trees, and return, in the course of time and things, to harvest grown fruit. Farmers follow and maintains this transformation process throughout the entire time.

Only real humans can transmit natural fear or exercise a restraining influence, because the restraining force comes from a personage possessing human characteristics or attributes. When tools are used to restrain, the restraining force does not come from another man directly but from a tool, and therefore, a person’s readiness to fear the tool

becomes insufficient. If as of the date man made prison doors to open and close automatically such human creation was sufficient to restrain behaviors, prisoners would not be always plotting to escape from their cells, and prisons would not be employing prison guards to control the restraining.

If even though tools carry out the actions of the percept and inspiration of another human, but are not sufficient to ensure the sought after restraining or defense, because the aggressiveness of man is much superior, this means that for as long as humans employ created things that lacks the natural characteristics and body of a human being to do the restraining or the controlling, man would be duplicating the same experience gained so far since this specie began to depend on incarceration or the use of machinery and equipment developed from the application of scientific knowledge to punish those who commit actions that a given society prohibits.

All the natural and legal laws that people legitimize or assert are not natural, but they are human creations. This means that the laws that people depend on to regulate behavior are simply a mean towards an end—the benefit of the individuals involved. This also means that as people in position of power continue to depend on technology (science) to help in transforming the conditions and outcomes that matters to them, the more the employment of such tools and machineries should be converting the different societies into an open-air-prison exactly as per what Amnesty International claimed is going on in Egypt as of 2014.

In prisons, all what correction officers and prisoners do is to monitor the behavior of each other to ensure that each group remains safe. Prison guards do tell the prisoners what to do and not do, but prisoners only obey to de-escalate confrontations and avoid that prison guard gang on them. However, the correction officers and the prisoners are at all the time living in constant fear. The “quality of life” in prisons environment is very unhealthy. Respect, trust, mindfulness, disregard, contempt for human rights, staff-prisoner relationships is all unstable. If according to Amnesty International, Egypt has become an open-air-prison as of 2014, this signify that the segment of the Egyptian population who are living on the outside of Egyptian prison walls are maintaining relations between each other that is not any different than the one that the

Egyptians people are maintaining with the segment of the population who are incarcerated. The only difference (separation) is a dividing wall - one disregard and contempt is happening on the inside of the Egyptian prisons and the other on the outside of those prisons.

If the only mindfulness that the Egyptians can show they have attained from 1945 to 2014 is that they are living in deeper discord, fear and want than what their predecessors were knowing before 1945, this means that either the Egyptians are losing the state of purity that all humans are born with, or their decision to get rid of their values and traditions to be modernized is transforming them into becoming incapable of distinguishing between what is right and what is wrong.

I have no way of knowing if the victors of WW2 or their heirs think that their wealth and control of technology (and weapons of mass destruction) can protect them against societies who converted its social order into becoming open prison as the case is like today in Egypt, France, China, Russia, Great Britain, Norway, etc., or in societies who converted its social order into becoming a gladiator combat spectacle as on-going in Lebanon, Iraq, Libya, etc. What I do know is that when man stops to improve his natural state of purity and begins to depend on fear or power to force others to obey, the more fear people would know. The more fear people would know, the more fear would be dividing people. The more fear divide people, the more the fear that people would be knowing would be driving them to form distinct factions to protect the ideas that they believe in. Likewise, the more each faction resort to collectivism to enable its members to be heard or to address the social and economic disparity that its members would be associating with or feeling that they are its victim, the more each faction would be living in denial. Most importantly, because what each faction that would be in conflict would be seeking from the other is not to determine what is required to be done to improve morality because everyone knows the way to do it, but rather to determine who would be controlling the institutions that would be legitimizing natural and legal rights (i.e., who would play the deputy of God role), then only institutions matter to help guarantee one's survival.

Verse 10 of Surah al Balad in the Quran, state that good and evil was programmed in the nature of man.<sup>178</sup> If injustice is a human characteristic, then the idea of institutions can help man to curb evil or secure his survival in two manners. The first is through letting institutions serve as platform to implement the Hammurabi Code<sup>179</sup> which historians claim Hammurabi<sup>180</sup> (1810 - 1750 BC) developed in 1754 BC as a form of punishment, which centered on the concept of the law of retaliation. The other idea is to continue to employ the incarceration method that man began to develop knowhow in employing starting from 1754 BC up to now.

It is important that readers keep in mind that man cannot implement the Hammurabi Code, because man depend on his evil nature (i.e., committing political corruption, money laundering, malice, deceit, killing, etc.) to solidify his power or to legitimize legal and natural rights. An endless "war of all against all" would erupt if man decides to go back to implementing the Hammurabi Code to find durable solution to the many difficult problems facing the world. The criminal justice system which replaced the Hammurabi Code was acquired in the course of generations through individual and group striving. However, when man failed to let his evil nature to interfere in the criminal justice system, this apparatus became a tool to punish the weak and the defeated. Simply put, the wealthy who the criminal justice system punish are individuals who the faction that controls the political power (deep states) does not want to protect for obvious reasons.

Furthermore, man did not limit the meddling of the evil side in his nature in the criminal justice system, but in the course of time and things, man used his evil side to create the most controversial idea that man penned till today after the idea of God. This idea is the legal entity that is separate and its distinct from its owners. Man call this legal entity "the government".

The effectiveness of the idea of government have been mixed. Some commentators believe that governments are an important force for peace and human development, while others believe that governments are

---

<sup>178</sup> <https://quran.com/90>

<sup>179</sup> <https://avalon.law.yale.edu/ancient/hamframe.asp>

<sup>180</sup> <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Hammurabi>

violence-wielding apparatuses that different factions want to get in control of to control violence for their own benefit.

Whatever people perceive governments are useful or imperfect for, man failed to agree that one (or some) in the group have more powers than others. Unfortunately, instead of man using his ingenuity to resolve how can the group stay together in order to focus on the profit, which is the principal reason why people came up with this idea, man once again allowed his evil side to meddle in this idea that was acquired in the course of generations through individual and group striving.

Indeed, the accomplishments that governments have made since human ingenuity introduced this idea has made the world become more hospitable and livable. At the same time, governments are more and more proving to be utterly ineffective in building a sustainable world. The state of well-being and happiness that exists in Egypt as of 2014, i.e., and open prison according to Amnesty International, is a sample of what the effectiveness of this idea has been like so far.

If governments continue to provide social programs, or provide the parameters for every day behavior, and many other functions, it would be naïve to suppose that man would be able to stop his evil side from meddling or interfering in the political order that gets legitimized. This is very serious and worrisome.

In other words, if the more man lets governments provide and support economic and social programs and missions, the more man would be unwilling to curb evil or injustice from his behavior, then the more man continues to be in favor of letting evil be transformed into a business from which mankind depend on to increase his happiness, the more the strongest would continue to be the one who would be positing what should be classified as evil and what should not be classified as one. But then again, this is not the only drawback that our successors would have to live with if they continue to let their evil side to focus on who would have more powers than others instead of focusing on the profit of doing the right thing (i.e., if they follow our diabolic practices). Those successors would be the ones who would be punished for the decision of our leaders to prioritize the human body over the mind, just as

suggested in the proverb ‘The parents eat sour grapes, and the children’s teeth are set on edge.’ [Ezekiel 18:2]

I have no way of knowing if children do get punished for the offenses committed by their fathers, but if this afore proverb in the book of Ezekiel is true, then it is highly likely that the heirs of the victors of WW2 could pay the price for all the desolation and hardships that people are knowing on the hands of governments.

In fact, the reversal to a simpler form of the heirs of the victors of WW2 could happen much faster than anticipated pursuant to the decision of the families/dynasties who won WW2 to allow that the formal intergovernmental organization named United Nations become an economic operator instead of keeping its tasks as suggested by the founding fathers of the UN to coordinating activities between states to prevent wars between states and to reducing the impiousness and insolence that government generate. And so, if in principle, as of 1945, it is no longer governments who are creating rules and who are working to protect people from conflicts and to provide law and order, but the different UN agencies, international aid organizations, NGOs, charities, foundations, and people who are both famous and ordinary are also doing it as well, this means that mankind started letting relations in which man’s side interfere to resolve who could have more powers than others increased. Hence the victors of WW2 want people to focus more on how to be organized post 1945 instead of focusing more on how to obey the work program that the founding fathers of the UN laid out so everyone can profit from its anticipated potential, this means that the victors of WW2 are going along with shortening the duration that would prompt the reversal to a simpler form of their heirs.

Once again, I have no way of knowing if the decision of the victors of WW2 to let different UN agencies, international aid organizations, NGOs, charities, foundations, and people who are both famous and ordinary create rules, protect people from conflicts and provide law and order would prompt the reversal to a simpler form of their heirs or accelerate the arrival of this event. What I do know is that man does not know the difference between evil or good. These two states refer to two ways that man attributes to the way the human body changes matter. In other words, the transformations that the mind does not like, man calls

evil; and the ones that the mind feels happy with, man calls good. In addition, from antiquity till now, it is the strongest (majority) who define what evil or good stands for, and it is the strongest who legitimize natural and legal rights, and who denies others from legitimizing natural and legal rights.

Furthermore, since in theory, when a person kills another man, he would not know if he is committing good or evil, because all what this act does is change the soul from being the one who is in charge of how the human body changes in time so nature starts doing it, this means that if the force that created man did not want man to be killing or be killed, it would have programmed humans to be like trees, who live and die on their own and from a fixed location. Simply put, if man has been refusing to believe in the unseen since antiquity (i.e., belief in the existence of a God – a creator to this world) then this conviction that human imagination maintains about the soul possessing any worth could be a fabrication that man (the mind) invented in order to use as a tool to solidify one's own power. In fact, the advances that man made in science so far support that it does not add anything because already Jesus took clay and convert it into a “real” bird [Surah Al Imran 3:49]. In other words, if the advances in science will not change the behavior of man anytime soon, and the behavior of man will remain as per the one that exists on earth already, then man could be building for his own destruction. In fact, man has managed in recent years to fly like a real bird and even to split his soul so it can incarnate into clay that is shaped in the form of a bird (i.e., airplane or wingsuit flying). This advance grant man power to be a “real” bird, yet his behavior has not changed.

That is also to say that when Muhammad was saying that good and evil were both programed in the nature of man, he could not have been directing us [mankind] to channel our energy to protect ourselves from the evil that reside in the heart of others, but rather to be devoted to triumphing over the evil that reside in the heart of each one of us. This is because Muhammad has to have known that man has no power to prevent that the things that human ingenuity creates from not ending up influencing human imagination to using such created things to provoke evil with them. This means that if the victors of WW2 do not resize the intergovernmental organization named United Nations, and then redirect it to teaching people to curb the evil that reside in the hearts if

each one us as religion has been doing or the founding fathers of the UN suggested, people would be continuing to be devoted to curbing the evil that exists in their heart by focusing on how to forgo the happiness of others to increase theirs.

That is to say, the economic problem is a problem in which man (the mind) tries to create a balance between two choices. So far, man failed to get the right balance (i.e., choice) in a world whereby the choices in it are themselves also continuously changing as I suggest in my book *Social Improvement and Human Security: Collateral Damage*.<sup>181</sup> I have no way of knowing if the victors of WW2 would get it right, if they continue to let the different UN agencies, international aid organizations, NGOs, charities, foundations, and people who are both famous and ordinary create rules and provide social programs before man manages to learn to curb from his heart evil first. Simply put, letting UN subsidiary organizations and others be devoted to curbing evil by teaching people why they need to be devoted to curbing the evil that exists in the heart others to increase theirs, instead of focusing on teaching people to curbing the evil that reside in the heart of each person, thus nurturing the parameters for everyday behavior that would make it unnecessary for a person to kill or steal from his neighbor to increase his happiness. What I do know is that if the victors of WW2 do not stop the UN subsidiary organizations, international aid organizations, NGOs, charities, foundations, and people who are both famous and ordinary continue to interfere or meddle in the social order their mindfulness would not be helping them (the powerful families/dynasties who won WW2) to reduce disregard and contempt, but rather it would continue to be making it more difficult for them to transform the conditions and outcomes that matters to them easily. This is because there is nothing that we are doing that is different than the one our predecessors were relying on to preserve world peace. In other words, we are repeating the same mistakes that our predecessors made to protect themselves from one another, we are adding new system to enhance transparency and improve accountability and democratic legitimacy just as its done in agribusiness supply chain activity instead of sticking to producing one product until getting it right first.

---

<sup>181</sup> Maloof, S. *Social Improvement and Human Security: Collateral Damage*, 2005.  
[www.globalhumansecurity.com](http://www.globalhumansecurity.com)

To put it differently, a supply chain activity is a “system of transformation of natural resources or raw materials into a finished product that is delivered to the customer.”<sup>182</sup> For example, in petro business, man’s exploration helped man to refine crude oil to make gasoline, diesel fuel, jet fuel, residential fuel oil, kerosene, propane, waxes, ink, crayons, tires, and some cleaning and personal care products. Each new product that man came up with produced winners and losers, but the new product did not help to reduce fear and want which is what the new product was created to accomplish in the first place. That is also to say that instead of the victors of WW2 or their heirs taking advantage of the reset that World War Two produced to teach people to be tolerant thus enabling them to use the readiness of every member of the human family to surrender freedom to them to secure the goal that nations were ready to come together to cooperate in the economic field to serve, they chose to introduce in the supply chain a new product or service instead. In other words, instead of the victors of WW2 creating UN subsidiary organizations who shall focus on how to make governments begin to cooperate based on the principles set forth in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights which is what the founding fathers counseled them to let the United Nations be devoted to doing, they preferred to create UN subsidiary organizations and to task them with teaching people why they should not be tolerant unless governments shares outcomes with them on equal rights. In other words, instead of using the intergovernmental organization named United Nations to curb evil, the victors of WW2 created a new white elephant to make it much harder for them and for mankind to improve peace and security.

As I said before, all what humans do from birth to death is to sustain their survival needs and earthly desires. Furthermore, we can also say that the longer the families/dynasties who control the international order and money supply of the world take to stop “evil” from being an activity that man use to draw benefit from (or increase his happiness from) as the case is right now, mankind would be divided into two factions. One faction would be exploring in the hope that the created things that its human ingenuity would be coming up with would create benefits to our societies. Likewise, the faction who would be operating the criminal

---

<sup>182</sup> [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Supply\\_chain](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Supply_chain)

justice system would be also doing the same, i.e., hoping that their efforts would rehabilitate the unpreparedness of people to obey.

Indeed, the scientific exploration that mankind carried out managed to provide lots of practical things to improve the quality of life, but the people who work in the penal-judiciary complex have not been as lucky or let us say since mankind moved away from the law of retaliation (Hammurabi Code) as of 1754 BC to use the penal-judiciary system as a tool to curb evil. This is normal because if the penal-judiciary complex would have managed to change the behavior of people, this would mean that the statements that are made in the Bible or other religious books about evil being an intrinsic property in the human nature are false.

In addition, we can say that there is one slight divergence (but at the same time a complementarity) between the practical benefit that scientific exploration is providing to our societies, and the one that the people who are working in the penal-judiciary complex from 1754 BC to now are offering. In the case of the benefits that scientific exploration is providing to our societies, we find that what those experts program for us distance man from serving the practical purposes that the force who created man intended this specie serve on its behalf for its sustainability in favor of letting tools and machinery do it. Whereas the practical benefits that the people who work in the penal-judiciary complex have been offering is doing the opposite during imprisonment, i.e., stripping away from man the created things that human ingenuity produce to return mankind into his state of nature (including in some cases using created things to serve the interests of the forces who control the penal-judiciary system).

Most importantly, we can say that the principal benefit that the exploration which human ingenuity (scientific and general) carries out in the natural world has been its aptitude to distance the people who are not incarcerated from knowing how to sustain the survival needs of their body using this mass's own natural programmed tools (brain, and hands and legs) in favor of letting tools and machinery do this task on behalf of human ingenuity. In addition, human ingenuity has been very effective at increasing people "virtual" knowhow instead of people "real" knowhow. Likewise, we can say that the practical benefit that the penal-judiciary complex is providing to the people who are incarcerated

is that it is distancing their human body (human ingenuity) from developing any know how whatsoever in how to sustain the survival needs using man's own natural programmed tools.

In mathematics, a loss or a deficiency is considered as negative. If distancing the humans body from fulfilling the role that the force who programmed this mass intended this aptitude to function like produce a loss that is identical to the one that negative number are understood in mathematics, then scientific exploration could be a function of the penal-judiciary complex and vice versa. In other words, if man reduces exploration, he would reduce concurrently the unpreparedness of people to obey (i.e., reduce evil). Likewise, when people start to be tolerant (i.e., doing less evil), there would not be any need to doing exploration that deepens fear and want.

Then again, I have no way of knowing how the victors of WW2 or their heirs are programming to continue to solidify their powers while the exploration that people do on the outside of prison walls diminish their "real" knowhow and increase their "virtual" knowhow, and while the penal-judiciary complex is shrinking the real" and "virtual" knowhow of those who are incarcerated. Likewise, I have no way of knowing how the social order will be looking like in the future if the victors of WW2 continue to be in favor of letting people delegate to technology the role that the human body was programmed to serve in nature, and while using their free time to either preoccupy themselves with what their neighbor is doing, or busy fighting, or rivaling each other, which is what historians claim happens when knowhow shrinks and tribal mindfulness rise. Most importantly, I have no way of knowing how this afore strategy could be impacting on people's own conception of the dignity and the worth of the human person. What I do know is that if the potential created by technical progress continue to idle people and increases in population continues to surge, it would not be possible for governments to match idle expectations with productive potential, especially that the potential is designed to idle people. This signify that as people continue to delegate to technology the role that the idea of government was established to serve, and people's distrust with government grows, it would not be possible to avoid, in the course of time and things, that man become organized not any different from the

one that exists now in prisons or as per the quality of life that correction officers and prisoners presently maintains.

I have no way of knowing if our successors would relate as per the afore complex way in the future or if the victors of WW2 or their heirs would plan a global war in order to use such a tool to reset the social order (i.e., increase death rates or reduce the number of people who believe that they possess right to realize the full development of their personality). What I do know is that in 2017, Prince Harry, Duke of Sussex (born 1984) expressed in an interview to Newsweek a perception that not many people expected to hear. He told the reporter "...Is there any one of the royal family who wants to be king or queen?"<sup>183</sup>

It is frightening to hear that a descendant of the families/dynasties who won WW2 (i.e., his grandmother is the head of state of most of the existing nations around the world till today), and one of the heirs to the British crown (this monarch is the most powerful around the world) is perceiving that no one in his royal family wants to be king or queen. All the human progress that people (human imagination) pursue is programmed to permit mankind to live the lifestyles that Prince Harry and other princes are depicted to benefit from. If the person who mankind is developing created things to emulate his lifestyle, claim that this lifestyle is lonely and nasty, then this could mean that the more people pursue material things, wealth or status, the more their loneliness would increase, or Prince Harry is insane. This is very serious and worrisome.

I have no way of knowing what prompted Prince Harry to make this afore statement, but I can think of only two motives that could have led him to establish this perception. The first is if the Queen of England is very occupied and she is not having enough time to enjoy her wealth, and the second is if the Queen is bored as a consequence of finding herself unable to occupy her time constructively thus taking away the fun or pleasure of being a king or a Queen.

I have no way of knowing which motive between the afore two could have inclined Prince Harry to make this afore statement. However, I can

---

<sup>183</sup> <https://www.newsweek.com/2017/06/30/prince-harry-depression-diana-death-why-world-needs-magic-627833.html>

think of only one rule that could prompt a person to be both occupied and bored at the same time. This rule is when a person delegate to another person his role.

When a person delegate to another person his role, and he does not get it right, then the person who benefit the most from seeing that the job gets done right becomes very busy to fix things. Likewise, when a person delegate to another person his role, and the other person gets it right, then the person who benefit the most from seeing that the job gets done right becomes bored because he would have not a lot to do.

I have no way of knowing which rule between the afore two could have prompted Prince Harry to perceive that becoming a king or queen is not fun. However, if I were to compare between how peace and security changed from 1945 to now around the world, it does not look as if the servants (governments) who the Queen delegated to them the task of securing peace and security in Great Britain and around the world are getting it right till now, so as to say that the boredom that the Queen is knowing is because she does not have a lot to be occupied with. In fact, before 1945 the Queen used to feel safe strolling in the courtyard of her castle, today not even with a platoon ensuring this protection, it is possible to guarantee that she would be safe.

Then again, if I compare between how her servants (the governments) were securing the protection of the Queen before WW2 erupted and after this global war is regarded to have ended, I find that only one of two details changed.

First, instead of Great Britain continuing to play the global policemen role on the aftermath of WW2, this monarch delegated this function to the United States and the intergovernmental organization named United Nations. It is not possible to say that the United States prompted the insecurity that the world is knowing, because this country would be the biggest loser if man switches from using the liberal interventionism and self-determination to maintain democracy and law and order and goes back to letting the state determine all that. However, we cannot say that the United Nations would be weakened if nations go back to maintaining democracy and law and order when nations go back to letting the state determine all that, because for as long as man believes that the world

order is governed by anarchy, they would need to accommodate roles for international institutions.

Second, and most importantly, we find that before 1945, the servants (the governments) who were securing the protection of the British empire were letting the parameters for every day behavior of citizens be done by real humans and now it is tools and machinery who is doing the lion share.

I have no way of knowing how the Queen (and her thinkers or wise man) reached that letting scientific advances that distances the human body from preoccupying this mass with being devoted to figuring out how to sustain its survival needs can have a constructive role to play in protecting her or in protecting the social order (the Anglosphere), which is a prerequisite to ensure her own protection. But if the consequence of distancing the human body from preoccupying this mass with being devoted to figuring out how to sustain its survival needs on its own is one that phases out the need by man to rely solely on his human ingenuity to distinguish between what is good and what is right, then either the Queen (and her thinkers) believe that they can phase out the utility of man and still maintain their power, status and wealth, intact (they believe they are invincible), or they want to test with doing the same thing over and over again in the hope of expecting a different results (what Einstein called insanity).

I have no way of knowing if tools and machines would be better classed to transform the conditions and outcomes that matters to the Queen of England (and her thinkers), as compared to letting human ingenuity do this task only (i.e., determines between what is good and what is right) as was done throughout history starting from the story of the flood onward, or if this strategy would revert man into going back to living not any different from the way animals do when human ingenuity loses its knowhow and people preoccupation starts to center on how to sustain survival needs and satisfy earthly desires. In other words, the survival needs and the earthly desires of people would become at the mercy of tools and machinery, and the individuals who control those tools and machineries. What I do know is that when a person maps out a path to achieve a result and when the actual result is attained there is an element of time that needs to be incorporated.

I have no way of knowing how peace and security would change in the future, or while Great Britain is favoring that parameters for everyday behavior become shared between scientific advances that distances the human body from preoccupying this mass with being devoted to figuring out how to sustain its survival needs, and a formal organization who is determining and enforcing policies that strengthens individualism rather than collectivism. What I do know is that the more people (producers and consumers) distance their human ingenuity from having to be preoccupied with how to distinguish between what is right and wrong so tools and machineries do it, the more people would be using the free time that their human ingenuity gained to map out better path to ensure that outcomes are shared on equal rights.

Likewise, I have no way of knowing if the financial aid that Great Britain is injecting in the social order so tools and machines that can update and "think" by themselves (computer software systems) replace the role that human ingenuity plays to sustain survival needs is helping the families/dynasties who control this country to continue to solidify their powers. Similarly, if allowing AI to attribute legal rights (i.e., interfere in the judicial and legal community), or allowing AI tools which can bite off increasingly big chunks of programming all by themselves, which put coders (programmers) out of a job as well is also a good strategy to solidify the power of the families/dynasties who control Great Britain (i.e., who control the Anglosphere).

In other words, if all the disregard and contempt that people manifest is in order to get in control of violence wielding apparatus (the moral and material created things that man invent), and the families/dynasties who control the international order and the money supply of the world, want all the things that man create start to distance real humans from doing the controlling role so machine and technology does it, then the families/dynasties who control the international order and the money supply of the world are working toward phasing out the role that government have been serving in protecting them in order to let machinery and tools do it.

Simply put, if artificial intelligence absorb the role governments play in providing parameters for every day behavior including the role that such

legal entities play when it comes to providing social programs, common sense dictate that most technical progress which has the potential to deliberately idle the human body be stopped to reduce the number of people who any rise in their awareness would provoke them to become impatient. When people become impatient, they either exhaust their energy in disregard or in becoming in favor of changing the leadership. If the families/dynasties who are controlling Great Britain want to preach about human rights and at the same time be in favor of AI distancing people from the role that they may have been programmed to serve for the natural world, then either those families/dynasties think they are invincible, or they are playing with the future of their heirs. That is of course, unless those families/dynasties know that if a new global world war is to erupt to reduce desires, its drawback will not affect them.

Likewise, I do not know if the decision of Great Britain to finance the intergovernmental organization named United Nations so this organization teach with this money the people who AI is freeing why everyone should be preoccupying himself with what their neighbor is doing and how to increase their earthly desires, but while the staff of this organization are doing it while enjoying privileges and immunities is the right approach to ensure that the power and wealth of this monarch remain intact. What I do know is that the more the families/dynasties who control Great Britain are going to be in favor of financing the intergovernmental organization named United Nations to provide parameters for every day behavior while its administrators are converting the UN ground into a market to buy and sell as they are doing since 1945, and while enjoying privileges and immunities to blunder and deny people rights, then one of two scenarios could be true: either evil and good are one and the same, or the families/dynasties who control Great Britain (i.e., the families/dynasties who control the international order and the money supply of the world) are going to be reverted into a simpler form just as per way the United Nations reverted the American national into becoming one when he tried to prioritize the idea of good over his self-interests.

I do not believe that good and evil are one and the same, because if this was the case, then good would have never triumphed on evil. Therefore, I strongly believe that the intergovernmental organization named United

Nations would revert the heirs of the victors of WW2 (i.e., the families/dynasties who control the international order and the money supply of the world) to a simpler form in the course of time and things, if this organization is not resized and tasked with only coordinating the work of Nations as per how the founding fathers of the UN suggested. Of course, it

Furthermore, I also believe that if the victors of WW2 or their current heirs (i.e., the families/dynasties who control the international order and the money supply of the world) do not resize the intergovernmental organization named United Nations to stop its officials from weakening their power, wealth and status, they could stumble on the following events before this organization reverts them to a simpler form.

Travelers to South Africa rave about the beauty of this country. In fact, some people consider South Africa to be one of the most beautiful countries in the world.<sup>184</sup> The country sweeps regularly all the international travel prizes. Yet South Africa is normally ranked as one of the most violent and dangerous places on earth. The 2018 Global Peace Index<sup>185</sup> listed South Africa as one of the most violent and dangerous places on earth.

South Africa has had a long history of violence. Some commentators claim that the population in South Africa were segregated by the regime who ruled this country from 1948 until the early 1990s.<sup>186</sup> The rulers used racial segregation as a tool of power and governance. They adopted a culture of violence as a repertoire to gain and maintain social and political control.<sup>187</sup>

In the early 1990s, the regime that was ruling South Africa was replaced with a new leadership. Yet despite all the efforts that the new leaders exhausted to get rid of this culture of violence that the people who were

---

<sup>184</sup>

[http://www.alantours.co.za/listing/south\\_africa\\_the\\_most\\_beautiful\\_country\\_in\\_the\\_world](http://www.alantours.co.za/listing/south_africa_the_most_beautiful_country_in_the_world)

<sup>185</sup> <https://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/resources/Global-Peace-Index-2018-2.pdf>

<sup>186</sup> <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Apartheid>

<sup>187</sup> <https://www.history.com/topics/africa/apartheid>

born before 1990s manifested, it has not been possible to get rid of it till now. All those who were born in South Africa in the 1990s are now the next in line to have the political power of the country handed to them. If in 2018, South Africa was ranked as one of the most violent and dangerous places on earth, this means that either South African are unable to reduce this systemic insecurity that is plaguing this country due to structural challenges or cultural ones.

I have no way of knowing if the violence that is prevailing in South Africa is due to structural challenges or cultural ones. It is highly possible that the regime that controlled South Africa was removed from power in the 1990s but its roots has not been severed to this day. In other words, the families/dynasties who control the deep state in South Africa are still in favor of extending this segregation tradition, and its effect is keeping the violence ongoing as was the case before 1990s. The prevailing violence could also be due to the new families/dynasties who are in power as of 1990 not doing enough to deepen connectedness in this country. Those aforementioned motives (factors) could be contributing to the prevailing violence that South Africa is knowing, but those afore reasons do not exclude the fact that the ongoing segregation that South Africans are knowing could be the product of a way of life that those citizens are adopting unknowingly as well.

To put it differently, this culture of violence and segregation that the Israeli and the Palestinian have been manifesting since 1948, its root cause is understood. The dispute between the Palestinian and the Israeli is over land. The South African are not entrenched in an ideological, or religious war as of 1990, thus necessitating that citizens extend this cycle of violence that all people in this country are knowing.

Likewise, we cannot say that poverty or corruption are feeding this unhealthy environment or way of life in South Africa, because this nation is among the G20 group of nations.<sup>188</sup> Besides, it is not possible for a nation to be plagued with corruption and not show the symptoms that Lebanon political system exhibit. Likewise, it is not possible to consider that poverty is driving this pattern, because there are lots of

---

<sup>188</sup> <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/G20>

poorer country in Africa and its people do not exhibit the same violent behavior.

What if South Africans are still legitimizing or justifying violence, because this country got rid of the apartheid law, and of the regime that was ruling this nation from 1948 to the 1990s, but South Africa did not get from this 1990s date onward, the absurdities of individualism and the stack of drawbacks that this way of living provoke?

Some researchers' agree that violent crime in South Africa began to rise in this country after this country ousted the regime that was ruling South Africa to support a democratization process.<sup>189</sup>

The intergovernmental organization named United Nations is teaching people all over the world to not be patient unless governments share outcomes on equal rights including ending injustice. Could this abnormal rise in violence that South Africa started knowing post 1990 have been provoked by all the money that rich countries like Great Britain, Norway, France, etc. channeled through the intergovernmental organization named United Nations so this organization teach people about their rights to be self-reliant and the importance of refusing to surrender freedom to their governments unless their rights are protected first?

If we are to consider that the reason why South Africa experienced instability and violence in the years leading to 1994 (end of apartheid) was because the people in this country wanted to switch into becoming ruled by a democratic process to allow everyone to prioritize self-interest better and not only few, and if post 1994, South African are continuing to prioritize self-interest as they were doing before and unprepared to prioritize collectivism which is the reason why all of them got together to achieve in the first place, this means that the more people prioritize the teaching of the intergovernmental organization named United Nations, the more they would be prioritizing self-interests. This is very serious and worrisome. This means that the South Africans would never be able to end this cycle of crime and violence that they are knowing for as long as they are prioritizing the values that the

---

<sup>189</sup> [https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-94-009-1479-7\\_6#page-1](https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-94-009-1479-7_6#page-1)

intergovernmental organization named United Nations is teaching them. In other words, the values that the South African are practicing is benefiting the segregating lifestyle that they are maintaining much more than the idea of collectivism which they came together in the first place to help strengthen. If South African were prioritizing collectivism over individualism, they would be organized in the same way people in the United States are living, and not in the same way the Palestinian or the Israeli are doing it. The Palestinian or the Israeli have strong collectivism within each faction, but this is only because each group knows that it is much easier if they stayed together when preventing outside attack.

If as of the date when Apartheid ended in South Africa, and the South African are, to this day, still living in the same way the Israeli and the Palestinian are doing it, i.e., what differs is the degree of violence, but not the conviviality, this means that the war aims that the victors of WW2 laid out at the end of WW2 are failing. This is because the objective of the war aims that the victors of WW2 laid out at the end of this global war was to strengthen conviviality and not to live in peace with one another but while each one is doing it from his own camp or as per the way the Palestinian and the Israeli are doing it. In fact, the segregation that the South African are still to this day adopting raises other concerns. The Israeli do not adopt social segregation styles that is structurally motivated but culturally as well. The Palestinian are forced into accepting the cultural (social) segregation that they are knowing due to the siege that is imposed on them.

If what could be prompting the South Africans to adopt this segregation that exist in this country to this day is cultural, this means that the South Africans could be ailing from the same Schizophrenic disorder that the Jews are still to this day ailed with (or from the day of the call by God to Abram), and its consequence has made people throughout history to be repulsed by them. This is very serious and worrisome, because the South African could be living an Apartheid lifestyle to this day without knowing.

It is important to keep in mind that I am not putting in question here the call that God made to Abram (which the Jews consider themselves to be his descendants), or all what God promised to Abram [Genesis 12:1-3].

The Schizophrenic disorder here refers to the unpreparedness throughout history of the people who claim to be Jews to be leading by example or in accordance with this privilege that God bestowed on them and its principles are detailed in the Bible. Evidently, this unpreparedness to assume this leadership responsibility is what prompted all human beings to perceive that they are not born equal and it is incumbent on them to act towards one another in a spirit of brotherhood.

I have no way of knowing if the South Africans are living an Apartheid lifestyle to this day without knowing or not. What I do know is that the rich (mainly white) in South Africa avoid the poor unless they are servants, nannies or gardeners.<sup>190</sup> Likewise, many of the communities combine armed guards, cameras and electric fences with private recreational facilities.<sup>191</sup> In other words, in South Africa people do not share an integrated pattern of human knowledge, belief, and behavior, as the case is like in the United States. The outlook, attitudes, values, morals, goals, and customs shared are restrained to whether the family lives in a private house that is guarded by armed guards, cameras and electric fences or in a gated community.

Once again, this way of life that exist in South Africa could not be what the founding fathers of the UN wanted mankind to cooperate to secure. This way of life creates a balance between the use of technology, manpower, freedom of speech, etc., but lacks the most valuable quality. This is freedom.

The founding fathers claimed that when we secure the UN goals, this should help us to live free from fear and want. The South Africans are living free from want, but drowned in fear.

Fear reinforce biasness and the decision of the Southern African to resort to live in gated communities (i.e. collectivism) and to rely on armed guards, cameras and electric fences (created things) to feel safe could be their way to protect themselves from the social and economic

---

<sup>190</sup> <https://qz.com/africa/1175370/johannesburgs-gated-communities-echo-apartheid-era-segregation-in-south-africa/>

<sup>191</sup> <https://www.nytimes.com/2019/03/09/todaysnyt/in-south-africa-a-sense-of-security-draws-many-to-golf-communities.html>

disparity that the idea of individualism or technical progress is waging on them.

If in theory the wealthy people in South Africa cannot do something to help the poor beyond employing them as servants, nannies or gardeners because this country is an upper-middle-income economy, which means it is dependent on manufacturing and industrialization, this means that as more and more technology would be freeing more wealthy people in South Africa and distancing themselves from prioritizing their human body/human ingenuity, the more this phenomenon would be creating two outcomes. The first is that they would be hiring more servants, nannies or gardeners. The second is that they would be doing with less.

The Zaire Lootings are riots and lootings that took place in September 1991 and January 1993 in the capital of Zaire (now the Democratic Republic of the Congo), and in the other main cities of the country.<sup>192</sup> No one knows exactly, what prompted the riots and looting in Zaire in 1991 or 1993. The New York Times suggested that the Zairian government was bankrupt, and its currency virtually worthless when these two events took place.<sup>193</sup> The Washington post suggested that “The riots sparked a massive exodus of the country's expatriate community -- a vital cog in the economy -- and forced the closing of countless businesses that were then looted or wrecked by a hungry, frustrated populace.”<sup>194</sup>

I have no way of knowing what prompted the poor in Zaire (now the Democratic Republic of the Congo) to revolt against the rich in the country to the point of becoming convinced that they should be resorting to such behavior to be heard or to address the social and economic disparity that they were associating with or feeling that they are its victim, but what I do know is that it was the servants, nannies, gardeners, armed guards, workers, etc. who were looting the homes and businesses that combined armed guards, cameras and electric fences.

---

<sup>192</sup> [https://fr.wikipedia.org/wiki/Pillages\\_du\\_Za%C3%AFre](https://fr.wikipedia.org/wiki/Pillages_du_Za%C3%AFre)

<sup>193</sup> <https://www.nytimes.com/1991/09/24/world/thousands-of-troops-on-rampage-of-looting-and-violence-in-zaire.html>

<sup>194</sup> <https://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/inatl/longterm/congo/stories/033192.htm>

Could this revolt that the army and the poor provoked in 1991 or 1993 in Zaire (now the Democratic Republic of the Congo) to ensure social justice be a result of those rioters having perceived that their lack of access to the created things that those rich were possessing is the principal barrier for their inability to realize the full development of their personality? This outcome was a result of what the self perhaps felt it was deprived of so it could be able to continue to pursue the full realization of the personality? Could the decision of the victors of WW2 to deviate away from the work program that the founding fathers of the UN counselled them to remain faithful to its principle to solidify their power and ensure lasting peace (i.e., which was to let government develop their own political status and their own solutions for as long as they respect democracy and the rule of law) in favor of letting the intergovernmental organization named United Nations prepare them and change the political system in all of them so outcomes become shared on equal rights, be what prompted all the insecurity that the world is knowing post 1945? In other words, could the decision of the victors of WW2 to have the intergovernmental organization named United Nations preach to the poor about the need to foster human rights and/or to be devoted to eradicate poverty, fight injustice or inequality, but while the rich have no opening to employ the poor except as servants, nannies or gardeners, etc. because the rich delegated to technology the jobs that could be preoccupying the poor people be what could have prompted this abnormal rise in intolerance as of 1945?

It looks as if the victors of WW2 or their heirs, need to determine how they want the world to be organized (i.e., domination or democracy) before another storm just like the one that the rich in Zaire (now the Democratic Republic of the Congo) experienced in 1991 or 1993 does not brew around the world. Most importantly, the victors of WW2 need to determine if they want that their heirs lead the same lifestyle that the leaders of the families/tribes who Moses brought to the promised land just to see it be taken away back from them, or as per the way the United States showed is possible to build when wrong assumptions are discarded.

Confucius suggested three keys to successful Leadership. Those three lessons were virtue, fair ruling, and decisiveness.<sup>195</sup> I have no way of knowing what Confucius was trying to suggest when he said that it was important to be decisive to be successful. Indeed, hesitation can never help in situation where the name of the game is the survival of the fittest. In other words, if time is speeding everything up (i.e., before one's own death catches up), then speed become the key to win any race (goal). If time is precious, and whoever is slow can never win, then the victors of WW2 or their heirs must always be fast, on alert, and ready to ruthlessly kill whenever any threat arise. In other words, the victors of WW2 or their heirs must be on the attack and not on the defense if they want that the values that they legitimize be obeyed. This is very serious and worrisome.

To put it differently, the only reason why Great Britain managed to get its way despite the resistance of others throughout the entire 2<sup>nd</sup> millennium happened because this kingdom was good at preventing that any other nation keeps up with its technology, and because this kingdom was always on the attack and not on the defense. In other words, the reconnaissance tools, ships, submarines that Great Britain possessed and used regularly against any nation who this monarch felt was threatening its best interests is what gave this kingdom the power that its leaders and people enjoyed. Likewise, the United States managed to get its ways during WW2, because this country was on the attack and dropped two atomic bombs on Japan.

If peace and security diminished around the world post 1945, this means that Great Britain and the United States (the two countries who determined the war aims at the end of WW2) did not adopt traditional attack strategies against the nations that they were deeming to be threatening their interests as Great Britain was doing it culminating in WW2, but adapted non-traditional attack strategies.

I have no way of knowing if the non-traditional attack strategies that Great Britain and the United States (the two countries who determined the war aims at the end of WW2) adopted starting with the cold war and culminating with their war on Islamic radicalization countered against

---

<sup>195</sup> <https://www.forbes.com/2009/05/21/confucius-tips-wisdom-leadership-managing-philosophy.html?sh=32117c897cba>

threats and preserved their security and stability. However, if people only win because others are unenlightened, we cannot say that people around the world are not catching up with those two countries.

To put it differently if to win in any fight a person needs both his legs and hands, and the United States and Great Britain cut one of their legs (gave all nations their independence) and instead of using their both hands to fight they also cut one hand (one hand is controlling the drones, satellites, computers), I do not think that those two countries can win in any fight (war) anymore except the war that does not start by leading by example. The “defeat” of the United States and Great Britain in Iraq and Afghanistan confirmed that the best of men fear nothing. In other words, the best of men fight with their legs and hands and not with satellites, drones, submarines, F15, F100, etc.

It is important that readers keep in mind that the word “defeat” shall not mean here that the United States or Great Britain were defeated militarily by the Iraqi or Afghani people, but rather the word is referring here to the failure of the United States, Great Britain and NATO to bend the will of the Iraqi or Afghani people. This is very serious and worrisome.

The United States and Great Britain failed to bend the will of the Iraqi or Afghani (and the Vietnamese, and Korean) because those two countries were not being faithful to the second rule that Confucius said it is important for a leader to be doing to be successful. This rule was to “rule wisely and fairly”. This also means that should the United States and Great Britain continue to be not in favor of ruling wisely and fairly (keeping their promises) they cannot go back to using the non-traditional attack strategies that they have relied on from 1945 to now (2020) and would need to go back to relying on adopting traditional attack strategies. Simply put those two countries would no longer be adapting cold war mentality or using Islamic radicalization or Christian radicalization arguments to counter against threats that they think threatens their security and stability but wage war to promote their security and prosperity. This is very serious and worrisome. This is because future wars would not be fought by soldiers but through ballistic missiles that would be fired from a distance, and which cause total destruction.

I have no way of knowing how peace and security would evolve in the future. The parameter that would be used to gage whether or not the international rule based postwar war order that the victors of WW2 laid out on the aftermath of WW2 would continue to be obeyed or not would depend on how successful governments would be at making their citizens be ready to living with no right and at the mercy of the state.

It is important that readers keep in mind that if the victors of WW2 or their heirs would want that all the countries consider the opinion of the United States or Great Britain before taking actions of their own, this means that the development and progress of any nation cannot continue to be as the case is like right now where every government thinks that this responsibility lies firmly in its own hands.

Once again, we cannot say that if the United States or Great Britain succeeds at stopping this laissez faire attitude that most UN member states are adopting as of 1945 to be erroneous, because the happiness that the United States, in particular, managed to provide for its citizens from 1776 to 1945 support that it was very practical.

It is important that readers keep in mind that the disregard and contempt that people are knowing around the world is not due to the United States or Great Britain instigating disregard. Rather it is mainly due to the unpreparedness of UN member states (including Great Britain and the United States) to cooperate based on what the victors of WW2 instructed on the aftermath of WW2. This instruction was to cooperate based on the principle of equal rights and not to be devoted to running social programs that are intended to end poverty and injustice including fixing date to achieve such goals while everyone is freezing social space and accumulating material things on a cumulative basis. In other words, the victors of WW2 did not counsel that government become ruled autocratically, via a one party system, or the military, etc. as the case is like now in many countries today. Therefore, if the victors of WW2 or their heirs want that all the countries abide by the international rule based postwar war order that they laid out on the aftermath of WW2 and tasked the United States with playing its global policemen role, this means that the development and progress of any nation cannot continue

to be as the case is like right now where every government thinks that this responsibility lies firmly in its own hands.

Then again, if the United States, Great Britain and its allies want to succeed and ensuring enduring peace, the parameter that would be used to gage whether or not they would succeed or not, would depend on how faithful those countries would be vis-a-vis the first rule that Confucius said it is important for a leader to be doing to be successful. This rule to be above all virtuous.

I have no way of knowing how the victors of WW2 or their heirs can be regarded as virtuous, or prompt people to regard the United States or Great Britain as virtuous, when the intergovernmental organization named United Nations is preaching about morality and human rights, while its administrators have converted this global council into becoming a den of thieves. In other words, if it is imperative that the United States and Great Britain be acting ethically in all transactions so people could trust them, can the United States and Great Britain manage to establish this trust if the administrators of the United Nations are reverting to a simpler form any person who prioritize the self-interests of the victors of WW2 over the money that the organization gains to stay in business?

I have no way of knowing how the victors of WW2 or their heirs could prevent that the intergovernmental organization named United Nations and the UN courts that this organization is operating from reverting them to a simpler form if its administrators are prioritizing their self-interests over the values the families/dynasties who won WW2 trusted them with. What I do know is that the longer the victors of WW2 allow the intergovernmental organization named United Nations and the UN courts to destroy the lives of the people who refuse to prioritize their self-interests over the values that those powerful families/dynasties have counseled everyone to obey, the more they would be destroying this global council. The more the administrators of the intergovernmental organization named United Nations and the UN courts destroy this global council, the more they would be the most dangerous threat that would be threatening those families/dynasties who won WW2 or their heirs.

All the kingdoms failed when they allowed politicization to manipulate their institutions when they did not get the outcome that they liked. I have no way of knowing if the evil forces that are controlling the intergovernmental organization named United Nations would revert the victors of WW2 or their heirs to a simpler form first or the other way around would be the case. What I do know is that fighters (i.e., boxers) work very hard to keep their foot work move very fast in the ring, to trigger an environment in which each fighter fails to keep up with the other due to the rapid moves that are happenings. There are two actors who are interfering in providing parameters for every day behavior in UN member states: governments and the intergovernmental organization named United Nations. It is not in the best interests of governments that citizens disregard the political order being legitimized. Evidently, the failure of governments and the United States (the global policemen of the world) from reducing people disenchantment can only be due to their failure with their tools to match the combined speed and power at which the intergovernmental organization named United Nations is making people lose faith in the international rule based postwar world order. The more disenchanted people get with the international rule based postwar world order, the more this conditions would be prompting governments to be bound by their personal power and conscience to control the social order. The more government rely on their personal preferences to stabilize peace and security; the more people would be convinced that the force that governments are using to shrink their call to improve social justice is programmed to benefit the individuals involved and not the welfare of society.

I have no way of knowing how fast governments first responders or investigative units would be getting in the future, thus becoming effective in suppressing factionalism, civil unrest or in resolving critical incidents involving citizens' disenchantment with the way their welfare is being improved. However, we can say that if government fail to make citizens be unprepared to obey, then this withdrawal can only be bolstered from the social justice echoing that the intergovernmental organization named United Nations is echoing. Furthermore, we can say that the more the intergovernmental organization named United Nations prompt societies to prioritize social justice, the more this preaching would be encouraging people to obey, including persuading people to

be in favor of changing the leadership. Likewise, the more people intolerance against the regime who would be refusing to relinquish control of the regime to the voting process, the more the social order of most nations would be converting into becoming an open-air prison just as the case is like in Egypt. Moreover, the more the regime that would be in control would be coming up with its own moral and own “national human rights strategies and laws”<sup>196</sup> to maintain law and order as Egypt has done in mid-2021, then the more the social structure would start to look not any different than the one that exist in South Africa already. Of course, we should not forget to include that as nations become organized in the same way the social structure is organized in South Africa or Israel for example, the more the industrialized nations would be obliged to use their complex web of alliances and alignments to resize weak nations to prevent the economic competition, growth of nationalism, militarism, etc. Actually, the need to resize weak nations would not be based on rivalry factors only (as exists between Iran and Israel, or Iran and the GCC countries). The rich (industrialized) nations need to resize weak nations to increase their own production which is necessary to pause their citizens from withdrawing their readiness to obey or become devoted to eliminate problems caused by industrialization, urbanization, immigration or corruption within their own government. In other words, to prevent their citizens from focusing on social justice, or democracy.

Moreover, because the jobs that are being created to preoccupy the behaviors of people in the rich countries is not one that occupy the body or behavior hence tools are doing the lion share, the more technology would be continuing to free more people in rich countries and to distance them from preoccupying the human body, the more people in rich countries would be devoted to ensure equal justice. Consequently, the more people in rich countries would be devoted to ensure equal justice, the more the rich countries would be converting first into becoming an open-air prison as the case is like in Egypt, and then as the case is like in South Africa today where social segregation is the dominant social pattern. When more nations start to be organized in the same way societies in South Africa are structured and/or are employing armed guards, cameras and electric fences to serve them, the more plunder, rape and murder would rise in the world as the case is like now

---

<sup>196</sup> <https://egyptindependent.com/sisi-launches-national-human-rights-strategy/>

in most countries. This nasty life would remain unvarying for as long as the intergovernmental organization named United Nations is preaching about sharing outcomes equally or about equal justice or while population growth is not reduced, and people are delegating to tools the role that their human body was supposed to play in sustaining their survival needs. If this short and brutal life is prolonged, two outcomes could emerge. First political, territorial and economic competition; militarism, nationalism, and the power vacuum created by the lack of a central authority that could control the social order would give rise to a new authority, which could very well make the United Nations become the center of a global governance. The second outcome will involve the world plunging into a new global war, which no one knows who it could end.

Indeed, this civilization mission that the rich chose to adopt from as far back as the date when Jesus died to make the poor replace their current values, traditions and emotions with thoughts and actions that are current or more rational worked very well till 1945 because the development metaphor was permitting the poor to employ their human ingenuity which was idle to find significance in created things. Earlier I said that what could have made the American people from 1776 to 1939 become capable to look past their frames to prioritize collectivism over their values and personal beliefs was the prioritization those people accorded to common good through their human ingenuity (or body) over the impulse of their self-interest or distinct and bias human behavior. This aided the American people, as I said before, to ignore their differences and to prioritize what is past their frames unlike how the people who were living in the old powers were using their human ingenuity to be organized like. This was based on adopting mercantilism type strategies permitting that only certain goods be produced in the nations they were administering. This policy that the old powers used prevented the colonized nations to have lots of tremendous possibilities and potential. Now the civilization mission is different. Technology is idling the human ingenuity and the human body of the rich and the poor alike. This idea that the rich followed to make the poor go back to becoming idle so tools could substitute for the role that the human body was supposed to fulfill in the natural world is firing back. All the solutions or the economic coercion methods that the rich are coming up with to create jobs and make people not become idle or feel deprived is

not working. To make matter worst, the decision of the rich to use the idea of democracy or equal rights to make the poor replace their current values, traditions and emotions with thoughts and actions that are current or more rational, is allowing the poor to convert collectivism or liberalism into becoming a force to make the rich prioritize moral over wealth when the initial idea of the rich was not fully centered on improving morality or seeing that outcomes are shared on equal rights but as a lure to make the poor prioritize material over moral. This also means that the more people in poor or rich countries continue to delegate to technology the role that the human body was programmed to prompt in matter, the more the poor in the rich and poor nations will find themselves left with no other choice but to be devoted to tackle human rights disparity.

In 2017, Fortune magazine published an article that reported that “a new study by the McKinsey Global Institute estimates that between 400 million and 800 million of today’s jobs will be automated by 2030.”<sup>197</sup> The magazine adds that office administrators could be among those who may lose their jobs to technology.

The current global governance is made of different independent political structures called states. Within each state, we have two entities who are organizationally determining and enforcing policies post 1945. One is the sovereign government and the other is the United Nations.

It is highly likely that in the future mankind could maintain the current global governance, but if researchers are predicting that in the future many jobs are going to be lost to technology, then there is a good chance, that it would not be necessary that we have two political authorities in each nation determining and enforcing policies. In other words, it would not be necessary to have the UN system and governments cooperating to provide solutions in small nations, or to have a federal government, a state government and the UN system providing solutions in large nations. Already many governments are relying on E-government to cut costs and tackle the tremendous margin of human error, laziness, etc.

---

<sup>197</sup> <https://fortune.com/2017/11/29/robots-automation-replace-jobs-mckinsey-report-800-million/>

No one knows how our societies would be organized like in the future if independent governments and UN subsidiary organization are both determining and enforcing two opposing policies at the same time. The UN system is teaching people “to take,” while governments are teaching people “to give.” However, what we know is that law and political order are not natural but human creations. Since 1945, governments and the intergovernmental organization named United Nations use the idea of governance as a mean toward an end. In the case of government and the UN system, the idea of governance is benefiting the individual involved and then society instead of the other way around. It is important to note that the people who make their living from the idea of God do not cooperate post 1945 while enjoying privileges and immunities but the employees of the intergovernmental organization named United Nations do. A person cannot challenge the intergovernmental organization named United Nations or its employees in court. This signify that the evolution of the international order could take two paths if the intergovernmental organization named United Nations and governments continue to transform the conditions and outcomes that matter to each body. The first is if those two political authorities (i.e., the UN system and governments) continue to teach each one a distinct opposite dogma in each nation as they have been doing since 1945. The second is if one authority would voluntarily or under violent and compulsory dominion surrender to the other. This signify that if the United Nations would be the central power, existing governments would eventually decline and fall. On the other hand, if governments resize the intergovernmental organization named United Nations, this option would mean that all the UN subsidiary organs that the intergovernmental organization created would have to stop to maintain relationship with the formal general organization so those development aid agents operate under the authority of local governments and not as per how they are now doing it whereby the staff do not seek or receive instructions from any government or from any other authority external to the Organization as Article 100<sup>198</sup> of the UN charter state. This also means that all the international development aid agencies such as USAID, Dfid (now called FCDO), Red Cross, World Bank, Oxfam, etc. would all stop to interfere in the political order of any nation unless it is the government who grant such right.

---

<sup>198</sup> <https://www.un.org/en/sections/un-charter/un-charter-full-text/>

It looks as if the UN member states are far from beginning to create the conditions of stability and well-being that are mentioned in the UN charter, while the intergovernmental organization named United Nations is teaching the poor why they should be devoted to end injustice and poverty, and while governments are protecting the rights of the rich at the same time. To the contrary, the past 70 years capture a clear example of the terrifying anarchy that emerged when the families/dynasties who won WW2 did let two authorities make people gain security. It also looks that in the years to come the UN member states are going to have both their hands full if they want to make all the world population change their behavior and attitude to come on board to make the world a better place. So far, all the world events that emerged seem to support that the intergovernmental organization named United Nations and the development aid agencies that UN member states created and granted right to interfere in the political order of nations has instigated a global counterculture that its propagators are using individualism and modernity to trigger a change in the international order. This has also triggered another problem that is as complicated as the global counterculture that emerged. The UN member states are going to have to decide if they would voluntarily or under violent and compulsory dominion surrender to the intergovernmental organization named United Nations or if this formal organization would surrender to them.

Indeed, the world events that emerged post 1945 seem to support that this development metaphor that the rich employed in the past to drive the poor to replace their current values, traditions and emotions with thoughts and actions that is based on making people prioritize material over moral has fired back this time around. Instead of appeasing the poor so they would work with the rich to change the world to the better, the teaching of the intergovernmental organization named United Nations is disenchanting the poor, because their growing knowledge is making them recognize that they are in a world where the gap between the rich and the poor is vast.

Carl Philipp Gottfried von Clausewitz (1780–1831) was a Prussian general and military theorist. He once said: “Every age has its own kind of war, its own limiting conditions, and its own peculiar

preconceptions.”<sup>199,200</sup> Mankind could continue to let each age have its own war to serve the preconception that the members of each particular generation cultivate. However, this time around what it is going to be at stakes will not be gaged by the number of lost lives, or value of material things that would be destroyed when the disregard would stop, but by something that is more precious than that if it would get lost. Mankind could be wagering on the practical results that the American culture managed to achieve for the greater well-being of society from 1776 to now. The American culture represents the frontier of mankind’s evolution to date. The attitudes and values that are explicit or implicit in the American culture were acquired in the course of generations through individual and group striving.<sup>201</sup> They are the deposit of the cultivated behavior that mankind invested thousands of years to reach. After mankind agreed to cooperate on their premise in 1945, this American culture does not belong anymore to the United States only but to humanity in its entirety. Those ideals have been from 1776 to now preserving freedom. Without them, later generations could not prosper.

I have no way of knowing if the victors of WW2 or their heirs are going to continue to want that the intergovernmental organization named United Nations continue to thrust people to create equality or democracy so the divergent culture that UN agents are breeding would remain pushing people to have unlimited natural freedoms including being prompted to plunder, rape, disobey, cheat, murder. Alternatively, if those powerful families/dynasties, would make the intergovernmental organization named United Nations surrender this freedom so individuals like Mahathir bin Mohamad or countries like the United States show mankind how to avoid that this "solitary, poor, nasty, brutish and short" life that emerged post 1945 does not continue to deteriorate the social order thus prompting mankind to test in a state of total war who would carry on with having the "right to all things" alone.

Every choice carries a consequence. If history is any guide, it pays to consider what some famous political philosophers regarded could have been the right choice if taken by their political leaders. It is reported in the literature that Étienne de La Boétie (1530 – 1563) was asked about

---

<sup>199</sup> [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/War#Theories\\_of\\_motivation](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/War#Theories_of_motivation)

<sup>200</sup> [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Carl\\_von\\_Clausewitz](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Carl_von_Clausewitz)

<sup>201</sup> <http://people.tamu.edu/~i-choudhury/culture.html>

allowing Catholicism and Protestantism to co-exist. La Boétie "warned of the dangerous and divisive consequences of permitting Catholicism and Protestantism to co-exist, because it could lead to two opposed states in the same country."<sup>202</sup> It is even reported that he even said that "the most he would have allowed the Protestants was the right to worship in private."

Religious experts claim that the major difference between Roman Catholics and Protestants is due to the interpretation of the Bible. The Catholics believe that the holy Scriptures are inspired by God and that the church councils, could give weight in matters of faith and doctrine. Protestants believe that the sole rule of faith and practice should be the holy Scriptures.<sup>203</sup>

I have no way of knowing what worried La Boétie if Catholicism and Protestantism co-existed to the extent of being against that Catholicism split when the two creeds were going to be teaching basically the same ideas.

Al-A'rāf is one of the most detailing Surah in the Quran about the origins of creation and revealing prophecies about the judgment day.<sup>204</sup> The Surah says that every community or people that will come on earth, and who refuse to be organized to worship only one God, its decision could have severe adverse consequences.

No one knows if the conjectures that are placed in the holy scriptures are right or wrong. However, if the claim that the Quran make about the people who allow interference in matters of faith and doctrine to occur is true, then there is a good chance that the person or the nation who split their idea could also face adverse consequences as well.

The paradox of hedonism, "refers to the practical difficulties encountered in the pursuit of pleasure."<sup>205</sup> Hedonism is a "school of thought that argues that the pursuit of pleasure and intrinsic goods are

---

<sup>202</sup> [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/%C3%89tienne\\_de\\_La\\_Bo%C3%A9tie#Life](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/%C3%89tienne_de_La_Bo%C3%A9tie#Life)

<sup>203</sup> <https://www1.cbn.com/questions/difference-between-roman-catholic-protestant>

<sup>204</sup> <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Al-A%27raf>

<sup>205</sup> [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Paradox\\_of\\_hedonism](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Paradox_of_hedonism)

the primary or most important goals of human life.”<sup>206</sup> The paradox of hedonism, is the apparent contradiction that “constant pleasure-seeking may not yield the most actual pleasure or happiness in the long run—or even in the short run, when consciously pursuing pleasure interferes with experiencing it.”

This signify that if the UN member states are allowing the UN system to teach people to reject their old way of doing things in favor of being modernized to increase pleasure, which is a very noble mission, there is a good chance that this idea “may not yield the most actual pleasure or happiness in the long run—or even in the short run, when consciously pursuing pleasure interferes with experiencing it.” This is very worrisome and serious. If “pursuing pleasure interferes with experiencing it,” and we have two authorities post 1945 who are pursuing in each nation pleasure, i.e., the UN organizations and sovereign governments, then there is good chance, that this decision could have severe adverse consequences on the preservation of the international order. I think it is useful to check if “pursuing pleasure interferes with experiencing it,” and then move to examine if indeed this process could have severe adverse consequences on the preservation of the international order.

When the industrial revolution allowed mankind to focus on issues that are other than the material necessities of life, our predecessors created the left-right political spectrum as a substitute to the governance system that was prevailing till this date. In the left-right political spectrum, people began to classify themselves in respect to political positions, ideologies and parties from equality on the left to social hierarchy on the right.”<sup>207</sup>

From the start of the industrial revolution to 1945 and people were splitting themselves into two principles ideologies: conservatism and liberalism.

Conservatism refers to a broad system of political beliefs that prioritizes traditional values and ideas over change and innovation. Throughout history, different people have been interpreting conservatism

---

<sup>206</sup> <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Hedonism>

<sup>207</sup> [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Left%20%80%93right\\_political\\_spectrum](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Left%20%80%93right_political_spectrum)

differently. All the people who subscribe to this idea believe that hierarchy and religion is the foundation of civil society. The people who approve of this political belief oppose the idea that sovereignty is derived from the people and reject the authority of parliament and freedom of religion.<sup>208</sup> Liberalism to the contrary is a political and moral philosophy that is based on liberty, consent of the governed, and equality before the law.<sup>209</sup>

Historians rationalize what prompted WW1 and WW2 to erupt through different accounts. In my opinion, it was a war to conciliate and concord between the people of the left-right political system to decide on how the pursuit of wealth, power, prestige, and fame would be handled in the future.

The United States and Great Britain rose above all the human measures and agreed to achieve a milestone for mankind unheard of its kind in the history of human rights. Those two countries agreed to begin to collaborate with one another on the principle of equal rights and self-determination, and to invite the rest of the nations to take part in this way of doing things, or culture.

Unfortunately, instead of the political leaders who succeeded the founding fathers of the UN capitalizing on the conciliation and concord that the people of the left-right political system agreed upon when WW2 ended, they decided to deviate away for obvious reason (rivalry). This deviation prevented mankind to build on top of the American culture. To make matters worse, the failure of the intergovernmental organization named United Nations to possess a complete understanding of its mission has now brought mankind to square one. This is very worrisome and serious.

Social equality is defined as “a state of affairs in which all people within a specific society have the same status in certain respects, including civil rights, freedom of speech, property rights, and equal access to certain social goods and services.”<sup>210</sup> Social stratification is defined as “a kind of social stratification whereby members of society are grouped into

---

<sup>208</sup> <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Conservatism>

<sup>209</sup> <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Liberalism>

<sup>210</sup> [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Social\\_equality](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Social_equality)

socioeconomic strata, based upon their occupation and income, wealth and social status.”<sup>211</sup>

Competition occurs in nature between organisms. The left-right political spectrum cannot converge so we could say that the reforms we pursue in the social order would help us to eventually conciliate and concord between people or nations.

“Egalitarianism is a school of thought within political philosophy that prioritizes equality for all people.”<sup>212</sup> The Meriam-Webster Dictionary define Egalitarianism as (1) a belief in human equality especially with respect to social, political, and economic affairs, and (2) a social philosophy advocating the removal of inequalities among people. The difference between the two definition is that in one case people should have the same political, economic, social and civil rights because they are equals; and in the other definition, this word is an idea that advocate the removal of economic inequalities among people to create an egalitarian world.

The UN member states allowed the United Nations post 1945 to create UN subsidiary organizations, and to be devoted to provide expert advice, training and grants to existing nations to promote technical and investment cooperation. Ending poverty in all its forms in all the UN member states is the first of the 17 goals of the United Nations 2030 Agenda for sustainable Development.<sup>213</sup> This goal that the United Nations is pursuing on behalf of the UN member states is not one that promote the creation of an egalitarian world so all people should be treated as equals in as far as having the same political, economic, social and civil rights; but one that advocate the removal of economic inequalities among people to create an egalitarian world as well.

This signify that if mankind does not want the world insecurity to deteriorate even further between now and 2030 (or the year 2100, etc.), the UN member states have only two choices to prevent that from happening. The first is if nations go back to harmonizing relations based on pre-1945 political order, and the second is if either the UN system or

---

<sup>211</sup> [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Social\\_stratification](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Social_stratification)

<sup>212</sup> <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Egalitarianism>

<sup>213</sup> <https://www.un.org/en/sections/issues-depth/poverty/>

the existing governments abdicate for the other so one authority could begin to determine and enforce policies in each nation only.

I think that the idea of having a new global war would not resolve the gridlock that the world is now facing, because humans were not programed to forget the ideas that increases their happiness. In other words, mankind cannot practice an ideology besides agreeing that all people collaborate on equal rights and/or on the principle of self-determination, and mankind began to collaborate based on this doctrine in 1945. If a global war is fought and the UN is continued to interfere in the social order to teach people to foster human rights to create an egalitarian world, the world would remain dynamic. Only if the history of the world is erased or altered so newborns would not know that this dogma “on all men being equal” that mankind reached in 1776, could the heirs of families/dynasties who won WW2 or the families/dynasties who control the money supply of the world stand a chance of continuing to transform the conditions and outcomes that matters to them with less resistance. Alternatively, if the UN is reformed and existing nations go back to fixing first how to be organized under a political, economic, social and a civil right order that makes people become equal before the law, before moving to practice how people could begin to rise above the weakness of their will, perhaps nations could stabilize peace and security. In other words, doing exactly what Mahathir bin Mohamad did in Malaysia when he served as Prime Minister of this country from 1981 to 2003 or the United States did from 1776 to 1945 during the progressive era. This would spare mankind from continuing to put the cart ahead of the horse and in this way secure the consciousness that the founding fathers of the UN said is possible. In other words, mankind cannot be cooperating to foster human rights or to eradicate poverty, injustice and inequality in all the nations by 2030,<sup>214</sup> before instituting a psychological environment that makes people perceive that we are living in a just world so people can start to have confidence in the rule of law, which is a prerequisite to be tolerant.

Surely, the non-cooperation that emerged between UN member states to achieve the goals that were set forth in the UN charter is due to the United States and Great Britain not condoning the instant gratification

---

<sup>214</sup> <https://www.un.org/sustainabledevelopment/sustainable-development-goals/>

that the United Nations was pursuing. This wave of intolerance that emerged post 1945 could also be due to the designers of the new international world order not taking enough time to explain to the intergovernmental organization named United Nations on what is it that this organization need to be devoted to prioritizing to avoid that the direction that this organization took lead mankind to this degrading state of peace and security. Another principal reason that could have contributed to this state of abnormal rise in intolerance could also be due to the UN member states not letting the United States take the lead to erect the new international world order, and/or aiding this country to achieve this goal. This has now created a situation which makes it appear as if the United States (or Great Britain) need rescuing when it was those two countries who were the one who decided to rescue the world from the subjugation of domination and exploitation.

Indeed, the challenge with allowing the intergovernmental organization named United Nations to foster human rights to create an egalitarian world within a social realm that its subjects or culture classify its political position into a left-right political spectrum is dangerous and could have divisive consequences. When two opposed behavioral “states” strive in any country, this situation keeps people at all the time divided and be devoted to rivaling each other. This could have severe consequences on the progress humankind made to achieve the international order that was proposed by Great Britain and the United States in 1945, because the powerful nations could decide to go back to harmonizing actions based on pre-1945 political orders to control peace and security.

La Boétie’s policy for religious peace was “one of conciliation and concord through reforms in the church that would eventually persuade the Protestants to reunite with Catholicism.” I have no way of knowing if the UN member states would be able to resize the intergovernmental organization named United Nations after it has proven that it could be an effective source of income for the powerful special interests who control the money supply of the world. This is again very worrisome and serious. This is because if the powerful special interests who are protecting the organization and are channeling to its different organs resources so its agents teach people to be impatient and to be devoted to foster human rights to create an egalitarian world could choose to allow

the UN teaching to go on. This means that the more the authority that the intergovernmental organization named United Nations develops, the more this organization could start to pose a threat on the individuals or the families who control the money supply of the world. This is because no one can guarantee if the UN system would remain a faithful and wise servant to the powerful special interests who are protecting and financing the organization.

Einstein view about how it appears that “*the fate of nations is inescapably in the hands of wholly irresponsible political rulers*” does not appear to be a totally erroneous perception. The decision of the families/dynasties who won WW2 to let political leaders let the UN interfere in the social order could have drastic consequences on the stability of the international system and their heirs.

Dystopia is an imagined world or society in which people lead wretched, dehumanized fearful lives.<sup>215</sup> Throughout history, the treacheries, violence, disregard or wars that previous generations lived led them to believe that an ideal society with minimal crime, violence and poverty is not a state that mankind can experience. This led some thinkers to believe that all the accumulated chaos would continue to retrocede human’s progress so every posterity would live in realm that would be worse than the realm that its predecessors lived. This cycle will continue to retrocede until a new balance is created.

The end of history has been defined as “a political and philosophical concept that supposes that a particular political, economic, or social system may develop that would constitute the end-point of humanity's sociocultural evolution and the final form of human government.”<sup>216</sup>

This work has shown that the decision of the families/dynasties who won WW2 to let political leaders let the intergovernmental organization named United Nations interfere in the social order could have drastic consequences on the stability of the international system and their heirs. The work tried to support that the fate of the international postwar order pursuant to the transformational changes that emerged in the world post 1945 culminating in the gridlock that emerged in Iraq (i.e., the condition

---

<sup>215</sup> <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/dystopia>

<sup>216</sup> [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/End\\_of\\_history](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/End_of_history)

in Afghanistan, Libya, Syria, Lebanon, Tunis, etc. are all the same) do not support that the all the efforts that the United Nations (nations and organization) have invested are aiding man to live free from fear and want. In fact, the work tried to support that the way the intergovernmental organization named United Nations is denying its employees' rights because they are emphasizing the importance of morality over the unimportance of the self, support that this global council has become a place to sell and buy and not a ground to achieve what the existing nations in 1945 created this intergovernmental organization to serve.

Furthermore, this work tried to support that this disdainful behavior that the intergovernmental organization named United Nations and people in general are exhibiting would have not occurred if the political leaders who succeeded the founding fathers of the UN remained faithful to the work program that the United States and Great Britain proposed in 1941 and to replace this initial program with a new one that aims to establish an egalitarian world. In fact, this work tried to support that the kindle that spiraled the world into deeper insecurity happened when the intergovernmental organization named United Nations divided UN member members into rich and poor nations despite the UN charter stating that all people are equal as of 1945, culminating in 2015 with the aspiration of the intergovernmental organization named United Nations to end poverty and injustice in all its forms by 2030.

Most importantly, this work tried to support that after the UN became a ground to buy and sell, mankind could not be progressing on the track that would help our successors to reach “the end of the historical dynamic with the perfection of a civil society” as per what the French philosopher Antoine Augustin Cournot [1801 – 1877] connoted would ultimately occur. To the contrary, this work tried to support that if the intergovernmental organization named United Nations is not resized and stopped from continuing to interfere in the social order, including stripping its employees from enjoying privileges and immunities so they could injure with impunity, the heirs of the families/dynasties who won WW2 or the heirs of the families who control the money supply of the world could be resized.

Last but not least, this work tried to support that if the intergovernmental organization named United Nations is not resized to stop its different organizations from aiding people who feel that they deserve to have freedom and privileges, it is possible that the Anglosphere power disintegrate and be reverted to a simpler form thus giving rise to a new authority in the same way the Roman Empire collapsed when the followers of Christ were preaching the same ideas.