

PROGRESSIVE REGRESSION

Thoughts on how the socio-cultural
patterns that emerged post WW2
are a regression to reconstruct the in-bound
world events in reverse order

Salim Maloof, Ph.D.

Copyright 2019 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., Progressive Regression, 2019

This is a work of non-fiction.

Salim Maloof

PROGRESSIVE REGRESSION

Thoughts on how the socio-cultural patterns that emerged post WW2 are a regression to reconstruct the in-bound world events in reverse order

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

In memory of my beloved father and mother in law

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Special Note to All UN Member States

Special Note to All Staff Members of the United Nations

PREFACE

1

Man's search to be the measure of all things

2

Mankind's ambition to stop with seeing our specie as being an integral component of the natural system

3

Could mankind's irrational patterns be rooted in our decision to make the purpose of the human life to be about providing benefits for our society?

4

Reflection on how the rich who lived during the Industrial Revolution could be controlling the money supply of the world till now

5

Mankind's ambition to stop with seeing our specie as being an integral component of the natural system

6

Could the development mission that people pursue prompt unwillingness to practice tolerance

7

Can man continue to test his human experience when algorithm seem to be overpowering human reason and making the human body surrender rights involuntarily?

8

Do we need to purge philosophical ideas to make newborn become ready to put up with one another?

9

Are the iterations that we are always making is what is creating complex systems in the social order?

10

Evidence to support how the UN is fracturing the social fabric

11

Did mankind begin in 1945 a reversal of events leading toward a social breakdown?

12

Perspective on how we could expect the social order to change if mankind chooses to continue to let the UN interfere in the social order

Special Note to All UN Member States

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.

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 states. One should also bear in mind while reading this book that the intentions of the author are not to criticize the performance of any UN member states, or regime, or specific government and in particular any ideology.

One should, while reading this book, bear this point in mind to avoid any misunderstanding with regard to the intention of the author. His purpose here is not to discredit any UN member states, regime, specific government or any particular ideology. The author goal is to show a view that could have a bearing on the reason for the failure of the UN member states to attain the goals specified in the UN charter with the main aim being to provide constructive criticism to achieve the ends that all members of the human family joined together to pursue.

Furthermore, the views expressed here are those of the author only and should not be interpreted as those of any organization that the author is affiliated with today.

Special Note to All Staff Members of the United Nations

All references to the “United *Nations*” in this study could mean (i) the idea of the different member nations to be “united” under the auspices of a global council to maintain international peace and security; and (ii) an intergovernmental international organization named United Nations whose staff is working to achieve the goals specified in the UN Charter.

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 purpose of the author is not to discredit their efforts or their achievements, and henceforth the results they achieved.

PREFACE

Humans have been conjecturing and trying to determine if the statements that they make about reality could be taken as true since their appearance. Over the years, human managed to resolve conjectures that we know that no matter how many counter-example are given to disprove the provable truth about their essential nature, it would be impossible to disprove their truthfulness or falseness. This inherent pursuit to explore and to conjecture keeps the social realm an experimental theater. At the same time, one of the by-product that the different patterns that humans effectuate generate the rise of a leisured class who the division of labor and the natural inequality makes them find themselves involuntarily wielding considerable social power. This makes the underprivileged scramble to change the social contract that the powerful come up with and expect the powerless to abide by in order to create democratic principles that would allow everyone to increase his happiness.

The shelter that the poor duck under to nurture consensus and resolve to rid from the rich the social space or the material of terrestrial origin that the poor consider that the rich are denying them is based on positing conjecture that spread that every person is inherently entitled to rights simply because she or he is a human being. This conjecture has been putting the human civilization in extraordinary danger year after year. The challenge this conjecture poses is that it makes the poor devote their lifetime to displace or resize the rich to produce nothing but a cycle in which those who become installed in place of the ones that were pushed out become now the ones who denies other rights and henceforth the next target to be tested. This cycle occurs only because the poor do not want to be patient so the rich possess a complete understanding of themselves, which is a prerequisite if the rich are to begin to achieve practical results for the greater well-being of society.

The refusal of the poor to practice tolerance has been keeping humanity hang on a pendulum that has been swinging peace and security from one complex system to the next. This ongoing state of affairs has led to certain powerful forces rise and to benefit from this social inequality

problem that the division of labor and the natural inequality create to increase their own happiness.

During Greek antiquity, when the idea of God started to create conflicts for the poor/rich to harmonize actions, the people of this epoch changed their complex religious system that was loaded with gods, goddesses, demigods, and mythological creatures with a single all-powerful God. This iteration helped mankind to begin to influence patterns that was free from having people attribute how their actions was driven by supernatural forces, but gave rise to the poor/rich beginning to rely on behavioral conjectures that were much more complex.

In 1776 during the American independence war the people of this era penned a philosophical conjecture to wield power that was as powerful and as complicated perhaps as the idea that our predecessors came up with about the universe having been created and is administered by a God occasioned. This conjecture was about all humans having been endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness.

All human being are created on earth to satisfy conjecture that existing people develop on the nature of reality. Humans can only naturally harmonize actions by letting the changes that any individual prompt in the social order be guided by one's personal power and conscience, or by depending on laws to control such process.

The regulatory systems that existing people are ready to surrender freedom so it would grant them "certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness," are in total contradiction with what the people who reported in the biblical scriptures such a path is possible. In fact, the purpose of this book is to support how the regulatory system that existing people are pursuing as of 1945, are in total contradiction with the regulatory system that even the people who penned those conjecture in 1776 practiced or followed up to 1945.

The difference between what the people who lived from 1776 to 1945 and the people who lived before 1776 or after (i.e., the one who are now existing post 1945) did to have those unalienable Rights benefits

everyone is the culture that was being cultivated. As of the date mankind began to keep record, it is only from 1776 to 1945 when humanity managed to demonstrate that when certain culture is cultivated it is possible for the dispersed know-how to create dividends that would make the rich and the poor to come together to be ready to achieve practical results for the greater well-being of society.

From 1776 to 1945, the separatists who split from the British Crown in the Americas managed to coordinate actions to the point of building a culture that aided the United States to convert from a country that was full of challenges into becoming a superpower. The American people managed despite all the internal problems that this country passed through to build a culture that was capable to stand up in front of the existing powers that were dominating world affairs including making the people who live in this country be regarded as the happiest by 1945. Indeed, most African Americans were not as happy as the White Americans were from the date when slavery formally ended in 1865 until 1960 when full political, social, and economic rights for African Americans started to be secured, but this was due mainly to the time it took until the American people possessed the minimum understanding of themselves to create this subtle change. Let us not forget also that the loyalists who stayed leveraged lots of the power and wealth, and time had to elapse until the generation that succeeded them had to develop understanding or yield to the will of the majority.

The feats that the United States was knowing was not how other human societies in other parts of the world were living. In all the other nations, human societies were denying each other freedom. The social contract that they were upholding was based on a political philosophy that was advocating that human societies are hierarchical and not equal. The programming that the existing nations in all the Eastern Hemisphere were using from 1776 to 1945 was "solitary, poor, nasty, brutish and short", because the guiding authority was relying on distinction such as race, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth or other status to get its way despite the resistance of others.

In 1941, the United States used its power to push the Western European nations who were colonizing many countries worldwide to end this

practice so every member of the human family live free from fear and want.

If it was not for the culture that the people who lived in the United States developed making them become conscious about the need to create conditions of stability and well-being, there is a good chance that most of the people who are living in the Eastern Hemisphere could have remained living, to this day, under the cruel and inhumane way that they were cooperating under when they were living under the authority of the nations that were administering them. The people who live in Latin America now knows that the policies of the US spared them from the confusion that exist in other parts of the world if they had allowed the European powers to mingle in their politics.

The founding fathers of the UN counselled that the unpreparedness in the political, social and economic field of the people or nations who would be decolonized should not serve as a pretext to delay independence and that each nations should be free to determine its political status.

The leaders who succeeded the founding fathers of the UN did not adhere to what those initial leaders counselled they should cooperate in the economic, political, social and cultural field together like on the aftermath of WW2 to attain the ends set forth in the UN charter. The UN member states tasked the UN to create UN subsidiary organs and commissioned them to jointly provide economic, political, social and cultural solutions to create the UN ends faster.

The UN member states approved that the officials of the different subsidiary organizations that would be created perform their duties while granted rights that lets them not seek or receive instructions from any government or from any other authority external to the Organization. The UN member states approved that the officials of the different subsidiary organizations become an economic operator or while fulfilling their responsibilities, while enjoying privileges and immunities.

Throughout history, all the wars that mankind has known was to curb peoples greed. If people could emphasize the importance of the human

reason over the unimportance of desire, all the wars that mankind has known would have not occurred. Most importantly, the existing nations at the end of WW2 would have not joined to cooperate based on the principles of equal rights.

Humans believe that because they are programmed with aptitudes that differentiate them from other species with whom they co-exist that their inherent mental power could be employed to make their detention time or life span serve a different purpose than what the human body may have been programmed to serve in the natural world.

From 1945 to now, instead of the UN member states using the different subsidiary organizations to help them to teach their citizen tolerance, they went along with this organization fostering human rights, including teaching the poor why they should stop to be content and to be devoted to invest reactive coping to eradicate poverty and to reduce inequality. This teaching has turned peace and security upside down so far.

The different UN subsidiary organs that the UN created to teach the poor about why they need to replace their current values, traditions, and emotions with more modernized behaviors, helped the nations with great powers to increase their wealth and power significantly. But at the same time, this teaching increased people degree of intolerance. It is evident, if the UN is fostering human rights than all the people want to achieve the same degree of standards of living.

Humans cannot harmonize ethical relations using any other philosophy that is better or beyond making such relationship be structured on the basis of respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples, and in 1945, mankind began to program relations on this principle.

No one knows what could have helped the United States to build the awareness that its people developed from 1776 to 1945 to transform this new country from one that was full of challenges to a powerful one except that if its people agreed to practice tolerance as per what the founding fathers of the UN counselled.

If the UN member states continue to let the development mission of the UN to be about how to foster human rights, and/or not do anything to stop this organization from making people dynamic, people dependence on tribalism should surely continue to rise. This also signify that extending the period in which the United Nations would be allowed to continue to operate without a complete understanding of what is exactly its principal mission, could lead to a total social breakdown.

This work examines how the world events that emerged since 1945, could be a result of the decision of the political leaders who succeeded the founding fathers of the UN and the UN to refuse to be tolerant enough to let the US cultural authority yield roots in existing nations to spare us from pursuing ideas which we know our predecessors failed to respect. Never mind, that all what such ideas achieved when our predecessors practiced them was to make them live in more insecurity. Most importantly, the work will attempt to show how the world events that emerged since 1945 could be a reversal of the inbound events that occurred in the world leading to WW2. The work tries to illustrate how it is very likely that the United Nations and all the Development Aid that are working on fostering human rights could be aligning mankind on a reverse track to reconstruct the in-bound events that our predecessors experienced until the regression that our successors would know would bring them back to primitive days. Evidently, the first rendezvous would be a global war date that resemble the one that our predecessors fought during WW1, that is if the UN and all the Development Aid are not paused from continuing to interfere in the social order to deepen corruption and insecurity.

The book examines how the employment of international machinery to resolve the gridlock that endanger the maintenance of international peace and security, deepened people dependence on distinction such as race, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth or other status in order to get their way despite the resistance of others. To avoid a social breakdown, this work will show that humans have no other choice now but to begin to purge most of the philosophical ideas that gives people power to build upon their tribalism and/or to pause the UN from fostering human rights in order so existing nations go back to implement the initial work program that the founding fathers of the UN counseled in partnership with the

international machineries that was created at the end of WW2. The work tries to argue that only the US can lead this process, because this is the only country that has knowhow.

The work will show that if humans do not pause the United Nations from being an economic operator and begin to empty out from the social realm the machineries that the UN is spreading through them why everyone needs to be devoted to foster human rights so this task goes back to being programmed by existing nations only, and under the leadership of the United States mankind could be heading toward its first rendezvous with a global war date that resembles the events that occurred during WW1 if the patterns are a reversal of the inbound events that occurred in the world leading to WW2.

The work will also show that if the United Nations subsidiary organs are not paused from maintaining relationship with the United Nations, there is a good chance that the corruption that the agents of this organization are prompting could resize the rich.

The goal of this work is to show how if the world leaders do not reappraise their decision to let the United Nations be an economic operator and to offer economic solutions, there is a big chance that the United Nations could be forcing the rich to surrender their wealth in the same way Christianity brought the Roman Empire on its knees when the disciples of Christ were preaching to the poor why they should stop to be emphasizing the importance of material things to pursue philosophical ideas.

The objective of this work is to provide the rich, the political leaders and readers in general a new perspective on whether the difficulties that emerged in the social order post WW2 could be due to an accelerated accumulation of conjectures that the UN incited to make a name for itself. The work will attempt to support that the UN work program is the biggest threat to the rich by showing how the UN is not helping the rich to create conditions of stability and well-being but how the officials of this organization are pursuing their best interests in the name of preaching social justice and equality. Most importantly, this work will help the rich to reappraise if they should allow the teaching of the UN to go on, when they already know that the only way for the UN to

succeed is if this organization rid them from their wealth and power. The work will aid the rich to reflect on whether it makes any common sense to let the UN make them and their successors live in more insecurity, when we already have the US model which is a good example that we can build a culture on its successes, if we just agree to be patient, which is what the UN founding fathers counseled we only do.

1

Man's search to be the measure of all things

There was never a set of fixed principles defining what is a human being. If a newborn is not immediately fed after birth, he would not survive. The awareness that a newborn develops about reality is not something that a person develops on his own. A newborn has to wait until the age when one begins to sustain his survival needs on his own to form his own views. Humans develop knowledge about the nature of reality by interpreting and studying biblical, philosophical texts and symbols. Anthropologists or archeologists consider the first form of abstract writing invented to be the cuneiform script used ca.3200 BC.¹ To this day, no investigator managed to decrypt from those pictograph or artifacts that have survived evidence to establish how mankind originated. Since antiquity, every posterity ponders to decipher how mankind originated, and coin its own interpretation on what is a human being. The conjectures and arguments that people continually come up with to define what is a human being create a series of irreparable relationships. This truth and the fact that humans were not granted rights to forecast the future has been part of the big questions that a human being devote his entire life span answering.

In a broad sense, philosophy and science are two activities that people undertake to understand the fundamental truth about what sort of things exist and what are their essential natures. No one knows if people's interest in exploration is a trait that humankind undertake for its own sake or if the lack of a systematic definition about the fundamental

¹ <https://sites.utexas.edu/dsb/tokens/the-evolution-of-writing/>

nature of the world is the principal tenet that forbade humanity from providing, to this day, only benefits for our societies. Humans want to unify ethics according to a single standard, but based on prioritizing first the self over the collective. It is not possible to know if the ethics that each newborn is roused to advance is contributing to creating conditions of stability or not, particularly when every newborn must structure his relationship with reality by dividing his realm into natural and legal rights. This type of social contract also implies that until existing people begin to surrender freedom so newborns do not find themselves entangled in figuring out how to make their own pursuit to improve their life chances does not interfere with the rules and laws in force, there is a good chance that humanity would not know any rest.

From antiquity until now, every posterity spends its own time exploring to address new ways to make us understand the nature, causes, or principles of reality, and especially about what constitute the nature of man and his behavior. If we compare between how our ancestors answered those questions and the new conjectures that it is our turn now to raise, we find that all the hypothesis that were resolved so far have not produced practical application that we can act on them to rid the world from the mental or spiritual theories that the self is always generating. The drawback with man wanting to be “the measure of all things”² as Protagoras [490 BC – 420 BC], a pre-Socratic Philosopher claimed, makes human ingenuity become an obstacles to deepen social cohesion and/or to help mankind to begin to live free from fear and want.

Throughout the history of humanity, every posterity appears to have absorbed the typical problems that prevent people from deepening social cohesion, and proclaim it has creative ideas and results to make the succeeding generation not to be compelled to have recourse to disregard so peace and security finally prevail. Then again, every conjecture that has been tested with has failed to prevent conflicts and to make future wars impossible.

No one knows how this basic tenet that humans have been throughout the history of humanity pursuing to deepen brotherhood emerged.

² <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Protagoras>

Likewise, what makes every posterity become mindful and devoted to test or bother with striving to create conditions of stability and well-being when history provides a clear picture of the patterns of cause and effect that hindered mankind's efforts to make those hopes to deepen fraternity come to pass fully. Definitely, there is a gap between the expressed desire and the required free will necessary to act on the things that people become mindful of and proclaim disposition to collaborate jointly to eventually attain.

Different schools of thought have pondered over what motivate new people to reject the behavioral patterns that existing people formulate preferring instead to refuse to integrate in order to militate to address their perceived natural rights to life and liberty. Then again, given how in the last two thousand years' no one apart from Jesus Christ claimed that his birth was predestined or commissioned by supernatural force to improve human relationships, I could say that everyone else his birth was either based on a conjecture that his procreators postulated or a result of his procreators not taking the right precautions to preclude the pregnancy.

Indeed, the invention of the idea of good or evil, right or wrong, or true or false to harmonize on the principle of such conjectures the action of newborns has been helping throughout the history of the human life people to blame the actions that one exhibits which does not suit his inclination as "evil" and the ones that are in line with his tendency as "good." Evidently, this good and evil abstract idea which till now there is no proof to establish if such epistemology describes, represent or mirror reality has lent an unprecedented hand to humankind to take advantage and do whatever one desire to another person, or the natural environment, and without any restraint. Interestingly, this "good and evil" abstract idea does correlate very well with another ubiquitous abstract idea that men invented for both tangible and intangible quantities or values. This quantitative abstract idea refers to what humans want the number and the numerical digit "0" and "1" stand for.

The number and the numerical digit "0" and "1" are part of a numerical system that people employ to distinguish between what they perceive to refer to "nothing" when they see or hear the symbol "0," and to "something" when they see or hear the symbol "1." The invention of the

idea of good or evil, right or wrong, or true or false to harmonize on the principle of such conjectures the action of people does not differ a lot from what humankind wanted those two symbols or forms, “0” and “1” to denote. The interlinking of those two abstract numbers or numerical digit so they mean the absence of any quantity (or void) when we employ the symbol “0”, and to the existence of a quantity (or mass) when we employ the symbol “1” when all what a human being does from birth to death is displace and change matter is perhaps the second most important concept that man invented after the idea about our natural environment being programmed by a God perhaps. In my opinion, those different relationships that on their principles we want our interaction with what exists on the outside of our frame to purport could have guided our intellectual evolution, and helped us to progress to the level of built environment that exists. However, as the present realm can attest, humans attempt to interlink the abstract idea of “0 and 1” to distill out of such a concept an essence, whereby the patterns that people generate are later classed into “good” or “evil” could be at the heart of the gridlock that has been preventing mankind from being able to put up with one another to create conditions of stability and well beings. Mankind search to class the patterns that humans exhibit in matter into “good” or “evil” and to want that every human being begin to abandon “evil” patterns (or changes which humans introduce in matter and class as creating amoral or unconstructive outcomes) in favor of keeping constructive patterns only (or changes which humans perceive are tangible or moral) does not seem to be a relationship that most people are capable to differentiate between and/or interrelate with one another on the basis of what mankind want each time a person perpetrate a change in matter to have his action denote. To put it differently, for one reason or another, humans do not seem to know how to differentiate between “good” or “evil” in the same way how this specie has managed to let the difference between “0” and “1” mean. Accordingly, it seems as if the permanent ideas, thoughts, words and concepts that people come up with and want newborns to translate into patterns that would aid humanity to move from the state that some people define them to be unequal toward a more equal one does not seem to produce the outcomes that mankind endeavor to create. The challenge does not seem to be rooted in man’s inaptitude to distinguish between 0 and 1 (or absence of quantity vs presence) as human evolution can attest, but rather in human decision perhaps to adopt ideas

or conjectures such as “good” or “evil” that its job is to produce nothing but the irrational patterns that has been accompanying humankind throughout history, and every posterity seem to be challenged with.

Relativism refers to an idea that stipulate that “views are relative to differences in perceptions and consideration.”³ This means that there is no universal, objective truth when it comes to wanting a newborn to see or think about good or evil from a normative prescriptive relativity. This could be perhaps the case, because it has not been established yet that all the human frame exhibits the same judgments.

William Shakespeare [1564 – 1616] was an English poet, playwright and actor, who in one of his famous play that was shortened to Hamlet said in Act 2, Scene 2, "There is nothing either good or bad, but thinking makes it so."⁴

Secularization is the transformation of a society from close identification and affiliation with religious values and institutions toward nonreligious values and secular institutions.⁵ Many nations passed laws that separate the churches from the state thus freeing governments from being swayed by people who obtain their bargaining power or authority from their aptitude to motivate people to surrender freedom through how skillful they are at explaining events that mankind does not comprehend how it did occur till now. But if we look very closely, we find that mankind has not passed laws that empties out from earth the historiography that the people who lived and passed away come up with so its patterns does not influence the judgment of the new people.

During Greek antiquity, when the idea of God started to create conflicts for those ancestors, the people of this epoch changed their complex religious system that was loaded with gods, goddesses, demigods, and mythological creatures with a single all-powerful God. Accordingly, the new ancestors who lived from Greek antiquity till 1776, refrained from using the idea of gods, goddesses, demigods, and mythological creatures to get their way, and began to rely more and more on natural and

³ <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Relativism>

⁴ <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Hamlet>

⁵ <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Secularization>

manmade distinction, such as race, colour, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, to keep delaying mankind from deepening righteousness, justice as between man and man, nation and nation. In 1776, a new nation was born and was named the United States. The people of this new nation managed to tumble all the natural and manmade obstacles that their former political leaders were depending on to get their way and to keep them suppressed. The efforts that the people of this nation exerted from 1776 to 1945 (and despite all the internal challenges) showed that mankind is capable to prevail over the weakness of the will to emphasize the importance of the human reason over the unimportance of the desires. The United States managed from 1776 to 1945 to show that it is possible that mankind abandon progressively diversity and to live under a system in which everyone can have a chance to improve his life chances. This country managed to become a superpower when its people penned in 1776 that “all men are created equal.”⁶

I have no way of knowing what aided the United States to be able to overcome internal and external challenges and emerge as a superpower from 1776 to 1945. I think that their conjecture that our specie was programmed to deepen happiness instead of perhaps having been programmed to create change to serve the natural world helped them a lot. This conjecture has led them to be devoted to push the boundary of their scientific and technical limits to provide benefits to our societies. At the core of this view must figure having interpreted that birth shall be intended to live and to devote oneself to increase the stock of knowledge about the inherent conjectures that one find existing people pushing. At the helm stand, how to come up with creative and systematic work in order to make people abandon their habits and traditions in favor of becoming modernized, because it is more beneficial for them.

The successes that the people of the United States were knowing from 1776 to 1945, were not what all the other existing nations who as of the date in Greek antiquity changed their complex religious system with a simpler one, but continued to rely on natural and manmade distinction till 1945, were knowing. More than two thousand years had to elapse

⁶ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/All_men_are_created_equal

from the date when the Greeks did God iteration until the rest of the people from around the world recognize that if they change their complex system that was loaded with distinction and to make it according to the one that the US uses it could also help them to achieve the same success that the American people knew. In 1945, all the existing nations agreed to harmonize actions “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,⁷” as stipulated in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights to ultimately attain this ideal world peace concept. Till now, existing nations have not been able to put up with one another to make future war impossible or to work to achieve the ends set forth in the UN Charter. In fact, the United States who managed to harmonize actions based on this philosophy from 1776 to 1945, and who managed to make its people to be the happiest, does appear to be challenged by the complex social order that emerged when all members of the human family began to secure the universal observance of such principles.

But again, we already know that if we want newborns to begin to exhibit prescriptive ethics instead of continuing to exhibit descriptive ethics as the past human history attest, there are only two ways to do it. The first is if we empty out the historiography of the people who lived to stop it from influencing newborns to generate irrational behavior, and the second is if we reduce birth rates. The paradox is that the United States did not practice either choice from 1776 to 1945, and this country managed to demonstrate that it is possible to make people emphasize the importance of the human reason over the unimportance of the desires. The United States managed from 1776 to 1945 to become one of the most industrialized nations despite all the internal challenges that this country knew. Why existing nations are not able to duplicate the successes of the United States from 1776 to 1945 when all what occurred in the social order from 1945 to now is that this philosophy that penned that “all men are created equal” was extended to cover all the lands is strange!

Moreover, if we take into account the policy that China introduced in 1970 to set a limit on the number of children parents could have until it

⁷ <http://www.un.org/en/universal-declaration-human-rights/>

was eliminated at the end of 2015,⁸ we find that this strategy did not have any real impact on improving how the people of this nation harmonize their relations with one another. The awareness that the Chinese people gained from 1945 to 2015 did not translate into politics in which the government began to exhibit that it is neither a tyranny nor a democracy, when this country applied one of the world's most extreme example of population planning. In 2018, the Washington Post published an opinion that was titled "China's glittering glamour disguises a fist of tyranny."⁹ Likewise, if we take how Russia who was part of the Soviet Union until 1991,¹⁰ and who from 1945 to 1991 was supposedly establishing an ethical system based on human reason rather than theological doctrine,¹¹ we find that the practical results that this country has achieved from 1945 till 2015 did not transform the government into becoming any different from the one that China reached up this date based on some opinion.¹²

The knowledge that we gain from the experience that Russia and/or China passed is that when a nation chooses to practice prescriptive ethics to achieve practical results for the greater well-being of their societies, this approach will not produce individuals who would begin to exhibit patterns that support that they possess a complete understanding of themselves. This also means that the lesson learnt from 1945 to now cannot be implemented elsewhere to eliminate the challenges that has prevented us from making progress on the goals that our leaders fixed on our behalf in 1945 to make the world become a better place.

This also means that the explanations that have been emerging since 1945, about people unwillingness to put up with one another to the accelerated rates of population growth, knowledge, technology, communications, environmental degradation, or religiousness, cannot

⁸ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/One-child_policy

⁹ https://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/chinas-glittering-glamour-disguises-a-fist-of-tyranny/2018/10/26/857ff93a-d949-11e8-a10f-b51546b10756_story.html?noredirect=on&utm_term=.cb489df6bb9d

¹⁰ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Soviet_Union

¹¹ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Soviet_Union#Religion

¹² <https://foreignpolicy.com/2018/03/12/the-banality-of-putins-potemkin-elections/>

be a reason because the United States did not prohibit its citizens from rights to realize the full development of their personality from 1776 to 1945.

Likewise, if we also take into account how every newborn has right to freeze social space and material things on a cumulative basis and to hand it to designated individuals upon death, and/or how we are more and more favoring that most people begin to distance their human body from creating change in nature and to delegate this task to technology, this shifting cannot be a real cause for people unwillingness to put up with one another as well. What delegating to technology the role that the human body could have been programmed to continuously be effecting to sustain the survival needs does, is it only distances or controls the body only. It is the human behavior who needs to surrender freedom, because the human body is just the faculty who creates the crises and conflicts on behalf of this aptitude. Therefore, we cannot say that the more people distance their human body from creating change in nature and to delegate this task to technology, that this shift can be the cause for this abrupt rise in intolerance that some people are exhibiting.

Indeed, the challenges that are making headlines from 1945 to now does not seem to resemble experiences with which humans are familiar with even during periods of war. The readiness of people to sacrifice their life post 1945 for what they believe in, when there is no evidence to prove that the things that people establish their state of mind about them is the case with factual certainty is not a conduct that support that mankind is on its way to possess a complete understanding of themselves.

Prior to 1945, most of the people around the world were living under European domination? Most of the European countries that controlled the poor nations until 1945, were pursuing a monarchical form of government. All monarchs place strong emphasis on custom and tradition, and believe that human societies are not equal but hierarchical.

The political ideologies that the United States proposed post 1945 contradicts with the ideologies that the monarchs in Europe believed in till WW2 and pursued. From 1945 onward, all the people and nations that were allowed to choose their political status picked mounting a

parliamentary government. In this type of governments, the balance of power is not formed in the same way how politics was done in Europe before 1945.

It is irrational to say that the social order that the United States proposed post 1945 is not better off than the social order that people were utilizing pre the outbreak of the second world war. If thanks to the US, most nations are not living under domination or colonialism post 1945, why there are individuals who are opposing this milestone that the US facilitated in human history for mankind to eventually achieve world peace, and are challenging even this nation?

If the only change that took place between when the United States started to harmonize actions based on pronouncing that “all men are equal” in 1776, and when all the existing nations started to harmonize actions based on the same principles as of 1945, is that instead of such philosophy being limited to being practiced in the Americas only, it was extended territorially so other people begin to employ its teaching to duplicate the same success the US achieved; why when the United States pronounced that “all men are equal” in 1776, this milestone helped this country to develop and to grow into becoming one of the most industrialized and developed country in the world by 1945; but when this philosophy was widened only territorially, people intolerance diminished, and peace and security turned upside down. in the world in the last seventy-three years’

People are not permanent on earth. The people who in the US during WW2 proposed that this country work together with the rest of the existing nations to create world peace, and the people who succeeded them are not one and the same? Could all the insecurity that emerged in the world be due to the United States wanting to dominate the world as some opinions tries to advocate?

It would be irrational to say that the United States proposed that people unite to rule the world, because this country knows that if the world could be ruled by a global power, this nation-state would have not been created in 1776. If the US wanted to rule the world, it would not have proposed that the colonized nations be freed. Most importantly, If the

US wanted to rule the world, why did it threaten to withdraw from international affairs in 2017!

What if the United States threatened to withdraw from international affairs in order to not be drawn into a global war, because of fear and not as per what some commentators claim that this country is in international affair to rule the world. The only “real” war that the US can wage or enter is one that would have to involve the use of weapons of mass destruction. The US is not the only nation that possesses weapons of mass destruction (WMD). If the armed conflict that the US would have happens to with one that possesses WMD, this would mean that this country could be threading its self-destruction.

We do know that this decision that Great Britain and the United States took to develop weapons of mass destruction jointly during WW2 was a turning point for peace and stability in the world. If the two countries did not develop weapons of mass destruction jointly, there is a good chance that we could be retaining the political structures that most Western European countries instituted in the previous centuries. Many historians are ready to support that the last two back to back world wars were a mass discharge of accumulated internal rage to alter the political map in Europe. The vast majority of the poor nations that participated in these wars were a result of formed alliance with the dynasties who were resizing each other. Peace and security was manageable or somehow under control in all the poor nations prior to 1945 unlike how the case became post.

Certainly, this mindfulness that the Western European powers became aware to foster human rights and to cement that by decolonizing the poor nations to create conditions of stability and well-being on the aftermath of WW2, is an action that serves the interests of those western European powers much more than that of the US. Let us not forget that it was the western European powers who maintained trading posts in those poor nations that were decolonized and who relied on segregation and discrimination while ruling those countries. It would be illogical to assume that the interests that those western European nations maintained in those poor nations was erased after those countries obtained their independence. It would be in the best interests of the western European powers and everyone if the people in those nations

that were decolonized stress the importance of civic virtue and to vilify corruption to make the world become a better place for everyone. However, this rise in aggressiveness that people are exhibiting, which is contrary to what most people were exhibiting pre 1945 support that certain things must be setting them off or creating this dissatisfaction.

Indeed, the nations with great power did not erase the history of those poor nations that were subjugated to colonialism in 1945, and they were all allowed to continue to boast about how in antiquity they were once great empires or kingdoms that collapsed.

Then again, it is highly unlikely that when the Western European powers agreed with the US to grant all the nations that they were colonizing right to manage their own wealth and resources including rights to determine their political status, they did not take into account that human nature would impel those who were granted rights to work for the benefit of their own republic to figure out how to arm to prevent that the subjugation that their fathers and forefathers lived would not be something that their children or successors would relive.

The international arrangement that the Western European powers agreed to it be mounted post 1945, and all the financial aid that they are sponsoring under the different initiatives that they claim is intended to end extreme poverty, combat disease, mass migration, insecurity and conflict could be programmed to prevent the United States from converting the world into becoming a safe place so this country does not get too strong? Then again, when people become domesticated to establish relations based on the American values, it is the nations who dominated the world throughout the second millennium who are bound to gain the most, and the US is not one of them.

Heraclitus [535 – 475 BCE] claimed “No man ever steps in the same river twice, for it's not the same river and he's not the same man.”¹³ If Heraclitus claim is true, this signify that we can never go back to what once was. This also means that what once made us happy is no longer giving us satisfaction. In general, it is our experiences or decisions what changes the direction of our lives. It would be irrational to say that the

¹³ <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Heraclitus>

decision that the western European powers took to decolonize the poor nations is a decision that was not in their favor, and therefore, what is defining their reality now should be event that are much better than before when they were living under domination, and they should be happier. Likewise, we cannot say the same with respect to the western European powers. What once made them happy and them satisfaction is no longer the case after they agrees that all the nations feely determine their own political status. This signify that the power that they were wielding pre 1945 is no longer the same, and their situation could be bringing them grief and sadness. This also means that perhaps they would like to go back to wield the power or authority that they were once wielding. What if the western European powers plotted to have the United States play the role of the police of the world post ww2, to reap from under the shadow of this country power to control the world, and go back to what once was?

The US has a lot to gain if all the people in all the nations begin to collaborate based on the principle of equal rights. After the UN member states decided to not practice the work plan that the founding fathers of the UN counselled, and preferred to pursue a work program aimed at sharing on equal rights natural resources and wealth, it is the western European nations who would lose the most when everyone becomes devoted to pursuing markets for natural resources and wealth. Till now, in many nations in Europe, the actual power is in the hands of certain families, who exercises power over the constitution either symbolically or in a restrictive way. Irrespective of the form of government and political systems that would be managed in western Europe in the future, the families who exercises the role of sovereignty are going to continue to be challenged more and more. If all the people are working on improving their standard of living, and if understandably everyone want to achieve the same power or wealth, this signify that the democratic institutions that those western European countries supported to help bring the changes that exists in the world has become a challenge after the UN member states decided to change their work program to be to achieve equality and not what the founding fathers of the UN counselled. If the forces that are threatening to reverse the democratic institutions that helped to attain the standards of living that everyone enjoys are not triumphed over and/or stopped from continuing to resize people, it would be the rich families or dynasties that lives in Europe or

elsewhere who would be resized first. This will mean that the rich families or dynasties would be the one who would lose the most.

In 1969, when Neil Armstrong stepped on the moon he said: "That's one small step for a man, one giant leap for mankind." The years that followed, has proven so far, that the sky is the limit in as far as scientific exploration. Heraclitus claimed we can never go back to being what we were before, hence no man ever steps into the same water in a river twice. This signify that if the rich in western Europe do not want to be challenged by peoples' pursuit to establish equality, they must be relying on certain safeguards to prevent this from happening.

I have no way of knowing what type of safeguards the rich families in Europe and elsewhere counted on to make such a giant leap in the social order in 1945 thus they were not worried that the poor people would be inclined to resize them.

In my opinion, from the date when mankind began to keep records till now, three giant leap occurred in the social order. The first occurred in 1776. The second occurred in 1945 when the founding fathers of the US decided to expand the American values into the east. The third leap occurred when the UN member states decided to deviate away from the work program that the founding fathers of the UN counselled us to follow and chose to devote all their co-operation efforts to establish equal rights standards on earth.

So far, the commissioning of the United Nations by the UN member states to unify morality by unifying body and mind, does not seem to be prompting people to voluntarily surrender some freedom in order to have access to the protection of remaining rights, as per the same way the United States managed to achieve from 1776 to 1945. This consideration has not achieved other than to breed people who are voicing in the name of the democratic principle that they were granted right to practice the need to share on equal rights access to material things. People seem to be wrestling with each other to pick who would live the good life and who would not as well.

No one knows if the UN and the UN member states would manage to stabilize peace and security so mankind go back to demonstrate the same

tenacity that our predecessors exhibited when in 1776, they managed to coordinate efforts to transform the United States from being a new country with lots of hardships into one whose national are the happiest on earth.

The patterns that certain people have been exhibiting post 1945, point only toward one conclusion so far. It does not appear that all the existing nations practiced the measures that the United States employed from 1776 to 1945, because if this was the case, we should have begun to reap some peace dividends after more than seventy years of observing the common standards that were enunciated in the UN charter.

Then again, the un-readiness of people to surrender freedom to expand the American values poses a problem that is much bigger than humans perceive. The decision of the UN and the UN member states to fix as a work program how to make people share on equal rights the natural resources and wealth that exists, including the one that human ingenuity produces before having instituted first the American values which is a prerequisite pauses a serious challenge. There is no other leap that mankind can make beyond pursuing that every member of the human family share on equal rights the natural resources and wealth that exists, including the scientific production that a person is the author. This signify that from herein onward the only leap that mankind could make is that we either continue to pursue the revised work program that we began to implement which by the way is not what the founding fathers of the UN counselled us to get together to work jointly to achieve, or we return to balkanizing the world in its entirety as per pre-1945 cultural and economic development practices. In later chapters, I plan to show why including the issues that are at stakes.

If the forces that are threatening to reverse the democratic institutions that helped us to attain the standards that exist now, the backward leap could be an opportunity for the rich families or dynasties that lives in Europe to be happier once again. Then again, if Heraclitus claims that no man steps in the same river twice, hence he is not the same man, how could be sure that the successors of those rich families or dynasties that exists would not be reverted to a simpler form and replaced by new families.

Evidently, the fall of the authority of the existing families will depend on lots of criteria, one of which is to repulse rival claimants. Rivalry is defined as competition for the same objective or for superiority in the same field.¹⁴

Throughout history, many philosophers have criticized and cautioned against picking a social contract that its headline is about making everyone be on a development mission conscripted to build awareness in the social order about human rights, due to its effective effect in aiding to gain advantage. What could have prevented the existing nations from reaping some peace dividends after more than seventy years of observing the common standards that were enunciated in the UN charter could be due to UN member states practicing measures that are distinct from the ones the United States employed from 1776 to 1945 to domesticate its own citizens.

When the United States was domesticating its own citizens from 1776 to 1945 to develop friendly relations with one another, there were no parallel arrangements that was teaching its leaders and/or nationals about why everyone needs to foster human rights and/or to be devoted to secure his rights to realize the full development of his personality in the same way the UN member states are doing post 1945. The founding fathers of the United Nations have counselled that this international intergovernmental organization be devoted to coordinating the progressive actions that the UN member states takes to achieve the ends set forth in the UN charter. However, the leaders who succeeded the founding fathers of the United Nations expanded the role of the United Nations, and commissioned the United Nations to make people invest reactive coping to foster human rights, including becoming an economic operator as well.

As of 1945, the United Nations is regarded as the primary formal organization who has interested itself in areas related to human rights and whose work program is specifically tailored or related to fostering human rights. The United Nations, as I just said, is an organization that operates a taskforce made up of a very large number of functional organizations who are providing solutions related to human rights as

¹⁴ <https://www.lexico.com/en/definition/rivalry>

well. For example, the founding fathers of the UN stipulated that the UN Secretariat, which is the executive arm of the United Nations “shall comprise a Secretary-General and such staff as the Organization may require.”¹⁵ In 2017, this executive arm was employing a force of 38,105 staffs alone.¹⁶ If we tabulate the number of staffs that the UN is employing at its principal organs, specialized agencies, funds and programmes, commissions, institutions, affiliated organizations, subsidiary bodies and so forth, the total shall most probably be more than the entire population of a good number of UN member states that this organization was formed to coordinate their actions. In fact, the UN member states approved that the United Nations create specialized agencies that are mandated to foster human rights who are even self-financed.

If many philosophers criticized and cautioned against making people invest reactive coping to foster human rights; and if the UN member states changed the work program of this organization and made it become one that is specifically intended to provide solutions related to human rights, then one place to begin to dig for answers, on what could be preventing people from abandoning their habits and traditions to become ready to put up with one another to reach that all the natural resources and wealth are shared on equal rights, is to explore if any organization, nation, from among those who are coordinating activities between states on a global scale on issues related to human rights, are abusing their own development mission to gain advantage. Could the interference that the United Nations prompted in the social order had something to do with the reason why people are not able to put up with one another to build and maintain the post-conflict peace and stability world that we all seem to be ready to surrender some freedom to help form.

The fundamental question that I would like to put before readers in this work is whether the decline in peace and security that the world started knowing post 1945, could, at its heart, be due to the decision of the UN Member states to expand the role of the United Nations to foster human rights.

¹⁵ <https://www.un.org/en/sections/un-charter/un-charter-full-text/>

¹⁶ <http://ask.un.org/faq/14626>

In other words, if the rates of population growth, knowledge, environmental degradation and other factors, have always been part of the challenge that has prevented mankind from interacting with one another in a moral way, allowing that the United Nations become an economic operator instead of remaining as the founders of this global council counseled an intergovernmental organization intended to coordinate their work could be a threat and not as per what the UN member states are thinking this intervention is accomplishing. This also means that the decision that the UN member states took to let the UN create subsidiary organs and to task its machineries to determine and enforce actions on their behalf may not be accomplishing what they have conjectured if Heraclitus claim is true.

Therefore, what I want to specifically investigate in this work if this decision that UN member states took to let the United Nations become an economic operator and to task its subsidiary organs to interfere and improve human rights instead of letting this task continue to be the sole responsibility of governments as was the case before WW2, be among the principal causes that is preventing mankind from abandoning natural and manmade distinction to ultimately make future war impossible?

In fact, I plan to narrow the investigation even more to try to understand how the decisions of the nations with global powers to commission the United Nations to become an economic operator to foster human rights, using staffs who is granted privileges and immunities is helping those countries to defend their best interests. Related to this, I also plan to focus specifically on how the decisions of the nations with global powers to allow the United Nations to interfere in the social order to foster human rights using its machineries is helping the rich in those countries to make the poor disavow bigotry.

Statistics is a branch of mathematics that deals with collecting, organizing, analyzing, interpreting and presenting data.¹⁷ The whole class of things that we could do with statistics help us to answer questions or figure out what is going on to a diverse of topics. An idea that is frequently employed in statistics in the notion of variability.

¹⁷ <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Statistics>

Variability is defined as “the extent to which data points in a statistical distribution or data set diverge from the average value as well as the extent to which these data points differ from each other.”¹⁸ The degree to which data varies help us to understand a whole lot about cause-and-effect relationships and correlation. Therefore, when we measure variability, we can quantify how change is progressing or regressing to help us come up with policies. Most importantly, the variability that we measure help us to understand the difference between causality and correlation.

Salman “Sal” Khan (1976) is an American educator, mathematician who founded Khan Academy. The Academy that Khan founded produce video lessons teaching a wide spectrum of academic subjects.¹⁹

In one of the videos that Khan produced, titled: Correlation and Causality,²⁰ he states the following about how the two differs:

“causality says A causes B. Well, correlation just says A and B tend to be observed at the same time. Whenever I see B happening, it looks like A is happening at the same time. Whenever A is happening, it looks like it also tends to happen with B. And the reason why it's super important to notice the distinction between these is you can come to very, very, very, very, very different conclusions.”

Hence, we cannot conclude any causal relationship from any data that we collect and analyze to determine if the United Nations efforts is progressing the UN member states to attain the ends set forth in the UN charter or is regressing mankind, I plan to build my case by attempting to identify if there is some underlying cause that causes people to be intolerant or tolerant. Then, if I manage to identify a variable that has influence on how a person can behave, I plan to take the variable that has inclination to make an individual become intolerant, and check to see if I can fit this difference into a graphical linear regression relationship and a correlation. Then, I plan to see if I can build to this specific difference that I isolated a correlation, to check if as per what

¹⁸ <https://www.investopedia.com/terms/v/variability.asp>

¹⁹ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sal_Khan

²⁰ <https://www.khanacademy.org/math/probability/scatterplots-a1/creating-interpreting-scatterplots/v/correlation-and-causality>

Khan claimed that whenever what we see happening in B, it could also happen in A, could really be the case. Most importantly, I plan to check if, indeed, it is possible to come to “*very, very, very, very, very different conclusions,*” if we cannot notice the distinction and do something to stop it from progressing. If this would be the case, then it would be up to the rich who live in the nations who are a superpower to decide if they would like to request their governments to reconsider their support to the UN or not.

I have reason to believe that if the nations with great powers continue to allow the United Nations to interfere in the economic and social field to foster human rights the number of people who would disagree about what is moral from what is not would continue to rise. People would stop to be able to put up with the actions they dislike and disagree about, thus plunging those nations with great powers in insecurity and uncertainty unheard of its kind before in the history of the world. To show how the UN is prompting this crisis, I plan to show what drives such dynamism perhaps, and how allowing the UN to be an economic operator could be a threat that the UN member states are ignoring its menace and/or the impact this is having to prevent them to be in a position to be able to better defend their best interests. In fact, I plan to show using a case study how the United Nations is violating the United Nations Charter, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and most importantly, how the UN could be driving the UN member states and the rich in particular to face the same fate that the individual(s) who the UN is victimizing are crossing. I plan to share a case study to support my claim, and to justify how if the rich continue to allow that the UN be an economic operator whose staffs are enjoying privileges and immunities to injure with impunity, could be a serious threat on the maintenance of their wealth.

The purpose of this work is to show that if the rich in the nations with great powers do not pressure their leaders to reappraise their decision to let UN subsidiary organizations maintain relationship with the UN, thus allowing the staffs of this global council to use this intergovernmental organization as a platform to pursue their best interests by disguising wickedness and egoism under the pretext that they are working to improve social justice and equality, there is a big chance that the UN member states would not make progress to attain the goals that were

fixed in the preamble of the United Nations Charter. Most importantly, the work will show that if the world leaders do not resize the UN, so this organization goes back to doing what the founding fathers counselled this association of nations be created to only serve, including letting the US take the lead in harmonizing the actions of UN member states, the UN officials would perhaps drive the rich to be reverted to a simpler form so new expanding families rise.

2

Mankind's ambition to stop with seeing our specie as being an integral component of the natural system

In the animal kingdom, all the different species stay with their own kind. So far, most animals and/or living species prey on each other, and the way this is done is either individually based on the survival of the fittest or in groups.

All the existing people do not know if man is a specie that was programmed to serve the purpose that mankind conjecture the coming into becoming among the living is supposed to serve or if people were programmed for a different purpose. Humankind want to conclude that because they are distinct from the rest of the living species, that they have a purpose different than what the other living species spent their life doing. Humans want to harmonize actions based on righteousness and on conditions of stability while everyone continue to have the right to the protection of the moral and material interests resulting from any scientific, literary or artistic production of which he is the author.

Indeed, all the animals that mankind domesticate and the ones who lives in the wild appear to have accepted their fate. Humans to the contrary, from antiquity till now, appear to have a different conviction. Humans believe that because they can individually or in groups outwit other living species and/or engineer and use tools that they have a different purpose.

Surely, the philosophy that newborns were prompted to promote from antiquity till 1776 when our ancestors penned that all people are equal,

prevented our predecessors from cooperating to have the same kind of societies. As of 1776, humans have been trying to take this awareness to a new height. Humans want to create synergy to operate as a unified entity.

In the natural world, synergistic phenomena are widespread. For example, in the context of organizational behavior, ants are regarded as being a specie that act in concert to produce phenomena governed by the collective.^{21,22}

I have no way of knowing if the social organization that myrmecologist claim ants are capable to maintain in as far as their ability to modify habitats, tap resources, and defend themselves, include upholding social stratification strata similar to the one that human societies maintains so they could be used as an inspiration and subject of study.

In my opinion, the social structure or lifestyle that on its basis humans harmonize actions whereby hereditary transmission, occupational identity, ritual status, hierarchy and exclusion characterize such fabric and/or customary helped mankind to apply this modus to create reasonable relation with other living species but not with respect to its kind so far.

For instance, horse trainers claim that free-roaming horses who live in an untamed state are feral and that in general, all horses exhibit a free-spirited character. Interestingly, after a horse is tamed, he moves from being wild to being people's most faithful travel companion. The people who tame horses depend on a method that seems to be much simpler than the method that humans use to domesticate newborns. The horse trainers stand in front of the wild horse in an enclosed area and make sure that the horse is noticing the presence of the person who is working on getting it tamed. All that the trainers do afterward is shoo the horse until it realizes that when it's looking at the trainer there will be security. But if it looks somewhere else, it would be insecure - hence the shoeing act.²³

²¹ <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ant>

²² <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Superorganism>

²³ <https://lifehacker.com/how-to-tame-a-wild-horse-1822205439>

In all likelihood, once humans became aware that when matter is sliced or chopped it could fit nicely in ones' own mouth, this awareness about man's limitation to fit objects beyond the maximum mouth opening, could have made our ancestors recognize that they could better endeavor to sustain survival needs if they rely on human ingenuity. This breakthrough could have prompted human ingenuity to begin to use tools, and henceforth develop relations to address the problem of the division of labor. Accordingly, this awareness could have instigated this conviction that humans have been conjecturing from one generation to the next about the importance of delegating tasks to tools to increase happiness. Perhaps, the first agricultural revolution [10,000 BC] that Anthropologists and Archeologists claim our ancestors underwent, could have marked a fundamental change or a shift in how humankind were being domesticated pre and post their transition from maintaining a nomadic lifestyle to a settled one. Most likely, when the knowledge of those ancestors was less sophisticated thus not prompting a division of labor and requiring they maintain a nomadic lifestyle, that nature was taking care of domesticating them to be truthful to the natural environment in a manner that should not be any different from what horse trainers do to tame wild horses. Furthermore, in all probability, those ancestors could not have been focusing on centric traditions and values such as religion, God, race, nationalism, sophistication, increase in productivity to deepen their pleasures and luxuries, while at the same time devoted to look at how to sustain their survival needs, because a human being cannot naturally be doing two things at the same time. However, it looks as if, for the exception of mankind, all the living species continue to this day to not let the changes that they bring modify their purpose and/or to pause them from continuing to perceive that their purpose is about anything other than to create change that serves the natural environment. All what the rest of the living species for the exception of humans spend their lives doing is nothing but to sustain survival needs, while letting the natural system do the supervision or domestication.

Humans, on the other hand, decided to conjecture that they were not programmed to create change that serve the natural environment as per how the rest of the living species appear to spend their lives being devoted to doing. Humans decided to employ a philosophy that contradicts with what John F. Kennedy's challenged every American at

his inaugural address at doing when he stated “Ask not what your country can do for you – ask what you can do for your country.”²⁴ Humans chose to employ a domestication method that makes a newborn shift his purpose from being solely destined to create change intended to serve the natural environment into one which makes the coming into becoming among the living of a new person to be to figure out - not what the new person can do for the natural world but rather what the natural world and other humans can do for that new person.

The conviction that mankind deduced on its superiority over the rest of the living things to engineer tools made our specie suppose that our ingenuity gives us right to live different. This conviction to be the “measure of all things” has created opportunities and perils. Humans have managed to push the boundaries of their scientific skills and technical limits so they do not need to be doing like the rest of the living species getting tamed by the natural system. The tools that humans create makes them sustain survival needs from permanent settlements. Then again, it seems as if right after our ancestors began to let their relationship with the natural world pause from being a lineage dependency which runs in one direction only, and they converted it into one that gets them to eventually make it about what reality can do for the self, that their search to be sophisticated, planted the seed that led to this growing complexities within our human societies. From antiquity till now, mankind does not know how to manage and share the natural resources and/or the things that human ingenuity engineer from the material of terrestrial origin.

This conjecture that our ancestors established whereby they paused from continuing to seeing themselves as an integral component of the natural system in order to divert their energy to ask big questions, has helped each posterity that followed leading to ours a lot to learn about nature and about each other. Mankind has not come up with answers to all the big questions that gets submitted to reason but the built environment that was mounted to date is evidence of the marvels that human ingenuity has proved it is capable to achieve. The problem is that, so far, there is no evidence to support that the solar system is

²⁴ <https://www.jfklibrary.org/learn/education/teachers/curricular-resources/elementary-school-curricular-resources/ask-not-what-your-country-can-do-for-you>

shifting, shrinking, expanding or going anywhere to back if the redundant alteration between night and day are going to change. Likewise, if this natural process that exists around us, which seem to pass through a series of recurrent or symmetrical life cycle changes that follows a “birth-growth-decline-death” pattern is ever changing thus prompting us to plan differently. This signify that from antiquity till now, mankind decision to make the coming into becoming among the living of any newborn to be about finding out what the natural world could provide to our specie instead of the other way around, has been creating one dilemma after the other. Our unawareness about whether we have been programmed to serve the natural world instead of the other way around has been pushing us to establish conjectures that its conclusions has helped us to come up with social contracts regularly but all of them have been creating opportunities and perils. When it comes about making us progress in the area of strengthening justice and righteousness based on how we want the natural world be split into natural and legal rights, the challenge remains universal.

Indeed, our decision to push the boundaries of our scientific and technical limits to provide benefits for our societies has helped us to progress toward realizing the dreams and predictions of our ancestors. At the same time, the challenges that seem to be confronting the planet's human communities after we chose to do more of the same things that our ancestors claimed has pushed them to not be able to put up with one another, seem to be a trend that we are also extending voluntarily. We are more and more favoring delegating to tools and to each other the changes that the human body could have been very well programmed to maintain with nature. For one reason or another, the more we aim to have our physical bodies maintain a vertical posture instead of a horizontal one with the earth, and the more the tools that we produce seem to be distancing us away from being able to put up with one another. In other words, the more we aim to distance our physical bodies from doing the things that help us to sustain our survival needs based on depending on our own body directly, the more the tools we engineer to aid us do this work on our behalf seem to be deepening our conviction that our superiority above the rest of the living things makes us be the measure of all things. Then again, the more the number of people who seem to prefer to not subsist maintaining a horizontal posture with the natural world preferring a vertical one instead seem to grow, the more

the people who switches begin to make it their business to convert other people to abandon maintaining a horizontal position with the natural world to be like them depending on tools to sustain survival needs grow. The more the number of people who depend on their human body to sustain their survival needs shrinks, the more the people who are depending on tools to sustain survival needs, seem to be unable to put up with one another, thus needing that they all resort to force to settle their crises and disputes.

In 1941, our leaders counselled to practice tolerance and relations based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination to help us to overcome the challenges that are preventing us from possessing a complete understanding of ourselves. Their suggestion to motivate us to put up with one another was to help us be able to figure out in due time how to promote better standards without the ambition to delegate to tools the tasks that our bodies could have been programmed to effectuate in the natural world create. Actually, there were many other issues that our leaders pledged that they were going to resolve so that the conviction that our human reason seem to be fixated with, and that is the importance of distancing our physical bodies from continuing to depend on the human faculty to cater for the human body to stay alive and/or as a way to live free from fear and want, would not plunge mankind in another global war. The practice that humans follows to freeze and transfer social space and material things to designated individuals without there being a planning program designed to control the number of children parents could have, compelled people to resort to disregard to secure their rights throughout history. In fact, the technical superiority that people observe aids in securing that an individual does not live in fear and want, has been a principal driver in mankind's fixation that when a person's access to material things around him grows, his security grows reciprocally. Unfortunately, if this was the case, we would all be still living under the rule of the Akkadian empire, which many historians claim was among the first ancient empires.

Indeed, our leaders recognized that the natural inequality and division of labor makes it impossible for a nation to dominate all others, because those who feel threatened could unite in a defensive coalition. For this reason, our leaders proposed to the nations whose scientific progress

was less advanced and/or whose built environment was not as developed to come onboard to co-operate so everyone in all the lands would work and contribute to solve the ram of political and social challenges that they inherited. In this way, our successors could eventually live free from and want in this vertical posture that mankind perceive that our specie was programmed to assume and/or is better for one's own self-fulfillments.

Our leaders counselled us to create an international intergovernmental organization to coordinate the interlinking or harmonization of actions of all the people (or nations) to secure the inalienable rights of all the human family to enjoy freedom from fear and want. The international intergovernmental organization that was created on the aftermath of WW2 and was named United Nations was tasked with coordinating the actions of UN member states to attain the ends set forth in the UN Charter.

The oxford dictionary defines coordination as being “The organization of the different elements of a complex body or activity so as to enable them to work together effectively.”²⁵ No one knows why man wants to interfere in how the natural world was programmed to coordinate the different complex bodies that exists, when they all seem to be systemized to follow a “birth-growth-decline-death” pattern that work together effectively. Perhaps, the perception that people form from observing, as I said before, how the natural system is on its own coordinating the redundant alteration between night and day, and/or how the machines that humans engineer work, could be a factor that drive our specie to suppose that we can duplicate the same coordination effectiveness. The vehicles or airplanes that engineers and technicians assemble for us to use as a mean of transportation, do the coordination when such machines are in motion independent from human interference. All what humans do is steer the vehicle in a given direction when they travel a distance between two points. Humans could be considering that because of the large number of people who are distancing their human bodies from maintaining a horizontal posture with the natural world in favor of assuming a vertical one that this action, which I said earlier, seem to be keeping mankind unable to

²⁵ <https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/coordination>

maintain social cohesion, require that human ingenuity intervene to coordinate this task while the natural birth-death life cycle is arranging the rest.

Indeed, the suggestion that our leaders counselled us in 1941 to practice (i.e., tolerance and relations based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination) does require coordination. Therefore, the idea of our leaders to suggest to form an organization to coordinate their pledge to narrow the economic gap that exists between the less-well off countries and the most well-off ones makes sense. Colonization made many nations function with their political, social, economic and educational preparedness below that of the industrialized nations. Arranging to have a global council that could coordinate the work of all the UN member states to assure the people in the nations that colonization made their unpreparedness in the political, social, economic and educational not be at par with the industrialized nations is imperative to prevent the disadvantaged communities in the less-well off countries from perceiving that the most well-off ones are not taking action on their pledge to make every member of the human family life free from fear and want thus giving them reason to withdraw their support. Surely, when there is a global council that less-well off countries and most well-off ones could go to in order to fix and review progress, this action would not encourage the nations whose lack of access to material things makes them perceive that they are not improving their life chances fast. This action will also prevent poor nations from justifying why they need to resort to erratic behavior to deepen their happiness or to attain their goals.

No one knows why the leaders of the nations with great power approved that the United Nations become an economic operator and to create UN subsidiary organs to interfere and improve human rights instead of letting this international intergovernmental organization stick to coordinating the work of the UN member states to attain the goals set forth in the UN charter as counselled by the founding fathers of this association of nations.

The founding fathers of the United Nations did not counsel, as I said before, that existing nations create an association of nations on the aftermath of WW2 to foster human rights but one intended to coordinate

the work of UN member states only. Most importantly, the founding fathers of the United Nations counseled that existing nations practice tolerance on the aftermath of WW2 to build the post-war world that they said would be predestined to make every member of the human family manage to improve his living standards eventually. It would be irrational to assume that the founders of the United Nations did not know that the natural inequality or division of labor makes it impossible that all the people progress to the same economic and/or development level even if we were to mount a single common political authority that exercises authority over the entire world. The people who live in NYC or Dubai depend on the farmers who live in Africa and in other cities from around the world to provide them with the food they need to survive. Is it possible that the founding fathers of the United Nations did not know that when a nation freezes its land surface and leave no place for its people to meet its survival needs because of the infrastructure and the socio-economic development model it is implementing, that its people would have to depend on the nations whose land surface is not frozen to sustain its needs and satisfy its earthly desires? Surely, enough knowledge exists now so the people who lives in NYC or Dubai could begin to build high rises (or floatable decks) that would be styled to plant food to sustain survival needs if needs be. But the specific question I want to raise here is what could happen to peace and security when the UN member states continues to implement a different work program than the one the founding fathers of the United Nations counselled we setup to attain the goals set forth in the UN Charter? Would the UN member states manage to maintain peace and security when more people are driven to stop maintaining a horizontal posture with the natural world in order to be taking up a vertical one? Would the UN member states manage to maintain peace and security among each other when they are pursuing a social contract that splits reality into natural and legal rights, and the outcomes that this type of ideology produces forces people continually to squeeze themselves into smaller livable social space to let the socio-economic development model that they are implementing subsist? Would the UN member states manage to prevent that one state take advantage of its strength and become much stronger than others, when the governance system that mankind pursue is based on a structure which divide people geographically and demographically into large and small states, and each one is preaching that mankind was programmed to distance the physical body from continuing to depend

on the human faculty to cater for this living mass so tools could do that part instead? Most importantly, would the UN member states manage to control and regulate peace and security when they tasked the UN to be in addition to playing the coordination role speed up their work program to have every member of the human family abandon his traditions and values (or ways of living) in order to be modernized so each independent nation gain advantage?

I do not know from where to start to answer the afore questions and/or if there is an overarching entity that is posing and answering how to maneuver and/or adjust the global governance system so we stay on track to achieve the ends set forth in the UN charter. Leonardo da Vinci [1452- 1519], once said: “He who loves practice without theory is like the sailor who boards ship without a rudder and compass and never knows where he may cast.”²⁶

Indeed, the social realm that emerged on the aftermath of WW2 does not support that the UN member states or the UN are relying on theory to steer the global governance system to stay on track to achieve the ends set forth in the UN charter. The patterns that some people are exhibiting does not support that when we have delegated to human reason the task to coordinate how to tame humans to be faithful, this aptitude is capable on preventing people from withdrawing their support in the same way the natural world manages to tame all the rest of the living species and/or humans are able to domesticate some animals to stay truthful.

For instance, the way the natural world programmed the human body to coordinate the transition of this complex body, from birth to death, we find that there is no such thing as most important organ. There are organs we can live without such as eyes, breasts, hands, etc. only. However, even though every human organs seem to have a function and it is better not to live without, but there are organs that are generally considered vital such as the nervous system, heart and lungs, or brain, because of the role they play to preserve the integrity of the body as a system. For instance, the heart is an organ that pumps blood in the human body to keep all the organs alive or as one. When a vital organ

²⁶ <http://www.oceanofnews.com/15-sea-quotes/>

such as the heart stops to properly function, the functioning of a human being as a system becomes disorganized until a person eventually dies.

When I analyze what the founding fathers of the UN counseled us to setup pre 1945 to attain the ends set forth in the UN Charter, I find that what they programmed is not that far off from how the natural world programmed the human organs to coordinate relationships with one another in the human body.

In the human body, each organ remains fulfilling the role that it was programmed to play from its fixed position. None of the human organs changes its fixed position throughout the life of the human body. In other words, the brain does not compete with another organs or tries to duplicate the same function that another organ is fulfilling. The brain was programmed to be located in the upper part in the human body, and this organ fulfills its role from its fixed position. Interestingly, no organ function without the need of the other. The coordination role that each organ plays is integral in terms of maintaining the reliability of the system or the human body.

Perhaps, the founding fathers of the UN perceived that if they make a new attempt at coordinating their actions in the same way the heart plays or serves in the human body to keep all the organs alive or as one, they could be able to overcome the challenges that they encountered when they mounted the League of nations on the aftermath of WW1 leading to its dissolution.

Indeed, there is a big difference between how the founding fathers of the UN perceived to attain the ends set forth in the UN Charter, and the path the political leaders who succeeded those founders and the UN system are progressing to attain the same ends. In fact, there could be a lot to learn from the way the founding fathers of the UN perceived to make people begin to practice tolerance so every member of the human family could eventually start to achieve practical results for the greater well-being of society and the way the UN and the political leaders who succeeded the founding fathers at this association of nations are trying to achieve the same end, by depicting this relationship based on the way the heart or another vital organ coordinates with the other organs actions in the human body.

Lucius Annaeus Seneca (c. 4 BC – AD 65), was a Roman Stoic philosopher. He once said: “If one does not know to which port one is sailing, no wind is favorable.”^{27,28} It would be irrational to assume that the founding fathers of the UN did not know that the progress of existing nations cannot be organized in a manner other than in a manner that would be identical to the way organs are stacked one on top of the other in the human body, whereby each organ occupy a fixed position throughout the life span of a person. In other words, when the human body is in the horizontal position, or when it is in the vertical position and even in motion, each organ maintains its fixed position in the body and does not compete or tries to duplicate the role that another organ is fulfilling. If those founding fathers wanted us to compete in the economic field based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples, this means that they wanted us to have the courage to accept the second best if what one considers the first best is not attainable. This also means having the courage to practice tolerance based on maintaining the economic standing that the country reached at the end of ww2 until the global cooperation that the nations with great powers promised they would be working to regularize between all the existing nations is accomplished.

I do not know if the work program that the UN member states and the UN system began to pursue on the aftermath of WW2 could help mankind to achieve the goals set forth in the UN charter, when the natural inequality that a person is born into is not voluntarily but an involuntary one. This signify that the moral and material interests resulting from any scientific, literary or artistic production that the different people (or nations) achieve could be a result of the capacity of each respective community to comprehend its natural reality differently, and to harness its own realm to its advantage accordingly. Therefore, the distinct natural environment and the different comprehension that each individual conjecture about his own purpose gets us to be aligned in the same way the organs of the human body are positioned one on top of the other when the body is in the vertical posture, and not as the case is like, when each organ becomes situated next to the other as in when the body mass is in the horizontal posture.

²⁷ <http://www.oceanofnews.com/15-sea-quotes/>

²⁸ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Seneca_the_Younger

Humans can crawl and/or set their body mass to be in motion when it is in the horizontal posture on the ground, but our specie seem to have been programmed to be doing work much faster when the human body is in the vertical posture. In other words, even though the nose, brain, heart, legs, kidneys, hands or feet would all be aligned or equally placed in the same axis when the human body is maintaining a horizontal posture with the ground or the natural world, but when the human body assume the vertical posture, each organ go back to being stacked one on top of the other.

The UN member states and the UN system are making people invest reactive coping to eradicate poverty, injustice, inequality and the like since 1945. This signify that what those UN member states and the UN system are resolving when they are coming up with work program to eradicate poverty, injustice or inequality, and fixing deadline to attain such ambitions as the Sustainable Development Goals²⁹, and before that, the Millennium Development Goals³⁰ is nothing but to make more people by such date stop with continuing to put up with maintaining the direct relationship that a person could have been programmed to maintain with the natural world and/or is born into involuntary, so as to be integrated in this vertical posture that mankind chose to build relationship on its premise with one another.

The only difference is that the UN member states and the UN system want that when people are in the vertical posture, that they do not be stacked in fixed positions in the same way the different organs maintain their fixed locations when the human body is standing, but to have all people be realizing the full development of their personality on equal rights basis in the same way when the human organs become aligned or equally placed in the same axis when the human body is in the horizontal posture.

Indeed, what the UN member states and the UN system are attempting to achieve in the social order seems to be not that different from the events that occurred when Jesus and his disciples were teaching people to stop to put up with the actual political order in favor of postponing access to material things to the afterlife. Surely, the story that emerged

²⁹ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sustainable_Development_Goals

³⁰ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Millennium_Development_Goals

about Jesus having risen from the dead and that he marked by his resurrection, a way so people could go on to live their normal lives, spared mankind from the disorder that was awaiting those ancestors if the people who were living in this epoch continued to be uninterested with accumulating material things in order to pursue philosophical conjectures. The resurrection did help the rich to maintain their status and production lines up and running. But, as we know, the movement that Jesus and his disciples were teaching to have people love each other and to build compassion, cost the roman empire its power and authority. Are the UN member states and the UN system machinating to botch all human rights milestones that our predecessors paid very dearly during the American Civil War and WW2 to get us to stop to put with one another hierarchically in order to bring us back to new dark days in human history?

When we compare how the social cohesion that the people of Saudi Arabia, Dubai, Qatar, Bahrain, Sultanate of Oman, or Yemen were upholding before WW2 to how this connectedness changed after those people were modernized post WW2, we find that those GCC nations cut their relations with one another when their economies started to grow and to displace each other. The challenges that the GCC countries appear to be going through do not seem to be any different from the one that occurred in Western Europe when the wealth of all those nations became plus or minus at the same level. Those European nations were settling most of their disputes, before WW2, through wars.

What if the reason why the GCC countries are settling their disputes through wars in the same way the western European powers were doing until WW2 is because of the nations with great powers counselling them to look for pacific solutions?

How could we expect our world to look like when the economy of the GCC countries begin to compete against the nations with great powers? Would those nations solve their problems pacifically with those GCC countries?

Moreover, if the UN member states and the UN system are prompting the people who live in the least well-off countries to abandon their values and traditions to be modernized and have access to all the

material things that the people in the most well-off countries possess, how could we be sure that those nations would not face each other off in the same way the GCC's are now confronting each other after the people who live in the Arabian gulf states abandoned their values and traditions to be modernized?

Great Britain who is one of the founders of the United Nations has voted to withdraw from the European Union for reasons in which economic rivalry is playing a major role. Are the UN member states and the UN system working on making people who live in the least well-off countries develop awareness to strip from the people who live in the most well-off countries their wealth?

Indeed, the UN member states and the UN system do not seem to be pursuing the work program the founding fathers of the UN outlined. The UN member states and the UN system want us to be able to program our relations, without the natural inequality that gets us to be stacked in a vertical posture involuntarily and not voluntarily right after birth, being taken into account when we harmonize relations. The UN member states and the UN want us to practice tolerance so every member of the human family could eventually start to achieve practical results for the greater well-being of society without the natural distinction such as race, colour, sex, or the manmade distinction such as language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth or other status that on its basis people create communities and harmonize actions interfere.

Can the UN member states and the UN get us to the port that the founding fathers of the UN counselled us to harmonize actions post WW2 to spare us from living the disregard that they knew. All those afore things that the UN member states and the UN system want us to abandon in our programming are parameters that even if we voluntarily want to surrender freedom to have some of them not influence our relations, we are not able to do so. In the first place, those parameters are the criteria that makes us be not equal. If the UN member states and the UN system want us to reprogram our relations without those parameters interfering in how we manage and distribute natural resources and/or the tools that our human ingenuity creates from those material of terrestrial origin, we would have to change our complex

social system to a much simpler one in the same way our predecessors during antiquity changed their complex religious system that was loaded with gods, goddesses, demigods, and mythological creatures with a single all-powerful God. The problem is that even if we were to make all the people believe in Buddhism or we get all to start speaking Spanish so we do not let lots of distinction influence our behavior we cannot start to put up with one another because of the division of labor problem. Likewise, if we make all the people operate from under a single state that exercises authority over the entire world, or see that every member of the human family lives in a modern city, it is not possible to have people begin to share on equal rights natural resources and wealth, because we live in a world that the only permanent truth in it has been till now change. And so, if death, and the parameters that the UN member states and the UN system want us to abandon when we do programing are what continuously cause empires to collapse, and/or poverty or injustice to exist, the question that begs an answer at the start of this new millennium is straightforward: Should UN member states continue to let the UN and its system program actions that we already know that all what it does is accelerate the materialization of the outcomes that were just mentioned. And so, once again, if all the initiatives that the UN is pursuing were tested with by our predecessors before and we already know that they all failed, should we go back to programing as per the way the founding fathers counselled by having each nation pick its own political and economic status for as long as its governance system adhere to respect the international machinery that was programed, or should we continue to let the UN contribute to promote ion of its own economic and social advancement thus preventing nations from achieving the successes that the US managed to demonstrate mankind is capable to attain?

Indeed, the accelerated way that the UN member states and the UN system are going about to attain the ends set forth in the UN charter does not seem to support that the wind has been favorable after 72 years of attempt to sail toward the port that the founding fathers of the UN counselled we should head to spare us from living the disregard that they knew. Based on how the world order seem to be evolving post WW2, the only benefactor from the programming that the UN member states and the UN system are pursuing appear to be the “parameters”

that the UN system is accelerating our awareness about them so we could use them to improve our life chances so far.

If we take all the parameters that the UN member states and the UN system want us to not program our relations on their basis, we find that some of them are natural such as race, color or sex, and some are manmade such as language, religion or political status.

Let us put all the natural distinction on the side because humans have not been provided right to change such parameters. Of the manmade distinction that people depend on, religion has had a significant impact on the political system in any countries. If a new global war is to erupt, we know that people would not stop to believe in supernatural forces and the importance of practicing compassion to prevent a relapse to violence.

Religion is a cultural system that relates humanity to supernatural controlling power including making people believe about the importance of ethics. The purpose from having existing nations come together to create a global council on the aftermath of ww2 was to arrange for all the different governments space to consult, deliberate or review the progress that they are making to deepen ethics. After the UN member states approved that the UN intervene in the social order to foster human rights and economic development its staffs are in principle doing is teaching people work ethics and frugality. This also signify that the UN interest in the social arena could be a concept that is not any different from the values religion is teaching. Throughout history, religion has had a significant impact on the political systems that people mount in the different countries.

The role of religion within societies has differed widely between nations. Whereas in some nations religion was considered harmful and in others the association of religion in the political and social system was endorsed and was regarded to have improved the quality of life, the purpose and arguments in support of religion has varied widely, because the right and wrong narrative ethics that religion tries to influence people to emphasize can be contentious due to ethnocentric views on morality. The Golden Rule is the principle of treating others as one's

self would wish to be treated.³¹ This rule is found in many religions and cultures. Many philosophers such as Karl Mar, Sigmund Freud, Max Weber, Emile Durkheim and others have criticized this rule and argued that it is not possible that mankind practice. Two people cannot fill the same void space and therefore this explains why. The efforts that aims to exclude religion from social activities or civic affairs has as goal to pause the people from using religion as a political tool to gain advantage. The set of ideas that the UN is promoting and want everyone take action to attain are not any different from the one that religion teaches and/or expect that every individual keep constantly in mind when determining between right and wrong.

Are the UN member states and the UN system mounting a new force in the world so that its objectives is to secure the observance of ethical norms that are not any different from the one religion promote? If so, how could we be sure that the two systems would be able to live as good neighbors right next to each other, and would not eventually collide with one another in the same way certain religions have crashed?

As I said earlier, we cannot collect data and analyze it to come up with any causal relationship and/or to determine if the UN member states decision delegated to the United Nations new tasks besides the ones that the founding fathers of the UN counselled to attain the ends set forth in the UN charter faster or if this move was taken to regress mankind. In other words, we have no way of knowing if people are beginning to put up with one another, and if the answer is no; if they would begin to do it at later time. Our inability to know if we are making any progress to attain the ends set forth in the UN charter prevent us from passing any judgment on the UN effectiveness or efforts so far. However, we can try to identify if there is a correlation.

The disputes that the western European powers experienced when their economies started to displace each other, could be correlated to the events that the GCC countries encountered when their wealth was accelerated. The GCC countries do not possess weapons of mass destruction thus their disregard to peace and security could threaten human progress. The same could not be said about most of the industrialized nations.

³¹ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Golden_Rule

For example, Great Britain is a nation that is one of the principal founders of the United Nations, and its people voted to withdraw from the European Union for reasons in which economic rivalry is playing a major role, as I said. If it is possible that we could come to “*very, very, very, very, very different conclusions,*” in a given correlation, then this signify that if Great Britain continues to be minimized that the outcome of the conflict that his country would be waging may not produce the same outcomes that the GCC countries conflict produced so far. If the economy of the nations with great power displace each other to the point where a given nation become unable to maintain balance of power, its political leaders could put humanity at great risks if WMD were used.

If it is only until when we stop man from being the measure of all things could we say that we are on our way to eradicate poverty, injustice, or inequality, we could then say that all the challenges that the GCC countries are knowing, the ones that Great Britain is facing, and all the other ones that other nations are facing as well are a result of the decision of the UN member states and the UN system to accelerate people’s awareness to foster human rights, We can also say that for as long as the United Nations does not have power to reprogram natural inequality that all the interference that this international organization is achieving is serving nothing but to regress mankind from the milestones that our predecessors achieved from antiquity till 1945 to deepen people connectedness. In other words, all what the UN is going to be continuing on doing if this association of nations is not paused from being an economic operator who is prompting people to abandon their values and traditions to be modernized is nothing but accelerating this cycle of insecurity that has accompanied mankind from one generation to the next, and now it is our turn to live its drawbacks instead of putting an end to it.

The reason why the insecurity would go on is obvious. If the UN is fostering human rights, then all what we have done post 1945 is to augment the awareness of people about this idea. This means that we multiplied the values that religion promotes in two post 1945 instead of reducing them. For example, the people who dedicate themselves to the service of God and their neighbor believe that they have a Christian duty to introduce biblical law into the secular sphere. The idea of

secularization emerged to weaken the authority of religion in all aspects of social life and politics. The main aim is to stop the people who dedicate themselves to the service of God and/or their neighbor from enhancing their own status and influence to achieve social control. Many philosophers, as I said before, claim that as people become more and more modernized, people religiosity would decrease.

Anti-clericalism is opposition to religious authority, typically in social or political matters.³² This idea seeks to “remove religious authority from all aspects of public and political life, and its involvement in the everyday life of the citizen.” The people who “oppose religious authority in public and political life support their claim on the basis of moral corruption, institutional issues and/or disagreements in religious interpretation.”

Enlightened absolutism (also called enlightened despotism) refers to the conduct and policies of European absolute monarchs during the 18th and 19th centuries who were influenced by the ideas of the enlightenment, espousing them to enhance their power.³³

An enlightened despot is a “non-democratic or authoritarian leader who exercises their political power for the benefit of the people, rather than exclusively for themselves or elites.” Enlightened despots “distinguished themselves from ordinary despots by claiming to rule for their subjects' well-being.”

Enlightened despots “may focus government priorities on health care, education nonviolent population control, or physical infrastructure.”

The leader “may profess a commitment to peaceful relations and/or allow some democratic decision-making, such as public referenda, but would not propose reforms that undermined their sovereignty or disrupted the social order.”

Many commentators claim that the United Nations has interested itself in the social arena, fostering human rights, economic development,

³² <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Anti-clericalism>

³³ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Enlightened_absolutism

decolonization, health and education, trade, refugees and many other fields.³⁴

A prince-bishop is a “bishop who is also the civil ruler of some secular principality and sovereignty”³⁵

In the Holy Roman Empire, the term free and imperial cities, was used to “denote a self-ruling city that had a certain amount of autonomy and was represented in the Imperial diet.”³⁶

Many Prince-Bishops during the Holy Roman Empire combined religious and secular authority and broke away from the church authority and declared themselves independent and completely secular of religious affairs.^{37,38}

During the Holy Roman Empire, the principality where prince-bishop politically ruled used to overlap with the diocesan jurisdiction. Therefore, the city of residence of the prince-bishop used to be exempt from his civil-rule.

The Imperial Diet was the deliberative body of the Holy Roman Empire. It was not a legislative body in the contemporary sense; its members envisioned it more like a central forum where it was more important to negotiate than to decide.³⁹

What if the Imperial Diet body still exists to this day, and what if the United Nations is a new form of an enlightened despot that the representative of this assembly formed as a backup to protect their authority from decreasing in all aspects of social life and governance due to how modernization and rationalization is believed to diminish religiosity?

³⁴ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/History_of_the_United_Nations#Activities

³⁵ <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Prince-bishop>

³⁶ [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Imperial_Diet_\(Holy_Roman_Empire\)](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Imperial_Diet_(Holy_Roman_Empire))

³⁷ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Gotthard_Kettler

³⁸ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Livonian_Order

³⁹ [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Imperial_Diet_\(Holy_Roman_Empire\)](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Imperial_Diet_(Holy_Roman_Empire))

We can continue to hide behind our fingers and claim that before 1990 it was communism, and now it is radical Islamization what is making the job of the UN difficult to get people to emphasize tolerance and/or to prevent people to purge from their behavior their attachment to their tribal mindset. We could also argue that all the insecurity that mankind is knowing could be a temporary period as a result of the reorganization UN member states are knowing until the new postwar world order that the nations with great powers promised to mount is fully installed. But if after seventy-two years of attempts to make people become ready to be tolerant and to share on equal rights material things (as per the work program that the UN started pursuing), Great Britain's decision to withdraw from the European Union is what we have to show in return, then one of two scenarios could be true. The first is if the United Nations is instigating the insecurity that UN member states began to know after this organization began to accelerate people awareness to narrow the gap between the rich and the poor, instead of making progress on the cultural authority that the US emphasized from 1776 to 1945. The second is if the coming together of UN member states to resolve disputes passively, and to advance social welfare through working toward a world free of want and fear is not the right prescription to maintain world peace. In other words, the coming together of nations to provide solutions of international economic, social, health, and related problem to create conditions of stability and well-being which are necessary for peaceful and friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples is erroneous for world peace.

Since it would be anti-logic to assume that the coming of together of UN member states to maintain international peace and security, and/or to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace is a threat to mankind, then if human nature has not changed pre and post the founding of the United Nations, we can presume that if UN member states are not able to suppress acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace, and to bring about by peaceful means, and in conformity with the principles of justice and international law, adjustment or settlement of international disputes or situations to be because of a flaw in the UN work program. We know that the founding fathers of the UN did not council that the UN become an economic operator and provide solutions of international economic,

social, health, and related problem to create conditions of stability and well-being, as I said before. Hence, the UN member states did not implement what the founding fathers of the UN counselled this global council be fully devoted to doing to establish if indeed their suggestion to existing nations to come together to resolve disputes passively and to advance social welfare through working for a world free of want and fear is erroneous to maintain world peace, we can only presume that the ambitions of the UN to interfere in the political status of UN member states to bring the political, economic, social or educational unpreparedness of nations to be at the same level is a principal perpetrator of this wave of intolerance that seem to have swept mankind.

Most importantly, if people till 1945 structured their relations with each other and material things based on natural and legal rights, and for all we know, the UN member states did not change the way they wanted every member of the human family continue to interrelate in the economic field on the aftermath of WW2 (to the contrary, they even added that it should be done based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination), how could we be sure that the United Nations efforts post 1945 to make every member of the human family be entitled to the same social, cultural and economic rights is not the drawback that is making people become unable to put up with one another. We already know that if our predecessors could have been able to harmonize actions based on the way the UN started testing with us, this idea of world peace would have been attained by now, and there would not have been any need to have wars so nations resize each other.

In other words, if the natural environment is continually generating inequality, and if the economic and social policies that mankind use and depend on to establish natural and legal rights and/or harmonize actions generate the same outcome at all the time, i.e., inequality, how could we be sure that after the UN chose to make people stop with putting up with their own lives or livelihoods in order to be entitled to the same social, cultural and economic rights that a person who lives in Bingham palace in Great Britain has access to, that its efforts are not plunging mankind in insecurity unheard of its kind?

Moreover, if the UN is working toward making humans pause from letting the natural and legal economic and social rights that mankind use

and depend on to harmonize actions stand ahead of its own efforts to create stability, how do we know that its efforts to make everyone equal and capable to realize the full development of his personality, is not going to make the nations with great powers lose patience with one another and use the weapons of mass destruction that certain nations possess to resize each other thus bringing mankind to going back to living in the same way which our ancestors lived before the first agricultural revolution. If the UN continue to get into the head of the poor that they should stop to see their relationships with the rich to be one that is based on a social stratification structure as per the way it has been the case since time immortal, so everyone begins to delegate to tools the role that the human body could very well have been programmed to be devoted to doing, could our leaders manage to get our successors to put up with one another when already we are not able to do so based on the existing built environment?

Indeed, if the UN continue to want to build a name for itself and people continue to be unable to put up with one another and remain being bound by their personal power and conscience to get their way, there is a good chance that the nations with global war may choose to have existing nations harmonize action based on pre 1945 ideologies. The nations with great power could also choose to set up a single state that exercises authority over the entire world. How could we be assured that the United Nations ambitions to eradicate poverty, injustice, social and economic inequality does not expand to include aspiring to revert the existing families of financiers who control the money supply of the world presently into a simpler form so new families play this role? Hence, it could also be the existing families of financiers along with the people of religious authority who are prompting this wave of intolerance that emerged post WW2, I plan to check, if it is healthy to preserve their interests to have the United Nations preserve the cultural authority that the US managed to achieve from 1776 to 1945 and/or to continue to make people stop with putting up with each other to emphasize the importance of material things over what the UN founding fathers counseled people practice and that is tolerance so peace and security become stabilized. This would help to clear the role international families of financiers and the people of religious authority could have played in his wave of intolerance that emerged post WW2, and set the ground to check if the United Nations ambitions to build a name for

itself are retarding mankind from making progress to attain the ends set forth in the UN Charter to ultimately ensure lasting peace?

3

Could mankind’s irrational patterns be rooted in our decision to make the purpose of the human life to be about providing benefits for our society?

The Latin word “a priori” and “a posteriori” are two philosophical terms of art that Immanuel Kant [1724 – 1804] popularized in his book *Critique of Pure Reasoning* which he published in 1781.^{40,41} Philosophers and mathematicians in all the different schools of thought use to this day those two words to distinguish between what must come before sense observation from a conclusion based on sense observation, which must follow it. Actually, even Socrates [470 -390 BC] who is credited with laying the fundamentals of modern Western philosophy was very interested in understanding the limits of human knowledge,⁴² which goes to show since how far back our predecessors have been like us keenly working to deepen their knowledge about nature and our relationship to the world and to each other.

In the year 2015, the United Nations launched a work program called Sustainable Development Goals (SDG). The UN developed the Sustainable Development Goals to succeed the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), which ended in 2015. The UN claimed that it plans to achieve the targets fixed in the new SDG work program by 2030. Among the list of targets fixed, is included ending poverty in

⁴⁰ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Immanuel_Kant

⁴¹ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Critique_of_Pure_Reason

⁴² <https://www.history.com/topics/ancient-history/socrates>

all its forms and everywhere⁴³ by this date. We are all witness that none of the MDG's which the UN claimed in the year 2000 would be adopted to end poverty in the least developed nations by 2015 did materialize. The MDG's do not seem to have transformed our world into becoming more peaceful so we could have new hopes that the new goals would produce any outcomes that would be any different than the results the MDGs yielded, and/or would act to prevent future conflicts. The question that is important here; is how would the people that the UN would have accelerated their coping mechanism and made them want to be focused on reducing economic and social inequality be ready to put up with one another when mankind pursue an economic system that produces winners and losers. In addition, mankind, harmonize actions based on social contract that splits reality into natural and legal rights including allowing dead and living people to freeze social space and to transfer the material they accumulate to designated individuals.

Kant argued that "the human mind creates the structure of human experience, and that the world as it is in-itself is independent of humanity's concepts of it."⁴⁴ For example, in his book *Perpetual Peace: A philosophical Sketch* [1795], Kant argued that perpetual peace could be secured through universal democracy and international cooperation.⁴⁵ He believed that this idea of perpetual peace would be the eventual outcome of universal history. Kant went on to even say that the history of humankind would be presented as a whole, although it would not be rationally planned this way. We are all observing how science is taking us more and more into this direction by structuring our actions based on explicit algorithms.

In his work, *Critique of Pure Reason* (1781), Kant attempts to explain the relationship between reason and human experience and proposes moving beyond the failures of traditional philosophy and metaphysics. Kant believed, as I said earlier, that the mind shaped the human experience, and that man need to put an end to futile and speculative theories of human experience, thus in so doing resist skepticism. May be the United Nations subscribe to this philosophy that Kant regarded himself appertaining to its conjectures. This school of thought believes

⁴³ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sustainable_Development_Goals

⁴⁴ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Immanuel_Kant

⁴⁵ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Perpetual_Peace:_A_Philosophical_Sketch

that it is possible to go beyond the impasse that has prevented mankind from finally creating the opportunities that rationalists and empiricists are at all the time stipulating require conclusive evidence to validate. Accordingly, the UN is fixing goals that makes people accelerate the changes that people perpetrate in nature. Then again, the UN does not seem to be taking into account what Kant also suggested in relation to change. Kant believed that “the world as it is in-itself is independent of humanity's concepts of it.” This signify that what our senses convey to us as concepts of causes and effect are not sufficient alone. The UN is ignoring that we are not alone in creating change, but nature was also programmed to do the same and/or the lion share. Furthermore, if we take into account David Hume’s [1711 -1776] work which he titled *A Treatise of Human Nature* (1738), and in which he argues that passion rather than reason governs human behavior,⁴⁶ this signify that the United Nations presupposition that making people accelerate changes in matter without evidence that its efforts are creating the opportunities that would allow future newborns to establish conditions under which justice and respect of human laws, could be a threat that humankind and the nations with great power in particular are underestimating. Could the nations with great powers manage to preserve their ability to defend their best interests and/or the rich when the UN is pushing people to invest reactive coping to emphasize the importance of material things over moral values?

Hume’s argument about inductive reasoning and our beliefs about cause and effect not being something that could be justified by reason; instead, our faith in induction and causation is the result of mental habit and custom, is a paradox that calls into question all empirical claims deduced or made in everyday life including the one reached through the scientific method.

If after more than 70 years of attempt by the UN to make people accelerate creating changes in matter on the hope that such programming could achieve practical results for the greater well-being of society, and till now, most people continue to do whatever they desire without their being evidence to support that the happiness that people are amassing is making them become tolerant, how long should

⁴⁶ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/A_Treatise_of_Human_Nature

mankind continue to wait on the United Nations for its efforts to start to make a difference in the social realm! If human detention time (or life span) is temporary, how could we expect newborn to be trained by existing people who themselves are not able to put up with one another to purge the tribal mindset that we depend on to deny each other rights.

It seems as if the preoccupation of the nations with great powers during the past 70 years to find out who would manage first to figure out how can science uncover “what must come before sense observation from conclusion based on sense observation, which must follow it” so it would be possible to make mankind be finally ready to sweep away the old and establish the new is making those superpowers underestimate the perils that the United Nations is piling up in the social order to enable them to maintain their conditions of strength and stability. The decision of our ancestors to connect the changes that a person exhibit in matter to serve relationships that splits actions between good and evil, or tangible and intangible and so forth, helped to place the purpose of humanity in a context that made it possible to structure people’s behavior. Our predecessors did not stop at interlinking the actions that man exhibit in matter to such metaphoric relation only, but proceeded to structure the motion (or mobility) of humankind to concepts or conjectures that are more complex in substance and form than their search to deepen their own understanding of man’s relation to reality to make the natural world serve mankind’s needs better. In other words, the decision of our predecessors to come up with the idea of God or Gods, good or evil, tangible or intangible and so forth to promote on their premise relations whereby a member gives up his natural rights to strengthen moral obligations could all be conjectures that man employ to preserve his own nature and maximize his wellbeing. However, the idea of structuring the motion of man to accommodate natural and legal rights, and to have the UN convert such rights into becoming an interest right enshrine a concept that could be as complex as the idea that humans came up with to make actions serve good and evil forces. The idea of good or evil, heaven or hell, “0” or ‘1”, up or down, small or big and so forth, could all be manmade or programmed philosophical conjecture, whereas motion seem to be a truth that is controlled and regulated by natural laws.

Since 1945, the UN has been making people accelerate their motion to serve philosophical conjectures that no truth was formed so far to support that their outcome promote world peace. That is said, how can we be sure that the pursuit of such philosophical conjectures is consistent with the maintenance of the strength and stability of the nations that the UN is on their behalf making their citizen invest reactive coping so they accelerate their access to material things. In physics, when the motion of an object is accelerated the energy that gets released upon collision is greater than when the velocity of the object is kept low. Could our successors find that the decision of our leaders to let the UN accelerate our motion useful to help them voluntarily surrender freedom to ensure lasting peace or the policies that we are sowing for them would not be something that they would find pertinent to help them create the conditions of stability and well-being which we are not able to institute? In other words, how could we find out if the choices that we are now picking on behalf of our successors are the right ones to aid them to not have to resort to force or wars to settle their disputes or resize each other to create consequently stability in the same way it is now our turn to do?

Indeed, the dependence of mankind on profound manmade (or programmed) ideas and concepts about the right of every person to two rights: natural and legal, when in reality the changes or motion that the human body prompts are not relationships that can be structured, appear to have generated a very complex synthesis that has not helped our predecessors to develop the right knowledge to reduce mishaps and reinforce positive result but now it is our turn to deal with that. The more and more we seem to be pushing the boundaries of our scientific and technical limits to help us produce tools that we can use to improve our life chances and provide benefits to our societies, the more we seem to be finding that the instruments that our human ingenuity is developing is not requiring any more that our human reason splits reality based on the basis of good or evil, right or wrong, tangible or intangible. Most importantly, we are equally finding that we are not required to establish a social contract based on natural or legal rights to make people voluntarily consent to give up their natural freedom to obtain the benefits of political order, due to the shrinking role that the human reason is required to play to make the human body stop with letting actions be bound by ones' own personal power and conscience. As more and more science distances the human body from having to make natural

distinction so tools (i.e., via another person) can decide on behalf of human reason this task, the more the programmed algorithm that human ingenuity is developing and delegating to it the changes that the human body needs to be continually prompting in matter to sustain the survival of this mass is getting limited. When the benefits that real humans provide to our societies gets reduced, and as more and more the human body gets reduced into a financial instrument or a derivative of a financial instrument, mankind would definitely start to rethink the purpose or usefulness of uncontrolled reproduction.

At the same time, hence all what the tools or technology that humankind is coming up with appear to be doing is nothing other than to overrule the human body, which means that human nature remains unaffected; this will mean that humankind would continue to be divided between people who would be prioritizing material over moral, while others are prioritizing the opposite and even others are prioritizing a combination of both. It is important to note that insofar mankind challenge to ensure lasting peace, the secret lies in how to control human nature and not the human body even though the body is the mass that interpret the instruction of the human behavior. If we factor how everything in the universe is permanently changing, and factor humankind apparent powerlessness to distinguish between right and wrong, or natural and legal rights so everyone can know his limit, perhaps the impact of the UN work program on the ability of the rich and/or the nations with great powers to maintain conditions consistent with the maintenance of their strength and stability is going to be the most important challenge that could be facing humanity in the years to come.

For example, our ancestors chose to domesticate each other to maintain peace and stability by distancing the poor from possessing wealth or tools, and by taming newborn to believe that true life is in the hereafter, while our world is a place of trials and tests. As people were getting more sophisticated and knowledge was making it difficult to make most people depart wealth and pleasure to prioritize the hereafter, the rich had no choice but to cave in and accept that their relations with the poor be organized around natural or inalienable rights paralleled by legal rights.

The decision the rich took to accept that the social realm be built around relations that divide how the poor should be organized, and that is into

natural and legal rights, has been creating behavioral patterns that are erratic and disordered as the entire human history can attest.

As of 1945, instead of the United Nations being devoted to resolving how to narrow the gap between the human body and the natural world so the distancing that science is prompting does not continue to create abstract relations, this global council began to want to create a new worldview about reality and humanity's place within reality.

For instance, despite the UN knowing that it is not possible to make people prevail over the weakness of the will, because desire is a function of material things or human creativity, this organization decided that the entire human family should be dedicated to pursuing material things, under the pretext, of reducing inequality and injustice. This work program that the UN pursued prompt a situation in which instead of having the rich being devoted to resizing each other only and/or a segment of the general population doing it, we now have the entire human family devoted to resizing each other to have access to the things that each one of us deny the other for the exception supposedly of the people who practice religious asceticism by monastic living. Given, mankind's obsession with wanting to expand access to material things, can people manage to fulfill the full realization of their personality without becoming entangled in crises and conflicts, when we decided to make the natural resources that we all want to be able to share become a scarcity.

Naturalism is a worldview that relies upon experience, reason and science to develop an understanding or reality and humanity's place within reality.⁴⁷ If everything is relative, our ancestors should have been able to achieve this ideal state of world peace that the UN is pursuing to establish within and among all people and nations on earth? Moreover, if as of the date our ancestors began to use the naturalism philosophy to control and structure our behavior mankind has not managed to make people become ready to willingly cooperate, where is the evidence to support that when the UN introduces more possibilities, the pattern would change? In other words, why people did not begin to voluntarily cooperate despite all the benefits that pushing the boundaries of our

⁴⁷ <http://naturalisms.org/science.htm>

scientific and technical limits provided and/or religion and philosophy to control and structure our behavior till now?

Then again, hence we have no way of knowing how the technology that we claim is providing benefits to our societies is impacting on human security, how can we be sure that the ongoing efforts to distance even more the human body from creating change in matter, is not aligning mankind on a straight trajectory course with a predetermined date with added uncertainty. In other words, if humankind does not have experience with how to control the bias that the distancing of the human body from creating changes in matter prompts, how could the UN be teaching people to be devoted to reduce inequality, injustice or poverty, thus compounding even more the number of people that would be distancing their human body? The absence of historical patterns to draw lessons about whether making more people abandon maintaining a horizontal relationship with the natural world in order to maintain a vertical one, could mean that the UN is making people surrender freedom to expand man's struggle to eventually ensure lasting peace.

Therefore, hence neither when our ancestors harmonized actions based on wanting people to depart wealth and pleasure to prioritize the hereafter did this domestication approach made people understand the difference between right and wrong to pause certain humans from being bound by their personal power and conscience to keep peace and security dynamic, nor when mankind began to depend on rational natural and legal rights and systems (i.e., organizations or governments) to restrain people from positing that they have rights to plunder did such totting modify the irrational patterns that man exhibit, is it not totally erroneous to say that, so far, the more the built environment that exists on the outside of the human frame seem to be getting moved from premises to logical consequences, the more the deductive, inductive or abductive reasoning that people adopt or accumulate seem to be pushing more people to create patterns that are more irrational. To put it differently, could we say that the patterns that people are exhibiting in rich and poor nations alike are contrary to the conjecture that the people who determine policies claim outcome would eventually look like. Now hence humanity has experience with how to control the patterns that people exhibit in the social realm when relations were managed without the presence of an operator who is teaching people why they should stop

to be content and to be devoted to ensure social justice to increase their happiness (i.e., US experience from 1776 to 1945), we can conjecture three motives to be prompting this abnormal intolerance that emerged post 1945. The first is if progress creates crises and conflicts. The second is if the UN is who prompted all the crises, and the third could be from both, progress and the UN. But, hence technology is relative, could the UN be the principal perpetrator. Likewise, hence we cannot pause humans from creating progress or changes in matter, but we can make the UN pause from teaching people why they need to accelerate changes, this condition boils down to two choices: Should the UN be allowed to continue to take separate actions to teach people why they should invest reactive coping to improve social and economic conditions or should this task go back to being managed by existing governments as our leaders counselled be done pre 1945!

In a broad sense, people sophistication and all the advances that were made in politics, sociology, mathematics, science, and literature to make life easy did make us live a better life than the one our ancestors survived within. Indeed, people's search to create conditions of stability and well-being has improved the political order and eased relations between people tremendously. However, if we take all the social benefits that human evolution has created and check how much this civilization mission that every newborn find himself involuntary being drafted to sponsor, we find that, on the surface, the headline is hailed to deepen fraternity/democracy but down deep, the initiative that people are called to support appear to privilege the person who exhibit the creativity first. In other words, whereas the initiative would be designed to ensure how to eventually have everyone live free from fear and want, the person whose scientific, literary or artistic production resulted in a material interests, is allowed to reserve the right to protect and to not develop the knowledge of the people who need to use the material interests in question to sustain their survival needs and earthly desires better to prevent them from defending their best interests. Surely, article 27 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights grants everyone "the right to the protection of the moral and material interests resulting from any scientific, literary or artistic production of which he is the author," but based on the experience that we gained from communism, even when the material interests was not controlled and people were made to share on equal basis resources, the behavior of the people who practiced

such ideology did not change. Could we conjecture that the irrational patterns that many people exhibit could be rooted in mankind decision to make the purpose of the human life to provide benefits for society? Could, the challenge to create conditions of stability and well-being be one that is not rooted in one's own choice to want to seek to understand fundamental truth about what sort of things exist and what are their essential natures, but the real challenge seems to be rooted in people absolute conviction that adopting conjectures that are designed to intensify human relations could ensure lasting peace? I should not neglect here the impact of adopting religious pro-life policies could also be prompting to keep the social realm dynamic.

This philosophy that people pursue to intensify human relations to increase sophistication could have been a true conjecture pre 1945 when technology was not advanced. When human sophistication was not widely common, multilateralism could influence the balance of power to shift between nations, and therefore, adopting pro-life policies or conjectures that are designed to intensify human relations was necessary to tilt relationships to make it impossible that only one nation threatens all the others. Post 1945, the development of weapons of mass destruction intensified nations dependency on multilateralism, and prompted a new era in how people could subject each other to domination and exploitation for obvious reasons. The need for multilateralism became amply needed, because more than one country is known to have acquired weapons of mass destruction.

The question that begs an answer is why do the nations with great power are allowing the UN to teach people to invest reactive coping to reduce injustice, inequality, poverty, etc. which is an action that intensify human interaction, when at the same time, objects like computers, television, phones, etc. are aiding to distance human physical interaction in favor of increasing virtually interaction which is useful to reduce dynamism. When people increase their virtual interaction, this action does not increase crises and conflicts because humans are not interacting physically so they would be competing with each other to occupy the same void space. However, this action increases people sophistication, and/or after mankind decided to convert our specie from becoming producers to consumers after we decided to delegate to tools the role that the human body could have been programmed to be doing in the

natural world to reduce conflicts. The more people increase their sophistication, the more this action prompts more people to want to realize the full development of their personality. Our ancestors did not have the options that we are now having to preoccupy the human behavior using television, computer, etc. so less people become aware about their need to be devoting their entire time to figuring out how to occupy the void space that others are occupying. Our forefathers depended on religion to make the poor postpone whatever they do not manage to realize from the full development of their personality to the afterlife. If, as was the case pre 1945, when knowledge (i.e., tools and information) was distanced away from people to stop ideas from being shared, did such control did help make people be tolerant and ready to surrender freedom to deepen fraternity, and if, as the case is like now or post 1945, when the access to knowledge stopped from becoming locked away, did this change is making a difference in people behavior, this signify that the UN could be working on how to revert the nations with great power into becoming a simpler form faster than they expect. I shall explain how the UN interference in the social realm to make people accelerate their life chances to above and beyond the sophistication that a person develops on his own could be reverting the nations with great power into becoming a simpler form faster than they expect in upcoming sections. For now, I will just recall that pre 1945, all the monarchs, civilization collapsed when the access to knowledge by their nationals or foe was accelerated, including when people were prompted to be devoted to seek social justice. Since 1945, the UN is devoted to making all members of the human family accelerate their access to sophistication and to invest reactive coping to seek social justice instead of how to be tolerant. How could we be sure that the UN is not prompting the same fate the past monarchs, empires, civilizations faced?

No one knows how peace and security would have been like if when our predecessors realized that an unexamined life is not worth living had focused on how to control reproduction to guide human evolution instead of how to fit or make those who disagree with the cultural traditions and values of those who their access to knowledge, wealth, or power makes them become bound by their personal power and conscience be a threat to anyone else who refuse to act in accordance with the postulated ideas. Perhaps this ideal state of world peace that

most people crave to achieve and imagine is possible could have been attained. Probably, humanity would not have reached the level of development that exists, particularly since progress is a function of population growth rates as well. In theory, this policy that throughout the history of the world our predecessors adopted to do nothing to control reproduction and to let conflicts and wars reduce the threat that added birth rates prompts was a very effective method to control population growth particularly since people served as weapons of war and shields. The absence of weaponry (rifles, machine guns, mortars, artillery, tanks, aircrafts) justified the need to make people act against their judgement for the sake of some “greater good”. Obviously, as people knowledge was increasing people began to recognize the importance of distinction such as race, colour, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth or other status, as a tool to help them to get their way despite the resistance of others. This idea of reproduction seems to be more and more in modern times intended to transfer to designated people the social space that a person freezes and the material things accumulated including to take actions on God’s suggestion to be fruitful as some religions disseminate. Reproduction is also needed to uncover the scientists who help us to provide benefits to our societies including, in particular, any work related to showing us how to slow the aging process.

The manner the UN wants us to reprogram our relations is not a practice with which humanity has had already prior experience. People till 1939, depended on natural inequality and manmade distinction to domesticate each other. This was done sometimes with an individual becoming in a position of power and having influence above all the others or collectively. The built environment that existed when WW2 broke out support that some families managed to stay in power for a long time, and therefore they were capable to transfer their wealth to respective successors. In fact, in some of those 193 nations that exist now and mainly in Western European countries, there seem to exist a group of wealthy families who are managing to preserve an order of hereditary succession in which control or power gets passed down from one member of the family to another member of the same family, that in some cases dates back to the first millennium. Those wealthy families appear to have such an extensive influence on society that is not any different from the one that the religious institutions who survived

portray to the extent of being able to maintain an institutionalized social control that is capable to preserve an order of succession that passes power from one member of the family to another member of the same family. As of 1945, the UN want people in all nations to build relations without relying on any distinction including seeing that poverty and injustice are eradicated. Could people build relations with one another without relying on any distinction and/or manage to develop friendly relations based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination, when the UN is teaching everyone to choose desire over tolerance? Most importantly, would the families that managed to stay in power for a long time, succeed in being capable to transfer their wealth to their successors, while the UN is preaching to the poor why everyone should be devoted to foster human rights? Could the UN on-going efforts of making the poor pause from being content and to be devoted to improve their life conditions weaken those successors of those individuals or families who control the money supply of the world

Let us in the next chapter see how we could expect our world to evolve, if the UN continue to be fostering human rights while manipulating economic transitions with staffs who are allowed to not seek or receive instructions from any government or from any other authority external to the Organization while performing their duties. And, who are also granted right to be an economic operator while enjoying privileges and immunities. I plan to analyze to understand if such select group of wealthy people could exist, how it could be obtaining its power. Then, I plan to check if it is possible that the UN render them to a simpler form, even if all the economic indicators show that the gap between the rich and the poor deepened from when this organization was formed to now, which is an indicator that shows that the rich got more powerful and the poor poorer!

4

Reflection on how the rich who lived during the Industrial Revolution could be controlling the money supply of the world till now

Evasion and honesty are two psychological conditions that determines whether a nation will have any reason to attack other people (nations) and/or go to war or remain peaceful. The norms and policies that people (nations) rationalize is what determines the type of stability a person (country) would know. In terms of fundamentals, the primary moral cause of war and peace are altruism and egoism. Throughout the history of the world, no country, monarchs, empire, dictator, noble, etc. delegated to a collective body right to coerce people to pursue life-serving values staffed with individuals who were not made to trade their own personal values so that they do not become a threat as the nations with great powers did post 1945. The nations with great powers (mainly the ones in Western Europe because till the outbreak of WW2 in 1939 it was mainly them who administered the sea) agreed that the UN administer and mediate their relationship with each other and with other nations while the staff of this international organization are simultaneously teaching life serving values and being an economic operator who enjoys privileges and immunities. The history of the world is full of stories about monarchs, rulers, sultans taping into mercenaries to help them to attain their goals, but never did it come to pass that a given political order commissioned a group of loyalists to teach about human rights but who are also working on advancing their own personal net gain at the same time.

For instance, throughout the first millennium, the western European monarchs used to resize the rich (i.e., barons) by adopting vis et voluntas (Force and will) principles that relied on employing ordinary common people to make the rich consent. The ordinary people that the crown empowered to make the rich consent were not kept to foster human rights, or to provide solutions to the barons or the poor in economic or social related problems when the crown obtained the concessions he/she wanted. Moreover, the crown did not keep the ordinary people perform their job without seeking or receiving instructions from him, which by the way is not something that the nations with great powers adopted when they allowed the UN to provide economic and social solutions staffed with personnel who was granted immunities and privileges. The nations with great powers approved that the UN officials be an economic operator with rights to coordinate, determine and enforce policies within UN member states using a staffs who is carrying out his function without the right of any government or any authority external to the organization to interfere in its work hence the organization (and its staffs) was granted privileges and immunities.⁴⁸

Clearly, the decision taken by the political leaders of the nations with great powers to have the rich harmonize actions with the poor post 1945 whereas everyone is allowed to freeze social space and is allowed to transfer the material things that a person amasses or accumulates on a cumulative basis to designated successors, including in the case of the UN officials to be allowed to become an economic operator while granted privileges and immunities implies one of two scenarios:

1. There is a select group of wealthy people (perhaps based in Western Europe because till the outbreak of WW2 in 1939 wealthy families / dynasties lived in those nations) who are not united in some close relationships or design in mankind's practical development mission to end poverty, injustice and the like. This group of wealthy people do not promote its private views, interests, or opinions in any shape or form on any everyday political or financial matter at both national or international levels. The absenteeism of this select group from interfering or making any comments related to how people should run their lives serve as pretext to hide their on-going plot to achieve world

⁴⁸ <https://www.un.org/en/sections/un-charter/un-charter-full-text/>

domination unlike how some common political leaders do it when they voice such motives. However, if this select group exist its members should possess a disproportionate amount of wealth and powers as compared to other wealthy people that they regard any attempt to narrow the gap would not have any effect on their status;

2. The select group who is depicted in point 1, and the rest of the wealthy people in the nations with great and soft powers alike decided to render themselves into a simpler form.

To show how it is possible to conjecture that such select group of wealthy people exist, and whose wealth and power could be disproportionate to other wealthy people that they regard any attempt to narrow the gap would not have any effect on their status, I will consider this example.

Until a new global power issue an edict to outlaw Christianity or any one of the most popular world religions and belief systems, the people who make their living from making others focus on Jesus's behavior (or doctrines) would always manage to get their way without having to make the person who they want to control stumble on their behaviors or interests. The select group of people who relate humanity to an order of existence, especially a personal God or Gods, does not have to invest any reactive coping to leverage power or to achieve controlling power to consequently establish dominance. For example, the doctrines that Jesus spread are capable to evoke a deeper connection between people even though none of the conjecture Jesus formed is based on complete information. The conjectures that the founders of the different religions have postulated are doctrines that do not require any physical, mental and spiritual manipulative approach or efforts to control or dominate as well. The different religions have narratives, symbols, and sacred stories that are organized around a collection of beliefs that can make a person surrender voluntarily freedom. All what the person who enrolls in any religious branch has to do to achieve power is to demonstrate that he is capable to maintain a perpetual continence (lust or toward material things) coupled with readiness to consecrate his career to the service of God and humanity to gain advantage.

This select group of wealthy people, if it exists, it must be one that operates in the same way the Vatican or any one of the world's most popular religions and belief systems who provide meaning and purpose to life function. For example, the Vatican does not interfere and cause systemic crises or push any controversial policies in the social realm. Instead, it is the people who believe in Catholicism and who want this dominion to exist, because of their belief in things that they consider to be the case regardless of empirical evidence to prove that the things that they establish their state of mind about is the case with factual certainty. In other words, it is the followers of this faith and/or the people who are God-fearers who cause systemic crises, and who unite around the different faiths they are each separately promoting and are using its specific dogmas as a mean to maintain connection, and most importantly, to evade dissolution and integration into another expanding religion so they do not lose their authority.

The members of this select group of wealthy people could be providing meaning and purpose to life in the same way the Vatican does it within the Roman Catholic Church but from an economic perspective. In other words, in the same way the politics of the Roman Catholic Church evolve around the service of God and humanity, the service of this select group evolve around controlling and regulating the money supply that humans use. The association of the members of this select group could be one that operate in the same way the Vatican political system runs. The members do not push economic policies or ontologies in the social realm but the people in the different nations do it. This select group exists because of people's belief in the need to have custodians who pass down from one generation to the next traditions that are supposed to link people to one another without there being empirical evidence to prove that the things that people establish their state of mind about is the case with factual certainty. This also signify that if this group of select wealthy people happens to exists, its assets or power must be linked to something that people trade or a thing that people pass down from one generation to the next regardless of the changes that people are continually undergoing in the social realm being something that can affect the continuity of the exercise of their power or control.

Religion and money are two manmade mediums or traditions that people voluntarily pass down from one generation to the next. All

people accept that those two principal manmade mediums be a conjecture in the social realm without there being empirical evidence to prove that the use of those two mediums that people establish their state of mind about them are aiding humans to preserve human security or not. certainty. The categorization of people based on income, wealth, social status, or derived power (social and political) is called social stratification. As such, this signify that the members of this select group cannot be drawing their power or status in the same way how we all do it to obtain the things we need and desire by bartering. The wealth (i.e., power or status) of this select group has to be derived like religion from a process that does not involve any bartering. This is because trading or exchanging is a process that creates systems and systems can be differentiated into socioeconomic strata. If this select group of wealthy people happens to exit, and if its members do not mind that UN officials barter while granted immunity and privileges so the power such officials continually develop does not resize them, then this select group can be obtaining its own guidance from two sources:

The first is if this development mission that this select wealthy people who perhaps control the money supply of the world want mankind to collaborate in the economic field to attain is already an exercise that was tested with before by our ancestors, and the experience gained showed that the potential to weaken the ability of this select group to defend its best interests does not get destabilized when other actors are bartering while granted immunity and privileges simultaneously and/or are accelerating people relationships to evoke deeper connection. The second is if those select wealthy people believe that the UN would never rise up or acquire the minimum degree of power that would make it become a potential threat.

I have no way of knowing if such select group of wealthy people exists, and/or which scenario between the afore two could have prompted the nations with great powers to feel indifferent about the threat of letting UN officials foster human rights and be an economic operator that coordinate, determine and enforce policies while carrying out this function without the right of any government or any authority external to the organization to interfere in their work, and while granted privileges and immunities.

On the other hand, if we take a look at a coin, we will see that it has two sides. The imagery that is stamped on each side of the coin is different, but the material from which the coin is made is one and the same. What if the two manmade mediums or traditions that people voluntarily pass down from one generation to the next, religion and money, are controlled and operated as per the way businesses are structured whereby they are either owned by a sole proprietorship or a partnership.

Alliance is a relationship among people who join together for mutual benefit. The members of an alliance do not need to have a common purpose when they agree to join together in a relationship but a common benefit.

Throughout the entire human history, humankind linked the productive capacity that every member of the human family exhibit to a set of power relation that is codified in laws. The laws that humans come up with are all a shared collection of doctrine about how life should be lived, which they also divide into two categories. The first category is about how humans should establish relations with each other, and the other category is about how humans should establish relation with the things they engineer or exist in the natural environment. People believe that some of those laws were instruction suggested to them by a divine power.

Humans established a cultural practice to pass from one generation to the next the doctrine that are articulated in the religious scriptures because people find them to include relations that humans could use to establish on their premise relationships that lets each person pursue the interest that one ascribes to and consider is of supreme importance without the changes that the individual affect in matter infringe on the security of the other.

The people who choose to enlighten others on the importance of structuring their relationships with each other based on the dogmas that are stipulated in the religious scriptures are called priests. In other faith, this title is called Archaka, pastor, rabbi, Sheikh, or Mùshī de mingzi. In religion, priesthood is by human choice even though in some religion, it is also inherited in familial lines. The individuals who pick the priesthood profession as a career receive their living directly from the

branch of religion they decide to teach its wisdom or dogma. The individuals who devote their career to preach about the existing of a super power relegate the importance of material things in order to emphasize the importance of righteousness or values.

The individuals who rule that their career should be devoted to teaching religious dogmas are organized following a hierarchical structure. The division of labor require that those individuals who are passionate about promoting religious dogmas to be stratified based on status and power. In the Christian faith or in the Catholic Church for example, there is a single body that has a leadership position over the entire Christian diaspora. The status and power that clergyman obtain is secured through an election. In other religious branches, each religious or secular communities and political movement elect or appoint its own governing bodies in a similar manner.

This regulatory system that is practiced in religion contrast the pattern that the rich or wealthy families who control the money supply of the world apply or appear to be structured and operating like. In the case of the rich and/or the international families who control the money supply of the world, the office is automatically passed down as family inheritance.

Earlier, I said that people appear to pass down voluntarily from one generation to the next two manmade mediums or traditions, religion and money. I also said that human's connection with religion is one that people promote to unite around such dogmas natural and manmade distinction, because it is a philosophy that is capable to dominate people imagination despite the fact that it is based on conjectures that are based on empirical evidence.

In anthropology, kinship is the web of social relationships.⁴⁹ Robin Fox (born 1934) is an American anthropologist who has written on the topics of incest avoidance, marriage systems.⁵⁰ Fox claim that we are "working with the same raw material as exists in the animal world, but [we] can conceptualize and categorize it to serve social ends."⁵¹ These

⁴⁹ <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Kinship>

⁵⁰ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Robin_Fox

⁵¹ Fox, Robin (1967). *Kinship and Marriage*. Harmondsworth, UK: Pelican Books.

social ends include “the socialization of children and the formation of basic economic, political and religious groups.”⁵²

For example, humans divided the earth geographically and demographically into mutually exclusive territories and political structures called states or monarchs. Immediately after birth, a newborn is made to appertain to an exclusive territorial or political structure. Likewise, the newborn is made to appertain to a religious ecclesiastical jurisdiction, which could be either related to atheism or theism. At birth, the religion that the newborn would be assigned would be chosen on his behalf but later this new person can change and appertain to other ecclesiastical religious jurisdiction or jurisprudence.

Jurisdiction is the practical authority granted to a body to administer rights within a defined field of responsibility. From antiquity till now, all what the new living human beings do is to ensure how to preserve the laws that they find existing people structure relationships on the basis of their principles. Newborn must agree to surrender freedom and to adopt whether they like the laws they stumble upon or not to survive. However, because humans are mortal and the laws that every newborn must agree to them in order to survive are immortal, meaning new living human beings trickle them from one posterity to the next, this makes the institutions that spread laws on how to establish relationships that lets a person pursue the interest that one ascribes to and consider is of supreme importance without the changes that the individual affect in matter infringe on the security of the other to be the most enduring.

A monarchy is a system in which people are organized around a supreme authority in which the succession of power is elected or inherited and lasts until this authority is incorporated into another expanding civilization or it collapse and reverse to a simpler form. The different hierarchical or formal elective or hereditary political organization that humans form, its objective is to categorize in the different kinship who plays what leadership role when providing economic, political, social and cultural solutions within a specific realm.

For example, in the Christian faith, the head and leader of this religion is called Pope. The Pope is the head of the Roman Catholic Church as

⁵² <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Kinship>

well as the Vatican City, which is the sacerdotal-monarchical state from where the Pope rule.⁵³ The office of the Pope is called the papacy. Governance is about managing people and the natural resources that exists. The papal office has had a prominent part in world history due to its position as the pre-eminent episcopal see of the universal Catholic church. In Islam, Judaism, Buddhism, Hinduism, Taoism, etc., the institution that spread the faith that those religions conjecture, their ecclesiastical jurisdiction have had also prominent part in world history as well. All those religious institutions serve as the central point of reference for the governance of the faith they spread, and intervene to find resolutions to various doctrinal disputes. Throughout history they are depicted as being entities that are responsible for the governance over the laity that subscribe to their faith, but most importantly acting as arbitrators. In some periods of history, those institutions had no temporal powers, and in some, their powers rivaled those of temporal rulers. In parallel, throughout history, temporal rulers have been switching between issuing edicts that declare neutrality with regard to allowing religious institutions rights to develop relationships with the citizenry in the exclusive territorial boundary they control or exercise their own political authority over, and in some, the tolerance is totally censored.

I have no way of knowing why throughout history temporal rulers exhibit patterns that declare neutrality toward religious institutions developing relationships with the citizenry in the exclusive territorial boundary they control, and in some, the tolerance becomes censored or banned. Likewise, I do not know why throughout history, another pattern seems to accompany the two periods in which temporal rulers' either express neutrality toward religion or when it is totally banned. This latter pattern refers to a select number of wealthy families who appear to manage to preserve or maintain under each respective pattern an institutionalized social and political control that does not seem to be weakened by people continuous scramble for equality. The power of this select group of wealthy families appear to be so strong to the extent of being able of passing down this control or power from one member of the family to another member of the same family through an order of

⁵³ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Vatican_City

hereditary succession that miraculously survive despite how many other wealthy families collapse and/or are reversed to a simpler form.

Then again, if in theory most religious faith are monarchs, and humans invented money to be accepted as a medium of exchange for goods and services, then the people who dedicate themselves to the service of God and humanity, needs “money” (a medium) to keep their monarch up and running.

Likewise, since it is the religious institutions are the permanent and not the different monarchs or states that people set up, common sense dictate that if a monarchs want to remain in power, it is better off that it links its power to any religion. If a global war is to erupt, we know that the power of the people who perform sacred ritual of religion would not diminish, because people would continue to want to interpret their events as being a form of divine destiny. Every time people or nations do not exhibit tolerance and resize each other instead of relying on multilateralism to resolve dispute, this behavior fits perfectly into the work program of the people who depend on religion to derive their income, or the international families of financiers who control the money supply of the world because their authority does not get threatened. If there is a select group of people whose wealth is disproportionate from other wealthy people and who could even be controlling the money supply of the world, then this select group has to always be ensuring that there is a gap between them and wealthy families who gets strong so the latter do not resize them. What this select group of wealthy people and/or those international families of financiers have to be vigilant about the most, is how to ensure that their status or own economic position be equal to what the religious institutions are capable to maintain. For example, countries such as China or Japan are largely secular and thus religion has a much smaller impact on politics as compared to neighboring India who religion impacts its politics a lot.⁵⁴ If the people of any one of the nations who religion has a much smaller impact in them on politics grow, they could be a big threat to the continuity of the authority of the religion institutions in the west or the existing dynasties or rich families. The challenge would be aggravated even more if the competition can be differentiated through a distinction based on shared physical or social qualities.

⁵⁴ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Religion#Related_aspects

A partnership is an arrangement where parties, known as partners, agree to cooperate to advance their mutual interests.⁵⁵ Fronting is defined as a person, group, or thing used to mask the identity or true character or activity of the actual controlling agent.⁵⁶ Silent partner is “an individual whose involvement in a partnership is limited to providing “capital” (a medium) to the business.”⁵⁷ Many businesses and investment vehicles are structured with silent partners.

One of the benefit of a silent partner is that in such partnerships either partner can step in for defending the purpose or importance of the other partner to increase the likelihood of each achieving their mission and to amplify their reach.

All the constitutions that governments write are nothing but rules and customs. There are two ways that humans can follow to rule each other. The first is if its’ done naturally and the other is through using rules.

Sport is a form of competitive physical activity through casual or organized participation in which contestants attempt to exceed the other. To ensure fair competition, the athletes who are competing individually or in teams define a set of rules or customs to allow consistent adjudication of the winner.

This idea of setting rules or customs to establish on its basis rivalry which people use to grade or classify in a competitive manner their physical athleticism is a natural way to show who crosses a line first or throw a ball further. It is also a natural way to score and rank which physical dexterity of an athlete is better than the other. Humans employ all sporting events as a mean to just provide enjoyment to participants and spectators and not necessarily when it comes to establishing political, social or economic relations.

The conditioning of the human mind into believing that everything that exist in nature is resizing itself in different shapes, arrangements, and positions to form the properties that we see; and the fact that two

⁵⁵ <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Partnership>

⁵⁶ <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/front>

⁵⁷ <https://www.investopedia.com/terms/s/silentpartner.asp>

organisms cannot occupy the same void space to pick who between the two occupy the void space of the other – hence one’s gain is the other’s loss – made mankind come up with relationships that structure, grade or classify how people establish relations in a competitive manner based on knowledge instead. The difference between those two relationship is that in one the ranking is based on natural dexterity while in the other it is based on philosophical manmade conjecture for which there is no truth. This philosophical views or tenets which later evolved into how we stratify each other based on wealth, power and prestige, help us to rival each other by changing how we establish our ranking from one that does not depend on physical dexterity but on human ingenuity. This also means that to control the things that exists outside the human body, a person does not need physical dexterity.

Scientists managed to show that nature is made of void and matter. Scientists also claim that to understand how life occurred it is necessary to understand how void and matter occurred. Scientists, also claim that on earth, man and void are always displacing each other. Also, because the void on earth is vast, if we need to have our life chances improved, this process will involve: (i) our cleverness to create matter from the void to create more resources so more people can have more opportunities, and not find themselves obliged to occupy the resources of others, or (ii) organize the various macroscopic properties that we see and we call matter to create conditions that would stop to resize itself in different shapes, arrangements, and positions on its own so more people can improve their life chances from the resources.

Therefore, since in either case, the goal is to displace void to expand outward with more resources and not the other way away inward, we can say that until we manage to push the boundary of our scientific knowledge and technical limits to resize the matter that exists on the outside of our human body so the enormous void could be properly utilized instead of focusing, as we have been doing, on how to structure regulatory systems to control how our bodies displace in the existing social space (or void) that is always shrinking because of the social order that we follow (i.e. mainly relaxed family planning policies and right of dead and living people to freeze social space), we have no choice but to continue to depend on human ingenuity to explore regulatory systems

to fix our structures, constraints and possibilities. The other option is to rely on natural physical dexterity to fix the same.

Moreover, since we have decided not to explore how the resources that exists would be sufficient so every member of the human family manages to not perceive that his life chances are not being met, but, to the contrary, the laws and customs that we come up with are intended to achieve how we could stop from resizing each other in different shapes, arrangements, and positions to help us to compete with one another so everyone continue to expand his access to social space and resources, we can say that if everything is relative and human nature has not changed considerably that the people who lived in antiquity could have harmonized relations in the same way it is our turn now to do it. Like us, our ancestors, were competing with one another to satisfy their present requirement and the one or their successor or dependents. They were like us influencing each other to believe that the resources that exists are not enough as well.

I have no way how throughout history our ancestors who dedicated themselves to the service of God and humanity, were generating the resources they needed to maintain themselves or the different religious monarch that they were running. Definitely, as modernization was growing, people religiosity was diminishing. This phenomenon was necessitating that those people who dedicate their life to the service of God and others to supplement their need for funds from other sources. I think only the rich could facilitate or afford to finance or provide the protection that the different religious monarchs needed to go on with teaching the wisdom and dogma of the respective faith.

In the 16th century, Henry VIII of England, managed to break away from under the authority of the Roman Catholic Church and to create the church of England.⁵⁸ From the day the Roman Catholic Church split to 1945, the history of Europe contains lots of reference to people who belong to distinct religious doctrine deriving the right to rule from monarch that was at one time a form of government in which a specific family embodied its national identity and/or the leadership, authority and hierarchy was split between a particular family and either one of the

⁵⁸ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Henry_VIII_of_England

two dominating churches. Likewise, a large number of the European wars that existed during the second millennium culminating in ww1 and ww2 were a series of conflicts waged by one dynasty against another, and one in which each side drew its allies into the war.

For instance, the legislature of the Kingdom of England existing from the early 13th century until 1707 was, for its most part, a result of the struggle that William the Conqueror (1028 – 1087) grappled with during his reign to push that the monarchs (along with their mounted “state church”) should be oriented to take decisions based on customs and laws to govern and protect its interests. Over the centuries, the ideas that William the conqueror introduced developed into forming the Parliament of England. Indeed, the Baronial revolt which occurred during the reign of King John (1166-1216), was a major milestone to prepare the first document that changed how the British Monarchs and the Church were hitherto accustomed to operate on the basis of their laissez-faire policies thus ushering the constitution of the United Kingdom.

What if the laws and customs that our ancestors came up with such as when King John, the Noble and the Church agreed upon to cooperate on its basis on the aftermath of the baronial revolt and uphold, was not necessarily related to their readiness to see resources being resized to stop them with employing measures that limits the customs and laws to how they need to build relationships with one another on its basis to operate within the polarized area in which they were cooperating, but how to employ those customs and laws to seize new resources or to resize the resources that they were already holding onto or occupying without this action being done in an unorganized competitive manner.

The only challenge with coming up with customs and laws to organize relations on their basis is that it is no longer the human body who decide how to settle using natural dexterity the disagreement that one feels is threatening his security but the rules. Now because the rules that people come up with organizes human actions and not the resources, this construct converts the actions of people into becoming rooted in forces and power that anytime a person needs to settle his differences with another person or have it his own way he needs to borrow this right from outside his own physical boundary.

For instance, prior to the start of the industrial revolution, there were no cars, television sets, etc. that people were competing to possess, and/or they needed to set up financial rules or customs to regulate and control markets. The rules and customs were established to maintain a status and not wealth in the sense we understand it now. In other words, the disputes, conquests and wars that the rich were having with one another until the arrival of the industrial revolution was not to take the crude oil that exists in the continent they occupied to build factories to produce petrol, diesel, kerosene, etc, but to accumulate status. For this reason, we find that the scramble to establish monarchs, dynasties and to freeze social space or natural resources was not to build cars or factories, but rather how the resizing that would be imposed would fit through such conduct into a God given order. This partnership that people in power built with the church worked well for both the rich and the church people who were deriving for them rules and/or forbidding ones. For this reason, we find that until the start of the industrial revolution, the monarchs, nobles and dynasties all worked well, and even hand in hand with the religious organizations despite all the wars that took place. This union prevented either side from becoming weak. The more cathedral were financed by the rich and built, the more this enabled the people with hard power to do their business, and to use the service that the clergy facilitated to help the monarchs acquire power and shape national identity, even if it meant having the clergy boost people emotions to go to wars. Kinship is defined as the sharing of characteristics.⁵⁹ It is through kinship how humans empower and commit to preserve values and traditions. This could also mean that the monarch, nobles and clergy may have managed to establish a balance of power scenario between each other in the same way we do it in modern times. The three sides managed to even stop each other from believing that either one could impose his own rules or continue to govern according to his conscience. Most importantly, the customs and laws could have provided an incentive to the monarchs to rule hence anytime the nobles became too strong, the clergy who dedicate themselves to the service of God and humanity could easily gang with the monarchs to re-balance power. Evidently, this balance of power that could have taken place in England between the monarchs, nobles and clergy from the start of the second

⁵⁹ <https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/kinship>

millennium to the birth of industrial revolution perhaps, could have been happening in the rest of Europe and in other parts of the world as well.

Change implies making an essential difference in something without the modification that is being introduced causes a loss of original identity, but it can also mean making a difference in a thing that it becomes something else.

Let us not go back that far in time. Interestingly, from the 18th century to now, and despite all the changes that occurred in the natural and built environment, the changes that certain monarchs, nobles, houses in western Europe underwent didn't imply an essential difference amounting to a loss that stresses a breaking away from sameness but a change that suggest a difference that limits the purpose without the change introduced making a real difference that amount to a loss of identity. In fact, in the case of certain monarchs, nobles, houses in western Europe, we cannot say that the change that was introduced limited, restricted or even make them adapt to a new purpose so we can really say that the gap that exist between them and other new emerging families is narrowing. For instance, from the 18th century to now, the power or authority of the Vatican and the Church of England didn't change. People began going less and less to houses of worship or erecting cathedrals and churches with the same devotion that existed in the 18th century. The power of the church didn't diminish. When the Pope travels, there are millions of people who come to pray with him.

Likewise, certain monarchs, nobles, or houses in western Europe didn't change. The only resizing that took place was due to their own internal dispute with one another. In fact, until WW2 erupted, most of the world population was either dominated or progressively losing ground so as to be dominated by them.

If we compare how people changed for the same period (i.e., from the 18th century to now), we find people religiosity diminished which is a change that made an essential difference that could be said to amounting to a loss of original identity without the changes introduced making an essential difference that would make humans breaking away from sameness. In other words, lots of people were becoming atheists.

What if the wealthy families who control the money supply of the world and the people who chose as a career to be dedicated to the service of God and humanity are two structures that withdraw their authority or power from one another. They are two systems that are identical in form to another, but with the structure reversed so each one can serve the legitimacy of the other. In other words, the wealthy families who control the money supply of the world are the owners of the means of production (i.e., tools, infrastructure) and the principal guardians of the laws required to establish relations in production. The individuals who control relating humanity to supernatural or spiritual elements are the owners of this cultural system that relates humanity to a superpower on all matters that mankind cannot explain with regard to how life started. To avoid that either one sees its authority incorporated into another expanding civilization or it collapse and reverse to a simpler form, the two patron each other so that each one preserves its own continuity.

If we compare the changes that happened in the social order from 1945 to now, the United States who supposedly was the most powerful nations during the second world war and who tilted the outcome of the war in favor of the allies or European monarchs, nobles, and clergy with whom this country sidelined, we notice that despite how much this country is accused of promoting hyper-individualism post 1945, the United States (or the Soviet Union) did not promote Pan-American political thought (Pan-Russian political thought) as per how the Western European nations advocated the creation of a Pan-European political thought as manifested through the creation of a European Economic Union⁶⁰ when in 1945 trade barriers were lowered, and all nations agreed to collaborate in the economic field based on the principle of equal rights.

Above all, we do not find from 1945 to now, certain monarchs, nobles, houses in western Europe making changes that contradicts with the neutral behavior in foreign affairs they exhibit, which is not what they agreed they would be doing to help the United States succeed in achieving the ends that were delineated in the UN charter. In other words, it is the US who is portrayed to be the bad cop, when the

⁶⁰ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/European_Union#Background

principles that the US is defending, it is the monarchs, nobles, houses in Europe who will benefit from it the most.

Given how from the start of the industrial revolution to now, the authority of certain monarchs, nobles, houses or religious institutions in western Europe did not change despite all the events that the world has known, we cannot say that there was a big change in their status. In other words, if as per what the nationals of the western European nations that still maintains a monarchy claim that the existence of a sovereign ruler is ceremonial and to preserve national identity only, we do not observe that this role is being circulated or rotated between families in line with what mankind started doing post 1945 and that is to program without any reference to any distinction. Could we say that we may be still living under the authority of the western Europe Monarchs, Dynasties, Houses, noble or religious institutions that existed in the world as of the start of the industrial revolution, and that the reorganization that the world has undergone till now has not changed their status or wealth. In other words, the successors of those houses that survived from the industrial revolution to now are the one who are now in charge of ensuring that the financial trading centers that they inherited and their fathers managed to keep under control are not absorbed or driven to collapse by another expanding power. The preoccupation that those families who perhaps control the money supply of the world have so their successors preserve their wealth and status are clear. One preoccupation has to do with how to delegate to their successors a path that would not destabilize their authority after their fathers decided to deviate away from what the United States proposed in 1941 to harmonize actions like. The other would be to let their successors deal with it. In other words, the individuals or families who control the money supply of the world have to decide if they want their successors to devote their lives to doing what they are failing to do. This is to make people be ready to build compassion and to be tolerant in the same way how when their predecessors managed to rely on the church to keep people content, and willing to tolerate that the material things that they cannot get in this life could be gained in the afterlife. The rich want that the poor would be ready to support this work plan post 1945.

I have no way of knowing how the successors of the wealthy families would be able to defend their best interests while the UN is teaching

more than 7.5 billion people why everyone should be devoted to pursue policies or laws intended to freeze social space or accumulate material things on a cumulative basis. The conditioning that the UN is pursuing makes it impossible to build compassion. Indeed, those families who control the money supply of the world are leaving a major challenge for their successors that mankind does not have experience with. Robin Hood (a British Legendary) was creating crises and conflicts when he was teaching people why they need to steal from the rich. Moreover, Robin Hood was not teaching the poor why they need to be intolerant and to be devoted to foster human rights as the UN started doing post 1945 including fixing utopian dates to end poverty. Indeed, when the predecessors of the individuals whose turn is now to control the financial trading posts were amassing wealth, there were no agent preaching to the poor at the same time, why they should abandon their traditions and values in order to be modernized, thus rendering them intolerant. Now the case has changed. Since 1945, the United Nations is preaching to the poor why they need to stop to be tolerant and to prioritize material things over moral. Most importantly, preaching to people to not be tolerant and to convert legal rights into becoming an interest right instead of remaining a will right to improves ones' own chances. I plan to show in later chapter a case study to support how the UN is tumbling the ethics that mankind spent thousands of years in developing.

If the international families of financiers who control the money supply of the world believe that it is their responsibility to hand to their successors a succession plan free of threats, their choices are clear. The first is if this wave of insecurity that emerged post 1945 goes on so the financial trading center that control the money supply of the world does not become split so new families rise and challenge them. The second, is if the wealthy families take a step backward and go back to harmonize actions based on what the United States proposed in 1941. When people institute the cultural authority that the US managed to mount from 1776 to 1945, those international families could maintain their authority. This is because when people believe that law and order is strong, they can never claim that they do not possess a complete understanding of themselves so they would have a reason to continue to be bound by their personal power and conscience.

Therefore, if birth rates continue to outnumber death rates, and the options of waging a global war carries risks, because it could affect the reuse of social space if it would involve a nuclear war, it looks as if the rich and/or the international families who control the money supply of the world have two choices to maintain their status. They can either stop the UN from making people prioritize material over moral thus more people become intolerant or we go back to domesticate based on what the United States proposed and that was to emphasize moral over the material. Alternatively, we continue to allow the UN to continue to preach to the poor about why they should be devoted to fight injustice to extend this wave of rotational geographical self-destructing creative chaos approach that we began to practice post 1945. In the process, depend on multilateralism to justify actions.

This geographical self-destructing creative chaos approach seem to be not sparing to resize some weak countries so far. The strife that are emerging are managing to collapse the standing governments, but in as far as the central threat that needs to be crumbled to stop those people from becoming a challenge and this is to erase attachment to tribal mindset, we find that none of the conflicts that occurred prompted a change in those people attachment to their own distinction. Let us take this Islamophobia that has also emerged, which is doing nothing but fracture the social fabric of the countries in which Islam is used as a basis to structure governance system, and assume that this wave would go on until Islam would collapse and this religion become banned. Let us also assume that those individuals or families who control the money supply of the world would also eventually manage to bring the world under a common political authority for all humanity, and even become the ones who would be ruling this authority? Let us also assume that technology does not aid certain humans who share physical or social qualities to develop power thus occasioning the split or the shift of the control of the money supply by newer families. How could we be sure that the unrest that is going on in some middle eastern countries would not be superimposed and threaten the successors of those individuals or families who control the money supply of the world, thus prompting the same self-destructing creative chaos approach that is going on from getting them resized, if the United Nations is allowed to continue to preach to people why everyone should change their traditions and values in order to reduce economic inequality, and while technology is the tool

that people would be using to control each other and the same tools are what people would be using to build their awareness on why they need to seek social justice.

5

Mankind's ambition to stop with seeing our specie as being an integral component of the natural system

Great Britain, France, Japan or Germany were among the four principal proponent of ww2. Those countries suffered the most destruction at the end of this global war. When we compare how a good number of the countries that faced a civil war post 1945 are coping, we find that their recovery does not resemble at all the revitalization that those four principal countries experienced. The drawback of the war does not seem to have had any drastic effect on their ability to continue to wield power, control on an international scale, or to recover posteriorly.

In theory, increasing the productive capacities of people is a phenomenon that should continuously generate or result in conflicts prompted by the problem of division of labor. The breakdown that occurred in Europe in 1939 leading to WW2 was to a great extent a war to determine if the Germans or the European countries that opposed them would control and regulate the trading posts where the money supply of the world is located. In the case of Great Britain, France, Japan or Germany in particular, the productive capacity of those four nations should have slowed down post 1945, because the mode of production was widened and shifted from remaining controlled and regulated as was the case pre 1945 by them principally to one that became based on capitalist production. Yet if we compare the GDP of those specific four countries to other nations, we find that the monetary measure of the market value of all the final goods and services they produce regained the prosperity and growth levels that they used to experience before the

war and even surpassed pre-war levels despite all the setback that ww2 created.

Many commentators claim that the United States provided financial aid to western European countries on the aftermath of WW2 to aid in the economic recovery. Then again, it does not make any sense from a geopolitical perspective and a common sense dictate that if indeed the United States entered WW2 to compete or share in the control of the money supply of the world that its political leaders would go ahead, and turn around and assist those nations to recover economically quickly to deal with a nationalist rise afterwards as the case seem to show again going on in Europe or Asia now.

For instance, the U.S. – Russia relations has been evolving in an expected and an unexpected way year after year and/or since those two countries began to relate in a manner that portray their actions as one in which each country is trying to determine who would project the most power on a global scale. The two countries cooperate bilaterally and multilaterally in a number of areas and have even ventured to space together in 1975 (Apollo-Soyuz mission). However, as of 1945, the relationship between the two countries is also depicted to be in continuous technological race to influence or control the global political and economic sphere. When Germany was split in two counties from 1949 to 1990 and the Eastern portion was occupied and administered by Soviet forces, Russia did not proceed to expand and to build the economy of Eastern Germany even though the distance from Berlin to Moscow was less than 2000kms which is much less than the distance between the US capital and Berlin. The United States could not have rebuilt the economic power of the western portion of Germany that its forces occupied from 1949 to 1990, or contributed to its rapid recovery at the level some commentators depict its role played. The United States also knows that when the economy of a sovereign nation grows, its people become a threat. The United States knows that the security of one person (nation) is the forgone security of another person (nation). Most importantly, this country knows that if a nation could dominate all others, the British empire would have not collapsed, and therefore, it would be erroneous to assume that its foreign policies could have been based on providing incentives to some nations over others post 1945

thus risking having nations withdraw their support to promote their cultural authority.

Any economic recovery requires two principal elements to be present to prosper. Those two factors are technical assistance and resources. Great Britain, France, Japan or Germany were all major industrial and cultural powers before ww2 and did not lack scientific knowhow to quickly rebuild. Accordingly, WW2 could not have been but a temporal setback that destroyed the machineries, tools and buildings that existed in those countries, and not the technical knowledge that existed in those nation states. The technical knowledge of the people who lived in those countries did not vanish, because human ingenuity is capable to retain knowhow. I consider that the natural power of human ingenuity to retain known how including the failure of WW2 to suppress or control the people who were possessing critical knowhow such as industrial or technological knowledge is what helped those four countries in question to rebuild quickly. In fact, the decision of the United States to cancel unilaterally in 1971 the direct international convertibility of the US Dollar to Gold as agreed in 1944 during the Britton woods conference which laid down how the monetary relations would be governed by the nations who ratified this agreement, and to render the US dollar into a Fiat currency post, shows that capitalist production is inherently in conflict with the increasing development of human productive capacities.

As of date when the UN member stated approved that the UN collaborate in the economic field to reduce inequality, poverty, and/or create conditions of stability and well-being, this organization which our leaders pre 1945 counseled it should comprise a “Secretary-General and such staff as the Organization may require,” has grown enormously. Presently, the UN system employs hundreds of thousands of employees, and boast about its military strength which exceeds the size of the armed forces of many UN member states. However, if we compare its effectiveness we find that none of the goals that this organization claim is pursuing have been attained. The wealth of the people in the different countries continue to be disproportional and the gap between the rich and the poor continue to widens. The same can be said with respect to disparity between nations as well. The gap between the most well-off countries and the least well-off countries is vast as many economic

surveys tries to depict. Interestingly, the UN who was supposedly programmed to be financed by assessed and voluntary contributions from UN member states does not seem to be undercut by this rise of indisposition to be tolerant, which in this work, I am building a case to support that the decision of the UN member states to implement a work program that is different than the one the US proposed prompted. The change that was introduced in the work program of the UN has been very rewarding so far. Besides the contributions that UN member states deposit, the UN generate its own income now. In fact, the UN is even working on achieving the UN goals using UN self-financed organizations. All the UN staffs is helping the UN member states to achieve the UN goals while enjoying privileges and immunities! In fact, the UNFCU which is the UN bank that UN member states use to wire funds and who claims that “*it is serving the people who serve the world*”,⁶¹ boasted in its 2017 annual report, that its investment for the year was above 42 billion US dollars.⁶²

If increasing the development of human productive capacities in capitalist production deepens competition and egoism, and makes nations who cooperate to address mutual global challenges have serious differences as the U.S. –Russia relations shows, or the U.S. commercial and financial relations with its allies of World War II to regulate the international monetary system does support further as well, how can we be sure that the United Nations System would not promote its own interests, and would not work to weaken the ability of UN member states to defend their best interests after this global council has become an economic operator who provide economic, political, social and cultural solutions intended to serve humanity? Most importantly, how could we be sure that the coordination that the UN system is offering and facilitating to attain the policies that are being pursued would not result in the international families of financiers seeing their ability to wield power eventually getting weakened in order for a new oligarchic hegemony extends its own power?

For instance, the rapid increase in the volume of trans-border digital communications is going to require that a new web of international coordination be created to address trade in goods, service and

⁶¹ <https://www.unfcu.org/home/>

⁶² file:///C:/Users/Salim/Downloads/UNFCU_2017_Annual_Report.pdf

currencies. It is impossible for any living human beings to forecast the future or know what the world to come would look like. Some commentators perceive that the United Nations was created in order to establish a one world government under a common political authority for all humanity. There are other people who depend on eschatology to put together scenarios related to the ultimate destiny of humanity. Insofar short terms outlooks, there are two issues related to the maintenance of the strength and stability of each nation within the current global governance system that sooner or later each UN member state is going to have to sort out or pick a stance on. The first is whether the coordination of the trans-border digital communications system including mass-media distribution (e.g., internet, satellite, television, etc.) that the nations with global power linked human activities across national borders to its web post 1945, would be controlled by each nation independently or if an overarching archetypal international body would control the information, ideas, and opinions that exist in each divided geographical and demographical exclusive territories on a global scale. The second is whether the rich would be disposed to have their wealth and resources tracked or be part of this big data machinery that the rich and the poor alike, and whether they like it or not, sooner or later, they are all going to have to operate under its authority to rule or govern each other.

Given the unlikelihood of the nations with great power easily agreeing to have their big data be coordinated and controlled by an overarching archetypal international body unless all the superpower agrees to voluntarily delegate this function to a single authority, we can expect that the on-going scrambling that the nations undergo over who would influence the most political and economic control on land to go on in space as well. Moreover, the more the United Nations peddle to the poor why everyone should be modernized or be devoted to fight injustice, the more this strategy accelerate people readiness to be bound by their personal power and conscience to foster human rights.

Indeed, when the social order is dynamic, the financial trading centers that the international families of financiers run remain strong. The high investment figure that the UN bank is reporting is a snapshot of how profitable the business of fostering human rights is!

However, if, as I said before, there is a good chance that there is a select group of wealthy families who do not barter like us but are providing meaning and purpose to life in the same way the Vatican does it within the Roman Catholic Church but from an economic perspective; and who possess a disproportionate amount of wealth and powers as compared to other wealthy people that they regard any attempt to narrow the gap would not have any effect on their status, because they could be operating in the same way the Vatican or any one of the world's most popular religions and belief systems who provide meaning and purpose to life function; this means that even of the nations with great powers do not manage to progress on their common aspiration to promote social progress and better standards of life in larger freedom, and/or people continue to exhibit disregard or violence, the interest of this select group would not be threatened. This is because, as I said, even if a global war is to break out in the future, people would continue to believe in the existence of a God and use money as a medium of exchange. Therefore, if this select group of wealthy people exists its power should be weaved in religion, and together with religion, their authority gets passed down from one generation to the next. This could be the reason why this group does not seem to mind or be worried about the UN having an impact on wiping out their authority.

If this group exists, and if it is not worried that the power that the UN is continually gaining in the social realm being something that can affect the continuity of the exercise of its power or control, the question that I want to investigate to better understand is how those rich families reached that if a global war is to erupt that they would be the victor so the religious institutions that they operate under their shadow, would continue to provide them protection. Most importantly, how did they figured out that the religious institutions would not trade them for newer families. I should also mention that there is a good chance that if a global war erupts that the victors, could be communities that are non-religious. If those nations decide to make religion unlawful, and set up new financial centers, the threat that this scenario poses on the continuity of those existing families would be serious. Evidently, the afore scenarios tales into account that the power that the UN is continually accumulating would not threaten those existing families so they could be replaced with new families that are from within the UN structure.

Earlier I said, I do not know the reason that led those wealthy families who control the money supply of the world to agree with political leaders to stop with continuing to harmonize actions as per the way nations were doing it pre 1945 and/or the founders of the UN counselled and to make arrangements to let the new archetypal international organization they agreed be formed help to be an economic operator to increase dynamism. Surely, this fashion is very analogous to how Christianity spread, except it is done in reverse modus. In the case of Christianity, the people who were spreading this faith created the psychological drive they needed to make adherents convert by highlighting the importance of postponing access to material things to afterlife to build the momentum they need to grow. This time around, the people who are spreading the need to foster human rights want us instead to invest reactive coping to increase access to material things. In other words, the psychological drive they want us to support rely on widening our access to material things instead of narrowing or postponing it. In my opinion, the two approaches are one and the same. In the case of Christianity, they led to the fall of the Roman Empire. Presently, they could be creating the same effect, making nations fall one after the other beginning with the poor or weak ones.

On the other hand, if no matter what policies people (nations) pursue, we know that people would not stop to believe in the existence of a God and/or use money as a medium of exchange, this signify that if either one of those manmade mediums that mankind build relationships on their basis gets threatened, there is a good chance that the other one would get threatened as well.

Since the norms and policies that people (nations) rationalize to determine what type of stability a country would know, is not something that can be based on controlling religion but money (i.e., the medium of exchange that people accept for goods and services) because it is not possible to control how people think, then those wealthy families could be counting on relying on technology to control the money supply of the world and to continue to exercise their authority.

Technology is a tool that has power to control the human body / human behavior thus downsizing the role religion plays to control and regulate this body mass. Likewise, technology makes people postpone access to

material things, because it limits the role human ingenuity plays to create change. This signify that if there are no agents spreading in the social realm the importance of investing reactive coping to increase access to material things or technological tools, people would be living not any different than during the time when the people who were spreading Christianity were creating psychological drive to make adherents postpone access to material things to afterlife. Hence the more technology continues to limit creativity and to canalize in one direction only this relationship, as people continue to eliminate their past systems of accounting and writing in order to delegate this function to tools, people power to render services and/or to create using human ingenuity would decline. Human ingenuity cannot produce the tools that people depend on to sustain their survival needs and earthly desires because of the technical precision required. This also signify that the more our specie delegate to machineries the role that the human body could have been programmed to effectuate for the natural world, the more virtual creation increases instead. The more virtual creation increases, the more people need for all the material of terrestrial origin (i.e., resources) decreases. This is because the goods from which all the tools are built are specific. Because humans cannot in any way use their human ingenuity to fabricate the tools they need because of the precision required, this signify that people need for money should reciprocally diminish. When people need for money diminishes, people need for all the currencies and all the trading centers would diminish as well. This situation should also prompt a takeover among the rich families or in the different religion in the same way businesses experience.

Hence technology could be a potential threat to religion and henceforth to the international family of financiers, what if there is indeed a select group of wealthy families who feels that as more people push their scientific boundaries and technical limits, this action could perhaps threaten their security. Therefore, this group wagered on the UN to foster human rights to keep the social order dynamic so they could prompt the continuous collapse of nations thus preventing any nations from developing power to threaten their interest, particularly since one of the principal rule of the new international world order is to forbid that a nation resize its territory outward but inward (see Atlantic charter). In other words, use the UN to continue to achieve exactly what the Christian movement managed to achieve for God and the wealthy

families who lived when Christianity began to become a faction. One of the biggest achievements of Christianity is the collapse of the Roman Empire.

When Christianity became a movement people began to abandon their distinct religion and to convert into the Christian faith which as we later saw became the religion of many state church. What if the select group of wealthy families or international families of financiers which I said could exist, want us to abandon “something” to create afterwards the rise of an authority that would be similar to the one that the Christian faith movement achieved? In other words, to safeguard against the potential threat of technology reverting this select group of wealthy families to a simpler form, they saw the UN as an opportunity to prevent their collapse. In other words, if technology is eventually going to make people involuntarily link human activities across national borders to its web, this signify that humans could not prevent the eventual setting of a common political authority for all of humanity. If mankind, manages to surrender freedom in exchange for creating a common political authority, this select group of wealthy families or international families of financiers which I said could exist, would maintain its power and control. If mankind, fails to set up a common political authority that exercises authority over the entire world, its status would not change.

Earlier I said that Khan claimed when studying correlation that whenever what we see happening in B, it could also happen in A. However, he also said that it is possible to come to *“very, very, very, very, very different conclusions,”* between the two.

In other words, during the Roman Empire and/or when Christianity became a movement, the people who were spreading this faith were not pushing people to pursue a capitalist mode of production that generate tools that distances the human body from fulfilling the role that it was perhaps programmed to serve in the natural world but to accelerate contact. As of 1945, the capitalist mode of production model that people are pursuing is one that distances the human body from fulfilling the role that it was perhaps programmed to serve in the natural world by delegating this action to tools. This method accelerates the interaction of the tools with the natural world and not the human body. In addition, the program that God and all the actors that he involved in this process

were not inviting people to invest reactive coping to end poverty or injustice but rather invest reactive coping to not mind that if one's access to material things is not materialized in this lifetime it would be achieved in the afterlife. The program that the UN is pursuing is the opposite.

The question that I said earlier I plan to analyze to form my own opinion on is whether there is a good chance that the power that the UN is accumulating could be a threat to the select group of wealthy families that I said there is a possibility that they could exist. In other words, to form an opinion on whether those international families of financiers would manage to keep on maintaining the order of hereditary succession of their power and wealth and to pass it down from one member of their family to another member of the same family, or new families would start to control the money supply of the world.

Indeed, there is a contrast between how the people in position of powers in modern times want to maintain their powers and the way their predecessors did it. In modern times, the people in position of powers want to stay in their position indeterminately while seeing that their dependents are deepening fraternity and access to material things. This is not how the predecessors of those people who are in position programmed when Christianity was formed. So far, the policy frameworks that those people who are in position of powers are developing are not reversing the cycle of insecurity that seem to have developed after they decided to deviate from the work program that the founding fathers of the UN counseled we harmonize action on its premise. Certainly, no one knows if those people who are in position of powers in the different countries would be able to continue to get their way despite the resistance of others now that more people seem to be investing more reactive coping to promote social justice. In particular, to manage to continue to operate in parallel to the work program of the United Nations.

Evidently, the people in position of powers who are determining the policies on our behalf are convinced that restricting human reproduction and/or placing stricter control on how much pleasure and luxuries a person should have would not threaten their interests or get them to lose more as compared to letting the United Nations make people invest

reactive coping to pursue equality which increases death rates, and compound crises and conflicts in the social realm. Indeed, the decision of those actors to maintain liberal policies is a consequence of this conviction.

Therefore, since the people in position of powers believe that letting the UN teach people in the social order to invest reactive coping to end poverty and injustice, and/or enforcing economic austerity along with reducing trade etc. could get people to achieve the goals set forth in the UN charter, let us check if the UN teaching would trigger the rise of new families wielding power whose expanding authority would revert the successors of those existing international families of financiers to a simpler form.

Moreover, since it is the successors of the existing international families of financiers who are bound to lose the most when social breakdown occurs or when national and manmade crises and conflicts create resizing in the social order, we can say that for as long as those wealthy people continue to allow the people in position of powers to adopt policies that does not restrict birth rates when technology is more and more limiting the role real humans play, that our search to harmonize actions based on friendly relations would be an objective that would not happen any time soon. Most importantly, if the successors of the existing international families of financiers do not pause newborns from believing that humanity lives in a state of disorder and inequality, humanity is most likely going to remain bouncing from one posterity to the next trying to do what it is our turn now to do and before that it was our predecessors turn and so forth: this is to restore the broken social system that seems to be permanent but with different people doing the restoration.

Now, hence mankind wants the mission of any living human beings to be about how to develop closer relationships and better understandings to provide benefit to humanity, including how to change or fix the social injustice that, as I said before, the human nature has no overall power over to fix, because people are not the only species that creates change but the environment is doing the biggest share; we can say that the more and more people develop new conjectures to find out what must come before sense observation from conclusion based on sense observation,

which must follow it instead of focusing on how to fix the social system first before starting any new project, the more people's search to provide benefits to our societies would accelerate human dynamism. Consequently, occasioning a rise in the number of crises and conflicts as well as increasing the rate at which people or nations gets resized, due to all the motion or pattern that people are influencing. Furthermore, since no proof exists to support that the restoration of the social system that living human beings make every newborn subscribe to its principle to establish if the efforts that humankind invest deepens fraternity or helps mankind to develop closer relationships and better understandings thus enabling us to conclude that its absence would not forgo ones' own security, this allows us to say that we cannot be sure that in the future our successors would be able to achieve what it is our turn now to heal, restore or balance. This means that how peace and security could change will depend on scenarios that humans have no control over, because this species, as I said, is not the only one that is creating change in the universe. Second, it is not possible to predict how the sum of the changes that people are creating is influencing the natural world to change or is influencing people directly to increase or decrease the changes that their own frame prompt in the natural world.

Algebra is a tool (a language) that man invented to study and explain in a numerical way how definitions and representations can be extracted from systems (shapes, objects, forms, variables etc.) that are continuously changing. The beauty of algebra is that it is a tool that allows humans to abstract things or relationships. It is a language that takes an input and it will work on that input until it produces a given output. For example, on the aftermath of ww2, all members of the human family expressed resolve to combine efforts to work together so no one does have to live in fear and want. However, the wide range of events or challenges that emerged post 1945 which are preventing people from harmonizing actions in accordance with the resolve all people expressed on the aftermath of ww2 are making people wonder if peace and security is not but a utopic concept. Algebra, which is an Arabic word that means healing, or restoring or balancing, is a tool that can be used to study abstraction as in things like in politics, economics, finance, logic, engineering, science, and an infinite number of applications. The beauty of Algebra is that what we discover from the manipulation that we make, can then tell us what specific problems

could be contributing to the wide range of issues that prevent a structure, a system, or an object or a form from properly functioning. This is because this language or tool strips away all the human definitions and show information that even though no proof has been found to support if it is true or false, but until another conjecture is to prove otherwise, the conclusion reached will always be true.

That is said, I plan in the upcoming sections to take the difficulties that are breaking up the expressed resolve of all the members of the human family to deepen liberty and freedom to try to determine if mankind could be able to “complete” this mission without first getting the world devoid of the wide range of distinction that our predecessors conjectured including even human progress to create space for new people room to exercise their human ingenuity. In other words, I want to check if we could continue to let the world be a reservoir for conjectures that both dead and living people deposit in it their perspectives. If I find that the “volume” is almost full, I want to examine how the decision of our political leaders to create UN subsidiary organs, and to allow them to maintain a relationship with this association of nations to foster human rights could be setting the nations who did not experience a civil strife to deal with one in the future. If as I said before, we seem to be doing the reverse of what our predecessors did when Christianity was founded, I want to check if the UN is setting mankind to face a global war and/or the fall of the nations with great power. Evidently, to avoid this, one solution could be to revert back the UN to function as per the founding fathers of this global council counselled.

6

Could the Development Mission that People Pursue Prompt Unwillingness to Practice Tolerance

There is no universal agreement on what the word logic means. Some people think that this word refers to “what is spoken” while others believe that this word refers to “thought” or “reason”. Since ancient times, people have established a tradition to associate the word logic to principles that are concerned with the most general laws of truths. People come up with definition to the word truth and postulate on what truth really is all the time, but no one knows what truth really is till now. All what humans spend their life doing is to develop conjecture. The English Oxford Dictionary define the word conjecture as “an opinion or conclusion formed on the basis of incomplete information.”⁶³ In other words, a conjecture is a proposition or a premise for which no proof has been found. All the conjecture that people establish, and then resolve about truth are all cosmic questions that no formal proof was found to support that they are not false because humans pose them, and then, answers them.

Rene Descartes [1596 – 1650], was a French Philosopher, mathematician and scientist who is dubbed the father of modern western philosophy and the father of analytical geometry for bridging between algebra and geometry. Geometry is a branch of mathematics that is concerned with shapes, sizes and angles. Descartes invented a method that allows to describe algebra using geometry.

⁶³ Oxford Dictionary of English (2010 ed.).

If I take this analogy that Descartes came up with to bridge between algebra and geometry, then I could say that the only logic that could be used to establish truth is the one that the human body prompt in the natural world, and not the one that people think or reason about, because the later does not manifest into actions that are visible so we generate for it patterns to follow and analyze but the former.

Some Anthropologists and Archeologists claim that humanity's written history dates back to between 8000 and 5000 BCE. I have no way of knowing how humans looked like physically then. However, from the symbols or fossils that Anthropologists and Archeologists claim survived, all the human beings appear to display no variance in physical characteristics like height, weight and size as compared to modern day humans. According to scientists, the variance in height, size, color, weight and other physical characteristics between humans is due to how genes are interconnected, and the impact of the environment mainly.

Let us split the patterns that exist in the natural world in two. Let one refer to the natural patterns that the human body and the natural world were programmed to prompt in the existing environment if humans were not to rely on human reason to distinguish between good and evil, and only rely on natural instincts in the same way animals do. Let the other be the pattern that the human body levy on the natural world after our specie employs human reason to change matter and vice versa. In the case of the changes that the human body levy, let the source from which emanate instruction to prompt a change or an action in the environment be the human ingenuity. In as far as the changes that the natural world levy such as earthquake, tsunami, hurricane, heavy wind, etc., its source is concealed and mankind does not know what causes its pattern to develop.

As of the date Anthropologists and Archeologists established a method to determine the age of objects thus allowing to assign dates in prehistory, the physical patterns that the human body manifest from birth to death including before birth or after death has not changed. Humans do not know what causes the physical changes that our own body undergo, but so far, it looks as if this relation depends on food principally. If food is what makes the human body develop the bell shape growth pattern that it takes, and if whenever a human being pause

from consuming food, the body will collapse and die, then we can say that food is the property that makes the human body to grow (or slope up) and is the one that makes the body to slope down until it goes back to zero. Likewise, we can also say that at a given point in time on this bell shape curve (most likely in the apex zone) is when the physical characteristics begin to stop to develop or grow and to begin to take a down sloping pattern until death.

If food is the property that makes human cell grow and is the one that make the cells shrink, then to live longer common sense dictate figuring out how to delay the human body from beginning to take the downward-sloping line or the drop in order to make it remain in this ascending phase longer or to extend the interval after it reaches the highest point longer.

I have no way of knowing what a person must do to stop the growth pattern that is on the upward side from reaching the peak faster or when the median (i.e. the top) is reached to delay the peak as much as possible from beginning to start its downward-sloping course. However, the explanations that the experts in the medical profession give about the importance of remaining active as a way to extend longevity makes sense.

In general, the only pattern that people devote to doing in the upward-sloping course of their growth is consume food and be active. This could be a reason why most children are less prone to diseases than elder people. This is not what people do after they reach a certain age. Most people stop being active, and begin to focus on developing conjecture that prioritizes the requirements of the human imagination than the human body. In other words, humans begin to seek to determine the limits and scope of reality instead of expounding new ideas to remain active. Most importantly, people begin, as I said before, to delegate to tools the things that the human body could have been programmed to undertake in the social realm in order to prioritize human knowledge of the relation of cause and effect, reproduction, pleasure, and so forth.

I have no way of knowing what prompts people to spend their lifetime subscribing or pursuing actions intended to influence unnatural patterns in matter related to widening their knowledge about the relation of cause

and effect instead of being devoted to expounding new ideas about how not to distance the human body from remaining active and/or producing the food this mass always needs to using the programmed body to keep this “machine” healthy, but prefers instead, to delegate this task to tools. In so doing, people could be forgoing or accelerating the likelihood of their human body to erode faster. If the food that people consume stops to be synthesized according to the way the human body could have been programmed to process food to stay healthy and that is by staying active, then humans could be foregoing by emphasizing the importance of the imagination over the body what they should be doing to prolong longevity naturally. This conduct that human reason agrees to rationalize to yield the human body to surrender to its fate, could be motivated to achieve one goal only. A reasonable premise could be the power of human imagination to override the human reason so that the latter shifts human ingenuity to focus on pushing the boundaries of our scientific and technical limits to figure out how to prolong longevity so a person reaches to live forever. The knowledge to achieve this goal must come from the external world hence the human body is required to be devoted to this priceless endeavor. In my view, humankind endeavor to push human ingenuity to provide benefits to our societies could only be due to human imagination seeking to figure out how to slow the aging process so a person could live longer / forever. In my opinion, this ambition makes lots of sense, because I do not see what purpose would it serve to be devoted to provide benefits to our societies or to preserve the natural world if this goal does not include how to preserve the human person or spirit first.

Indeed, I do not know why people establish conjectures that forces a newborn to subscribe to this idea of devoting the entirety of the only one life that each one of us has to develop knowledge on how to distance the human body from maintaining direct relationship with the natural world so tools act as an intermediary between the two. First none of the other species with whom human cohabit this planet appear to devote their life time pursuing goals similar to the ones that we humans pursue. Second, and as I said before, it appears based on the way the human body is programmed to function that it is when this body mass remain naturally active is when its chances of living longer expands. If this conjecture that I am suggesting is true, two principal reasons could be preventing people from prioritizing patterns that helps a person to live longer

naturally and not endeavor to figure out how to slow the aging process using science. The first is if humans are a defiant specie that does not want or know how to exhibit tolerance. The second is if human ingenuity is an aptitude that does not know how to distinguish between good or evil, contrary to what people thinks.

It would be incongruous to claim that humans are a specie that do not know how to exhibit tolerance. Throughout history, many people have demonstrated ability to put up with the opinions or behavior that one does not necessarily agree with. Likewise, it would be erroneous to say that humans are a specie that do not know how to distinguish between good or evil, because many people demonstrate ability to emphasize the importance of the human reason over the unimportance of the senses. Surely, it would be of no use to human imagination to see as a result of all the distinction that this aptitude manages to structure human psychological emotions around that violence destroys all the human progress so the natural world tame humans. But, if humans were programmed with ability to reason and to use tools, and human imagination want this specie to be devoted to push the boundaries of its scientific and technical limits to explore the unknown to be able to figure out how to prolong longevity, instead of relying on how the human body could have been programmed to live longer naturally as some religious scriptures depicts, then the fear of the only truth that is known to mankind and this is death makes human imagination be an aptitude that has more power over human reason.

Human imagination is a function of human ingenuity and the changes that the natural world is continually leveraging [Maloof 2005].⁶⁴ This also means that our ambition to prioritize our human ingenuity over the role that the human body can play to naturally live longer, could be the principal rule that is making most of us be tolerant with the irresponsible behavior that human imagination exhibit sometimes (or most of the time). Our hope that human ingenuity can increase our chances to live longer, makes us put up and be tolerant on the hope that this aptitude can help us to figure out how to slow the aging process before we perish. However, when our choice becomes to prefer to not be patient, we forgo our own chance to live longer and delay mankind (or our successors)

⁶⁴ Book: Social Improvement and Human Security: Collateral Damage [2005]

from making progress on how to slow the aging process faster. The social fabric that emerged post 1945 does not seem to support that we are practicing tolerance so our successors do not have to live the disregard that we are knowing. A question that would be nice to get to its bottom is the following: Can we manage to create the necessary environment that our successors need to progress toward such a precious goal for everyone when the UN is teaching people to be intolerant?

Earlier I said that Algebra is a language that man depends on to take an input and then distill the essence of the input until it produces a given output that can give us a pure idea of how the input and output are interrelated. The input does not have to be only numerical information hence this language can resolve any type of abstract conjectures to extract definitions and representations. For instance, when we take the method that Descartes invented thus allowing us to plot how the height or weight of a person changes from birth to death on a Euclidean plane, this exercise enable us to convert numerical information to extract a geometrical shape. This relationship which gets represented in the form of a bell shape curve for most people allows us to draw conjectures that we would later use to investigate and resolve. Accordingly, what I hope to be able to do is to take the behavior that most people are exhibiting and to try to convert them into a pattern so I could later use to figure out their implications on making most people unable to develop the will to put up with the opinions that our forefathers counselled that if we practice on the aftermath of WW2, we could be able to achieve the ends that were stipulated in the UN charter; mainly to live free from fear and want. Evidently, the main aim here is to identify which specific practice could be pushing people to be intolerant thus preventing human ingenuity from how to figure out how to deepen its knowledge of the relation of cause and effect to prolong longevity faster and/or to achieve the ambition of human imagination. Surely, when mankind refuses to practice tolerance, and demonstrate opposite behavior, what is at stakes here is the right of everyone to live longer so each member could manage to finish most of his projects before ultimately his detention time is up. I cannot see what other goals would our predecessors want us to practice tolerance to achieve particularly since it is only time after birth that we all face the only truth that mankind knows -death.

At death, the patterns of height, size, color, weight and other physical characteristics of a human being begin to undergo a reversal regression process that the natural system drives until this mass go back to zero (or ashes). However, since we know that what prompt death is connected to natural transformational patterns that the body does not have power to reverse, and unnatural patterns that the human body prompts, we can say that what causes death are both relations (in the former) that are logically impossible for it to be false and relations (in the latter) that is possible for them to be false if humans were to stop to establish conjecture and to pursue actions to find out whether they are true or not.

Furthermore, since the only difference that happens between when a person is alive or dead is that in the former, the human body is granted rights to induce changes in the natural world, but at death, the human body loses this right, and the natural world then takes over and starts to change the body and all the conjectures that man could have established before according to the way the natural world finds convenient, we can say that all the conjectures that the human behavior or spirit establishes are false minus the conjectures that the natural world appear to be programmed on its own to be mindful of always seeing take place, and that is, that no one escape from this unfortunate fate (i.e., death). This allows us to say that the motives that could be preventing most people from exhibiting tolerance so human ingenuity manages to focus on how to push the boundaries of our scientific and technical limits to figure out a quicker way to prolong longevity is either due to conjecture that humans do not have power naturally to respect or unnatural sources are obstructing humans from managing to prevail over the weakness of their will so peace and security ultimately prevail.

I have no way of knowing if unnatural sources are interfering in the social realm the aim being to prevent humans from putting up with one another so human ingenuity shorten the time this programmed aptitude require to figure out the secret that could help mankind to extend longevity or slow the aging process. Indeed, the scientists that humanity or human imagination is searching for so people could get to start to live longer to finish all their projects before old age or death strikes could be among those members of the human family who every year die during conflicts and wars. If unnatural sources are interfering to prevent people from putting up with one another, they are indeed doing a great job

specifically post 1945. Then again, given how, till now, there has not been any real sighting of extraterrestrial forces or supernatural forces interfering in the way humans should harmonize actions to attain the behavioral ends we continually fix, we can only investigate if the irregular patterns that most people exhibit, and which are contrary to what people fix, are a result of the conjecture that we establish.

In as far as the reason for people inaptitude to practice tolerance being due to conjectures that people come up with but it could be possible that our species does not have power naturally to respect, this is also a matter that is not possible to determine because we live in a multidimensional non-linear dynamic world.

To give an example, the command “to not steal” that people claim it was God who suggested that mankind refrain from exercising, and we have programmed legal right around it to structure human relations, we have no way of knowing if fixing relationships in which people do not steal is a practice that humans have power naturally to respect or not, because humans were programmed by the natural world and/or depend on the natural environment and not the other way around. Hence matter is never created nor destroyed, and all what humans do is change matter from one state to another, thus is so doing, our specie is only changing how matter should exist. The imposition that we came up with to restrict the body from taking something that does not belong to us when there is nothing that exist in the universe that any person can claim that it belongs to him is a rule that the strong impose on the weak and vice versa to protect “supposedly” the rights of everyone to live. Since we do not practice policies that control the size of population or how much social space or material things a person can freeze, and we believe that we should be fruitful and increase in number to be able to better attack and defend, we have no way of knowing if we were to voluntarily stop to fill the earth, we could begin to be eusocial automatically. Therefore, since for as long as we would continue to believe that we have to cooperate to prevent the expansionist among us from relying on the problem of the division of labor to create specialized behavioral groups, we have no way of knowing if our coming to work together to create a living situation favorable for us and our successors based on practicing policies in which a person is not supposed to steal is a conjecture that a

human being can naturally respect if desires is a function of human ingenuity, and/or is the right remedy to preserve global human security.

Moreover, because our social model revolves around a socio-economic relationship that is always rolling winners and losers, for as long as we do not control the size of the population or pursue economic policies that does not spin a social contract that divide access to all the material of terrestrial origin on natural and legal rights, the people whose income is low would be prone to stealing to obtain the things others are denying them, because of their reliance on their own bias. Therefore, since the natural inequality makes it impossible to know if the things that a person does not possess now, if those things would be stuffs that he would need later, and we are not capable to determine if when they become needed that the person who would be holding to those possessions would be ready to release them voluntarily, we have no way of knowing if the person who needs them would resort to stealing to obtain them or not. This paradox has prevented our predecessors from establishing relation based on a sustainable social contract so far. In 1945, we agreed to establish relations based on prioritizing principles of equal rights to stop those who depend on stealing, killing or other means to obtain the things they want through immoral means. This work program is the maximum degree of sociability the we can practice if we do not want to live in the “solitary, poor and nasty” world that Thomas Hobbes (1588 – 1679) articulated could take place when people harmonize actions based on their state of nature.

This also means that we can only investigate if indeed people have natural power to align their behavior to respect the conjecture they come up with, and if not what could be the motive. In other words, we can only determine if the conjectures that people are permanently coming up with to achieve practical results for the greater well-being of society are in themselves the obstacle that prevents mankind from harmonizing actions in accordance with the held ideas. If humans do have power to naturally align their behavior to respect the conjecture they are always coming up with formulate a plausible cause for their inability to respect the patterns that the founding fathers of the UN suggested, we harmonize actions based on their premise. We could also predict scenarios to highlight the potential impact of the behavioral patterns that are preventing humans from surrendering freedom to attain the goal that

are fixed. In this way, mankind, and the rich in particular, could decide if it is worthwhile to continue to adopt conjecture that are designed to intensify human relations as the UN began doing post 1945, when we already know that the natural inequality problem makes it impossible to share on equal rights material things. Likewise, if the time has come to take a backward step and to begin to experiment with the conjecture that our forefathers proposed. Surely, if the UN can show that its staffs have a solution to the natural inequality problem so we wouldn't be having social and economic problems, then definitely this organization should be allowed to continue to have UN subsidiary organs maintain relationship with the UN. In the absence of a solution, we can only continue to subject the UN conjectures to scrutiny to determine their effectiveness.

As I said before, all what humans spend their lifetime doing is to develop conjecture. This allows us to say that the patterns that people exhibit as a result of the different conjectures that human ingenuity comes up with can be split in two. Let us class all the patterns that contribute to prolonging longevity to be the outcome of conjectures that their configurations or patterns reinforces mankind's ambition to attain this ideal state of world peace that everyone is ready to both cooperate to attain and even involuntarily obliged to subscribe to achieve. Let us class all those other patterns that do not contribute to extend longevity, in a separate group. We can say that those conjectures that do not contribute to prolong longevity, to be one that do not reduce or eliminate the potential to slow the aging process but rather accelerates it.

For example, the displacement of the human body is an action that humans undertake throughout their lifetime. There are many ways available so a person can use to displace his body. A person can walk, use a car, a bicycle, ride on top of a horse, on the back of another person, etc. In theory, the only method that reduces the risk of death to a minimum during the displacement of the body is when the body does the movement unaided. We can say that whenever a person makes another object decide on behalf of his human reason what is safe for his own body, that individual is, in theory, taking a risk. The more a person agrees to accelerate the method he uses to displace his physical body based on taking the advice of another person for it, the more the person increases his risks. This signify that all the conjectures that people make

to modernize in areas that does not contribute to letting the human body function as per the way it was perhaps programmed naturally to run, does not in theory preserve human security but endangers it. But then again, since it is not possible to make advances in science to prolong longevity, without becoming modernized, we can say that anytime a person takes a mode of transportation to go from one place to the next on any non-life threatening matter instead of walking, this is a choice or a social programming that does not contribute to preserve human security or make people improve their life choices but decreases it. This also signify that it is not the objects that people produce that causes the most risks on the human security of any given person, but it is the weakness of the will to recognize that it is dangerous to use a mode of transportation other than the one that each person was programmed with one to go from one place to another, or whenever a person want to displace his body to preserve his own security longer is the challenge. This also means that since it is not the patterns that human use their human ingenuity to create what endanger people but it is the failure of the human behavior to exercise tolerance so the object human ingenuity create does not endanger human security, we can say that either our specie does not know how to distinguish between good and evil contrary to what people think, or the challenge is in the conjectures that people come up with. I will explain:

It would be very difficult to argue that our specie does not know how to distinguish between good and evil contrary to what people think. If our specie is one that does not know how to distinguish between good and evil, we would not be devoted to procreating after birth to have our offspring attend to our physical body when we are old. The mere fact that living people are theoretically “dead walking” and that it is just a matter of time before this truth materializes, yet they still go ahead and condemns offspring to succumb to the same fate, this signify that what is driving this procreation process is desires (fear) rather than human reason. This desires (fear) cannot be a natural conscientious impulse, because people are capable to practice celibacy. In fact, in some religion, adherents claim that God instructed mankind to increase in number. But, at the same time, if no human being has returned from the dead, the only benefit procreation does is that it provides a person protection that no other living things would prey on his human body when the human ingenuity becomes unable to attend to the body on its

own. In modern times, being fruitful is also needed to keep assembly lines or production up and running. The factories that produces cars, computers, etc. do not operate assembly lines that functions on as per order basis or below a certain production output, because they are afraid that other companies steel their employees in the event of a layoff. Likewise, as I said before, reproduction is no longer needed to dominate after mankind invented weapons of mass destruction. Therefore, since until mankind manages to live forever (or stop death) whether a person dies at the age of 10 or 100, none of the conjecture that an individual decides to devote his time to move them from ideas to proof would change anything in the way how the natural environment is programmed to be continually altering the human body, and/or the human body is programmed to change on its own, hence, as I said before, death is the only conjecture that no matter how many counterexamples people come up with to proof that it is not true no one can claim that it is false; this signify that people can only influence patterns intended to push our scientific boundaries and technical limit to reduce the aging process. To do that mankind needs to continually procreate and increase in number. This signify that procreation is a rational meditated action that mankind pursues and not a natural unpremeditated inclination. This signify that people know how to distinguish between good and evil. If the other way was the case, we would not have made all the advances that pauses some of our most life threatening adversaries such as viruses and bacteria from continuing to jeopardize our specie. Could the challenge to make people become ready to put up with one another be weaved in a rule embedded in this development mission that societies come up with all the time to have people abandon traditions and values to be devoted to be modernized and/or to provide benefits to our societies?

If human want the purpose of the human life to be about how to provide benefit to our societies to deepen happiness, it should be in the best interests of everyone to exhibit tolerance until our different societies figure out the necessary advancement in social welfare to provide security to all based on the natural and built environment that exists. However, if despite all the advances that have been made so far, which should encourage people to be tolerant, not all the people are willing to refrain from exhibiting erratic behavior, then one of two reasons could be prompting people inaptitude to put up with one another or to show compassion. The first could be linked to the rise of scientific knowledge

that mankind is knowing. The second reason could be linked to an error weaved in the regulatory systems – structures, constraints and possibilities that we began to practice to attain the goals set forth in the UN charter.

It is possible that as people's knowledge grows, crises and conflicts rises reciprocally as well. Knowledge confuses the human species because it distances the human body from being preoccupied or devoted to secure the food this mass continuously needs to produce to stay alive, in order to delegate this task to tools. Moreover, when the human imagination is not occupied and is toiling, this programmed aptitude begins to put into question the causes that creates the state of deprivation that the person is feeling or knowing. However, if as I said, the purpose of pushing our scientific and technical limit could only be to help us live forever or to slow the aging process, because there is no common ambition that mankind can pursue that is more precious than this goal, then the more science expands around people cannot be a threat but an opportunity. I should also mention that all what people do from birth to death is to change matter, and we cannot stop people from creating change except if they are in a lockup state. Could this rule that is making people become unable to put with one another be weaved in the regulatory system that we are pursuing? If so, this signify that the people who are in charge of determining the policies are testing with rules or frameworks that a person cannot voluntarily surrender freedom to attain. In other words, the policies that we are choosing to control how we process information, react to information and changes, or interact with each other and with the natural matter cannot help us to be tolerant.

From antiquity till now, whenever people felt that their access to information was suppressed or curtailed, disregard for human rights became unescapable and resulted in societies committing barbarous acts. The overwhelming access to knowledge that emerged on the aftermath of WW2 could be instigating people's apparent indisposition to put up with opinions or with behavior they do not necessarily agree with. Opinions could be translated into physical patterns or remain philosophical. As I just said before, this rule cannot be weaved in science, because the patterns that science generate help to slow the aging process. If increasing people access to philosophical knowledge (i.e., awareness) makes people unable to put up with one another, then the

rule that we are searching for could be a philosophical “bug.” Indeed, as of 1945, we began to want to make the development mission of every newborn to abandon traditions and values based on the environment that one is born to so we could all become modernized.

Then again, if the suppression of information or the exposure does not help to stop people from posing big philosophical questions (i.e., creates a zero net gain), it would be imperative to slow down birth rates or to go back to practicing pre 1945 philosophical measures if people continue to be unwilling to surrender freedom to attain the goals set forth in the UN charter. In other words, if access and suppression to information (i.e., knowledge) confuse and prevent people from being tolerant, then this conjecture would mean that mankind has to reexamine how to control and regulate progress due to the impact it could have on changing the course of humanity [Maloof 2005].⁶⁵

In as far as what is of concern to us in the scope of this present work, the regulatory policies that could be driving this process of confusion that is preventing people from being tolerant, it is possible to find which specific regulatory conjecture could be influencing people more than others thus keeping tolerance dynamic. This is because in 1945, mankind began to practice measure that were not practiced pre this date. If it is possible to narrow down ideas, it could be possible to rank which measure has higher influence on others to keep people dynamic.

For example, Monks are individuals who practice religious asceticism. St. Benedict of Nursia [480 -543 AD] is considered to be the founder of western monasticism.⁶⁶ Based on this early date that is reported in the literature about when certain individuals began to practice monasticism in the Roman Catholic church, we can say that we now have over 1500 years of experience with people practicing philosophical conjectures that no truth was formed so far to support that such way of living provide advantage before or after death. The individual who choose to adopt a monastic rule of life manages to not let all the conjecture that people come up with destabilize their vows or way of living. Therefore, we cannot say that all the regulatory systems or frameworks that people develop could be influencing the behavior of people to be intolerant,

⁶⁵ Book: Social Improvement and Human Security: Collateral Damage [2005]

⁶⁶ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Monk#Western_Christianity

because the stability that monks show by accepting to choose death to self and to the world show that mankind have power to prevail over the weakness of the will. The afore also goes to say that increased knowledge (scientific or philosophical) or its lack cannot be a phenomenon that can push people to be intolerant, because monks show that they have power to voluntarily surrender freedom in exchange for attaining conjectures.⁶⁷ The individuals who practice religious asceticism spent most of their time immersed in prayers and in reading. The knowledge that monks continually gain does not render them intolerant so we could say there is a relationship. The people who practice religious asceticism manage to confirm naturally to the legal right or political order that we want every member of the human society be bound to adhere to. On the other hand, the principal challenge for a monk's incapacity to practice tolerance could be related to another person wanting to force on his human body conjecture to deepen morality that his body mass may not have been programmed naturally to respect. In other words, forcing on the monk conjecture that his human reason does not have power over his human body to make this mass adhere to the regulatory control that other human ingenuities are coming up with no matter how much the monk wants to voluntarily surrender freedom to attain the appeal being made. This signify that if there is a philosophical idea that the human reason cannot have power over to not be influenced by its existence, then there is a good chance that it could also be the bug that could be confusing people more than others and making them unable to put up with one another.

I have no way of knowing from where to start to determine which regulatory conjecture from among the ones that people started coming up with post 1945 to deepen tolerance could be the principal challenge for people inaptitude to voluntarily surrender freedom so the dynamism that has been accompanying human history does not continue to jeopardize people efforts to harmonize actions in areas that humankind consider pressing. One of such conjecture is to deepen human knowledge on how to slow the aging process to prolong longevity. The world population is presently estimated at around 7.6 billion inhabitants; if we take all the conjecture that people come up with and which are continuously changing plus the ones they borrow from the people who

⁶⁷ It is important to note that this case is only applicable when a person refrains from distinguishing between good and evil. [Bible – Genesis: 2.17]; Maloof [2005]

died already, it is not possible to know which ones could be prompting people unwillingness to practice tolerance.

In the next chapter, I plan to attempt to isolate what conjecture could be making people become intolerant more than others.

7

Can man continue to test his human experience when algorithm seem to be overpowering human reason and making the human body surrender rights involuntarily?

The only conjecture that till now mankind has not found a counterexample after extensive search to show that it does not constitute falseness is death or change. All the other conjectures that people come up with and claim that they are true are just conjectures that there was not done enough counterexample to proof that they could be false. In other words, they are axioms that bear truth because humans have no power to establish if the statement that they regard as true or false are bearer of either proposition, because those two statement are a state of mind. For example, many people believe that the universe was created by a superpower. All the people who establish prayer and believe in the existence of God or the guidance that is stipulated in religion are believing in something unseen and without any evidence for the truth of this conclusion. Till now, there has not been empirical evidence to prove with factual certainty that a God or a superpower exists for such a conjecture or statement to stop with being a mere hypothesis. Humans are not the only creature who are creating change in reality but the natural world was also empowered to create change. All the conjecture that people establish are based on how the natural system behave and humans have not been empowered to predict how the natural system change. Till now, all the conclusions that people reach, they employ philosophical or scientific conjecture to conclude. All the philosophical

conjecture that people borrow from religious scriptures about mankind being programmed with good or evil features are conclusions based on incomplete information, for which no proof has been found. This also signify that all the claim that those people make about human nature being programmed with wicked habits from childhood cannot be argument that could help us to isolate what could be making mankind intolerant. Many people do not produce wicked acts throughout their life span.

In fact, even the results or outputs that mathematics gives, which commend themselves to be taken as true, are in reality based on axiom statement that are thought as being true. In other words, the conjecture that mathematicians claim is logically impossible for their premise to be false, are logical proposition that are not the absolute truth. Humans do not know how to take a conjecture and extend the search for counterexample to disproof if what is being postulated as truth is actually the case, as I just said. People do not know how to establish the falseness of a conjecture no matter how many example are given to proof that what is being claimed is not true. In other words, when a person drives from point A to point B, the distance covered is generally measured by multiplying the velocity by the time it took to get between those two points. The passage of time is a unit measure that people invented and apply after making observations about how the earth /moon is rotating on its axis. When we assign the standard of time measurement that we use to grasp the passage of time, we are basing this information on the natural rotation or revolution that the earth maintains. If the earth changes its natural rotation or stop with rotating, then the proof that people depend on to claim that to cover a distance from point A to point B, all what a person does have to do is to multiply the velocity by the time would no longer be true.

The powerlessness of man to take the infinite number of living and non-living things that are continually undergoing change by both the natural system, and the ones that mankind are prompting, and to split them into a finite number of cases or sets of equivalent cases, and then take each type and check to determine if the conjecture (or axiom) holds as evidence for what is causing the change, then to determine if it contributes to people unwillingness to practice tolerance or not is not something that man can do. In other words, we cannot determine how

life (as a system) is changing in the same way we see a newborn (as a system) change from birth to death. However, because we know that all the changes that the natural system and mankind are prompting result in patterns, and those patterns are the graphic representations to the solutions to the numeric data, function or some kind of qualitative data; the curves or lines we draw are graphical representation that shows the mathematical statement of how a certain situation (or variable) looks like at any given point of time. People in all fields plot how certain situation (or variable) were yesterday and how they are today in order to make predictions. The interpretation and the analyzes of the particular patterns such as increases or decreases help people to learn about the truth or falseness of causes and effects, which includes what could contribute to motivate people to be dynamic. However, as I said before, it is not possible to identify how the system is changing as whole.

Mathematicians have developed a number of methods to establish proof of a mathematical statement. Deductive reasoning is a method that is viewed as supplying evidence for the truth of the conclusion so that no matter how many counterexamples are provided; it is logically impossible for it to be false. A very well-known example that has been used to illustrate deductive reasoning is the following⁶⁸:

1. All men are mortal. (First premise)
2. Socrates is a man. (Second premise)
3. Therefore, Socrates is mortal. (Conclusion)

Let us split all the patterns that could exist in the realm in two: Those patterns that the natural world and animals create and the patterns that humans prompt. Let us center only on the patterns that humans prompt because mankind was not given power to alter the changes that the natural world or animal prompt except when our species employ human ingenuity. Mankind was given right to produce patterns that the self-generate only during a person's life span.

All the patterns that humans generate or prompt in the natural world were caused by conjectures that the self establishes.

⁶⁸ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Deductive_reasoning

In mathematics, inference “are steps in reasoning that moves a conjecture from premise to logical consequences.”⁶⁹

There are two ways that people use to move a conjecture from premise to logical consequence. The two principal methods are either through adhering to a pragmatic approach or to follow a rationalistic approach with fixed theories, ideas or rules.

As I said before, I do not know how to follow a rationalistic approach with fixed theories, ideas or rules to identify from among the infinite number of changes or conjectures that people come up with and they are working on moving them from logical premise to logical consequence which ones could make an individual incapable to surrender freedom or to practice tolerance, and which ones do not. Every second there could be billions of conjectures that people are establishing, and/or are acting on. Never mind, the infinitesimal number of variables that are changing at all the time.

I do not think it is possible to use pragmatism to find what could be making people incapable to surrender freedom or to practice tolerance, so mankind could ultimately mount this ideal state of world peace or happiness that we are all willing to cooperate to attain. I will explain why it is not possible to use pragmatism to come up with a rationalistic explanation.

The Cambridge dictionary define the word pragmatism as being “an approach to dealing with a problem in a sensible way that suits the conditions that really exist, rather than following fixed theories, ideas or rules.”⁷⁰

Charles Sanders Peirce [1839 - 1914] was an American philosopher, logician, mathematician and scientist who is considered by many as the father of pragmatism.⁷¹ Charles S. Peirce believed that “mathematics studies purely hypothetical objects and is not just the science of quantity but is more broadly the science which draws necessary conclusions; that mathematics aids logic, not vice versa; and that logic itself is part of

⁶⁹ <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Inference>

⁷⁰ <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/pragmatism>

⁷¹ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Charles_Sanders_Peirce

philosophy and is the science about drawing conclusions necessary and otherwise.”⁷²

This pragmatic maxim that Charles Sanders Peirce used to explain how mathematics moves a premise to conclusion was illustrated through another statement that he became known for having expressed: "consider the practical effects of the objects of your conception. Then, your conception of those effects are the whole of your conception of the object."⁷³

This pragmatic method that Charles Sanders Peirce suggested a person follow to draw conclusions, by considering “thought as an instrument or tool for prediction, problem solving and action, and not a tool that its function is to describe, represent, or mirror reality,”⁷⁴ allows an individual to take a conjecture and move it from a premise to logical consequences by "emphasizing the practical application of acting on an idea to actually test them in human experiences,"⁷⁵

Charles Sanders Peirce said that there are three methods that could be used to find out how a conclusion is entailed by the premises through building this relationship on deriving deductive inference, inductive inference or abductive inference or reasoning.⁷⁶ The challenge with allowing the self to employ the pragmatic method to move with a conjecture from a premise to a conclusion as per the three methods that on their principle Charles Sanders Peirce claimed that we could treat premises is that they convert mathematics from being just the science of quantity to a science of convenience. This is because any time we employ inductive and abductive reasoning as opposed to deductive reasoning, we would be viewing the premise as supplying some evidence for the truth of the conclusion or perhaps as the most likely explanation rather than a rationalistic speculation. Most importantly, since Pragmatism focuses on a "changing universe rather than an unchanging one as the Idealists, Realists and Thomists claim," and since as of the appearance of the human life, people have not fully amended

⁷² https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Charles_Sanders_Peirce#Mathematics

⁷³ <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Pragmatism>

⁷⁴ <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Pragmatism>

⁷⁵ <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Pragmatism>

⁷⁶ <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Inference>

their behavior so we could say that the philosophical topics that we continually come up with such as the nature of knowledge, language, concepts, meaning, belief, or science has transformed human nature and made us become content and happy, thus their practical uses and successes has surpassed their implications, we cannot count on pragmatism as a tool to start to make people exhibit tolerance.

If it not possible to deduce from among all the irrational patterns that the self generates which relational premise could be causing erratic behavior using reasoning methods that employ a pragmatic approach, and/or using theories, ideas or rules to develop relationships, I can think of only one other method to see if it could help me to identify which specific conjecture from among the ones that researchers postulate could be making people unable to put up with one another.

The perception that Charles Sanders Peirce argued about the nature of mathematics being a tool (or a language) that “aids logic, not vice versa; and that logic itself is part of philosophy and is the science about drawing conclusions necessary and otherwise” is a view that both Charles Peirce and his father Benjamin Peirce [1809 – 1880] held. Benjamin Peirce was an American mathematician who is regarded as a world class mathematician among peers. Benjamin Peirce is known for the statement that "Mathematics is the science that draws necessary conclusions."⁷⁷

Another, world class mathematician that shared the same perception as the Peirce's on how mathematics needs to draw necessary conclusions including the fact that logic would not be complete if it does not also include the study of faulty reasoning is George Boole [1815 – 1864] a British mathematician. Boole is “credited with having laid the foundation for the information age.”⁷⁸ He is best known as the author of the book *An Investigation of the Laws of Thought on Which are Founded the Mathematical Theories of Logic and Probabilities* published in 1854.

Boole claimed that in mathematics and mathematical logic:

⁷⁷ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Benjamin_Peirce#Research

⁷⁸ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/George_Boole

“No general method for the solution of questions in the theory of probabilities can be established which does not explicitly recognize, not only the special numerical bases of the science, but also those universal laws of thought which are the basis of all reasoning, and which, whatever they may be as to their essence, are at least mathematical as to their form.”

For example, if death is a true conclusion and all the patterns that people make cannot drive a person to escape from this truth, if instead, I focus on what people must do to slow this truth from manifesting, then I can say that this variable that I am searching for to stop it from making this event that I know its occurrence is true (i.e., death) is everything that could take place minus this variable.

If I take into account what Boole claimed, we should also recognize when we want to establish solutions of questions in the theory of probability, and that the laws of thought which are the basis of all reasoning are mathematical in form, I can say that the variable that I am searching for that could be making people unable to put up with one another is a rule that is integrated in something that humans are reasoning.

The laws of thought are defined as “fundamental axiomatic rules upon which rational discourse itself is often considered to be based.”⁷⁹ At its core, the laws of thought are taken as laws that guide and underlie everyone's thinking, thoughts, expressions, discussions, etc.

An axiom is defined as “a statement that is taken to be true, to serve as a premise or starting point for further reasoning and arguments.”⁸⁰

In mathematics and mathematical logic, a rule of inference, is “a logical form consisting of a function which takes premises, analyzes their syntax, and returns a conclusion.”⁸¹ In mathematics, a logical form is defined “as a semantic version of that expression in a formal system.”⁸²

⁷⁹ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Law_of_thought

⁸⁰ <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Axiom>

⁸¹ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Rule_of_inference

⁸² https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Logical_form

Semantics is defined as “the linguistic and philosophical study of meaning, in language, programming languages, formal logics and semiotics.”⁸³ Mathematicians and philosophers claim that the study of meaning is concerned with “the relationship between signifiers-like words, phrases, signs, and symbols and what they stand for, their denotation.”⁸⁴

Denotation is defined as the “translation of a sign to its meaning, precisely to its literal meaning, more or less like dictionaries try to define it.”⁸⁵

Humans have been taking conjectures and trying to determine if the statements that they make about them could be taken as true since their appearance.

What if the reason for people failure to prevail over the weakness of their will and to practice tolerance post 1945 is due to people establishing rules or conjectures that are based on hypothetical premises that humans do not have power naturally to respect? In other words, what if humans are trying to establish logical conclusions to hypothetical conjectures that are purely imaginary, and therefore, the logical quantitative methods that people employ to resolve the premise are not capable to draw the desired conclusion, because to begin with the proposition that are assumed are based on incomplete information, for which no proof could be found. For instance, Benjamin Peirce was an “apologist for slavery, opining that it should be condoned if it was used to allow an elite to pursue scientific enquiry”.⁸⁶ What if because existing people have not condoned certain conjecture that newborns find they have to be devoted to resolve, this situation blocks humanity from making progress on the goals that existing people fixe on their behalf, because those hypothetical premise that existing people come up with are tied to universal laws that whatever they maybe, as Boole said, humans were not empowered to resolve. This makes it that instead of humans aiding logic, humans become the obstacle. This view is exactly what Charles S. Peirce was trying to point when he said that

⁸³ <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Semantics>

⁸⁴ <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Semantics>

⁸⁵ <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Denotation>

⁸⁶ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Benjamin_Peirce#Research

“mathematics studies purely hypothetical objects and is not just the science of quantity but is more broadly the science which draws necessary conclusions; that mathematics aids logic, not vice versa; and that logic itself is part of philosophy and is the science about drawing conclusions necessary and otherwise.” What if the rule that is making most people post 1945 unable to put up with one another is a rule that people cannot naturally control or condone, but the United Nations devotion to make people develop awareness about this rule is what has prompted all the insecurity that emerged contrary to what the founding father of the UN claimed would take place when humans begin to collaborate in the economic field jointly.

We all know that it is not possible to make people stop to conjecture. For example, Pierre de Fermat [1607 – 1665], was a French lawyer and a mathematician who is given credit for early development of infinitesimal calculus including his technique of adequality.⁸⁷ In 1637, Fermat conjectured that no three positive integers a , b , and c satisfy the equation $a^n + b^n = c^n$ for any integer value of n greater than 2.

In mathematics and in mathematical logic, Fermat’s last Theorem.⁸⁸ is considered among the most notable theorems in the history of mathematics. This conjecture was considered as one of the “most difficult mathematical problem” in the history of mathematics. It was listed in the Guinness Book of World Records, as being one of the theorems that had the largest number of unsuccessful proofs.

No one knows how proving Fermat’s conjecture is helping mankind to begin to exhibit tolerance, or to prolong longevity. However, it is reported in the literature that up until 1994 when Andrew Wiles (1953 -), a British mathematician released the first successful proof thus showing that for a special case of the modularity theorem for elliptic curves there was an integer solution, many mathematicians and amateurs during an interval of time that is more than 350 years were taking turn to prove the theorem. All the patterns that mathematicians and amateurs exhibited should have generated, in principle, tolerable behavior and intolerable ones when they were failing to show how this equality could be possible. What if in 1945, mankind began to want to

⁸⁷ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Pierre_de_Fermat

⁸⁸ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Fermat%27s_Last_Theorem

prove that certain social, political, economic, cultural variable could become equal but that no matter how many conjecture people make to establish their adequality, it is not possible to achieve the expected outcome because humans have no power to naturally attain.

In mathematics, adequality means equality, and refers to the equal sign symbol “=” which in mathematical expression tries to show a relationship between two quantities, thus asserting that the quantities have the same value or mathematical object.^{89,90} The object can be a property with physical referent or one with no physical referents.⁹¹ When the object does not have physical referents than it is formally defined as an abstract object. An abstract object is defined as “an object which does not exist at any particular time or place, but rather exists as a type of thing, i.e. an idea, or abstraction.”⁹² In abstract object theory⁹³ which is a branch in mathematical philosophy, the integer denoted 0 (zero) implies that no object (or quantity) is present.⁹⁴ No one knows what does an abstract object that is void from any quantity means other than what is purported by Plato. Plato posited “that mathematical abstract objects have no spatiotemporal or causal properties, and are eternal and unchanging.”⁹⁵ All what people spent their life doing is, as I said before, develop conjecture and establish for those proposition equality. In other words, we could have at any moment billions upon billions of conjectures floating, and among them, could be ones in which their authors are trying to proof that a “horse = house.” A question warrant itself.

The people who develop estimate about the global human population growth claim that in the year 1600, when de-Fermat lived, the world population was about 0.5 billion.⁹⁶ In the 1600s algorithm (i.e., automation) was not dictating how people interact with the natural world. The world could tolerate individual like de-Fermat coming up

⁸⁹ <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Equation>

⁹⁰ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mathematical_object

⁹¹ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Abstract_and_concrete

⁹² https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Abstract_and_concrete

⁹³ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Abstract_object_theory

⁹⁴ <http://mathworld.wolfram.com/Zero.html>

⁹⁵ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Philosophy_of_mathematics#Platonism

⁹⁶ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/World_population_estimates

with conjecture that emphasize fixed theories, ideas or rules, and to test them in human experiences. Now when people are searching for the practical applications of ideas so they can act on them to pause the continual scramble that people pursue to improve their life chances. The question that begs an answer boils down to one: Can the international families of financiers who control the money supply of the world manage to not lose the most when people refuse to adhere to the principles that they would like everyone to harmonize actions based on its premise to maintain their status or authority? Alternatively, if they would lose the most when people's awareness about fostering human rights is accelerated. Moreover, if, as I said, it is not possible to pause human reason from establishing conjectures on behalf of the human body that are based on hypothetical premises; and if their appear to be a rule that emerged post 1945 that this mass does not have power naturally to respect; and if all what people appear to spend their lifetime doing is to establish conjectures which produce relations that some of it is useful and can be used to domesticate our specie to ensure lasting peace and others do push people to renegade against them, can we afford having the UN teaching people why everyone should be devoted to pursue the full development of their personality so more people come up with conjecture and pursue how to test them within human experience when algorithm (automation) is already making people develop bias and such machineries seem to be overpowering human reason and making the human body surrender rights involuntarily? Most importantly, when more people like de-Fermat make conjecture and have people spend hundreds of years to prove their practicality, but at the end we find that their usefulness to make people become tolerant could be put into question, how can we identify from among the conjectures that people are always coming up with, which one we need to act upon and which one we do not so we do not hand conjectures to our successors that would serve them as a prerequisite to continue to behave irrationally?

If all the patterns that humans generate are a result of deductive reasoning or conjecture, and if what Boole claimed is true; then this signify that if humanity does not look for pragmatic solutions to those "universal laws of thought" to pause the impact they have on the behavioral patterns that people exhibit, it would not be possible to expect that newborns would be ready to surrender freedom to ensure lasting peace. This is because if as Boole said, "those universal laws of

thought which are the basis of all reasoning, and which, whatever they may be as to their essence, are at least mathematical as to their form,” then if mankind would never manage to encrypt those universal laws, I have reason to believe that mankind is at a crossroad. Mankind can continue to let birth be a reservoir for newborn or new people to deposit their conjecture and/or tap on the power of those universal laws to get his way despite the resistance of others and then leave, or we begin to resolve by “force” the conjecture that people come up with so we pause the earth from being a reservoir to dump conjecture that could have influence on contributing to patterns that makes people behave irrationally. In other words, we stop people from continuing to come up with conjecture that create patterns that people devote time to prove their adequacy that do not change nothing in how people can harmonize actions and/or to start to put up with one another as Fermat’s conjecture that people spent more than 350 years to solve so far shows. Likewise, we stop people from continuing to depend on the universal laws that make certain people get their way despite the resistance of others which is a prerequisite before controlling what could conjecture and what not which science is already taking care of.

For example, one of the principal universal laws of thought is related to defining what is a human being. All the definition that people come up with about what is a human being are till now, as I said before, conjectures for which no proof has been found. As I said before, in logic an argument is said to be valid “if and only if it takes a form that makes it impossible for the premises to be true and the conclusion nevertheless to be false.”⁹⁷ If people do not resolve the conjecture of what a human being is, this situation will continue to let newborns after birth have a choice between believing that humanity was programmed on earth while others are disseminating that the human species evolved from chimpanzee.

By handing a newborn this universal law about how humans could have been programmed from either source, this domestication method in which the newborn is aided in forming his own conjecture on what a human being is, as compared to letting the new born reach this

⁹⁷ Validity and Soundness – Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy

conclusion on his own, gives a person the choice of picking between alternatives.

The challenge with aiding newborn with choices on what is a human being rather than to hand a new born a universal definition and/or to let the newborn come up with his own conclusion is that the more choices one has, the more our present ongoing programming on human beings having been created by a superpower or evolved from chimpanzee would continue to influence us to create patterns that are in function of the number of definitions that are handed to us. If all what we do on earth from birth to death is establish conjecture and pursue to establish if they are right or wrong, the more we hand conjectures instead of letting a person come up with his on his own, the more we would be accelerating people motion. Earlier, I said it is increased human motion, what could be contributing to people being intolerant.

The word bifurcation means the act of being divided into two branches or forks.⁹⁸ There are two type of bifurcation. One method is for example, when a river that is flowing in a single stream separates into two or more separate streams. The branches split from the principal river. The other method is when the bifurcation or the separation does not maintain any connection with the element it splits from. Birth, for example, is a type of bifurcation that once the split occurs, the two people become each one independent and each one abiding to different relationship.

Bifurcation theory is the mathematical study of changes in the qualitative or topological structure of patterns.⁹⁹ There are two principal criteria when studying dynamical systems where a family of patterns or vector field constitute the different structure: symmetry and asymmetry.

World Peace is defined as a concept of an ideal state of happiness and freedom within and among all people and nations on earth.¹⁰⁰ Varying concepts exists on how such a state would come about. All members of the human family claim that it could come about either voluntarily or by a virtue of a system of governance.

⁹⁸ <https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/bifurcate>

⁹⁹ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bifurcation_theory

¹⁰⁰ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/World_peace

I have no way of knowing the specific work program the UN system and the UN member states are following, thus hoping to make dynamical systems like humans begin to establish static behaviors when reproduction is a bifurcation process, and the conjectures that humans establish are a function of human imagination. In turn, human imagination is a function of the natural world, the built environment, and one's own conception. What I do know is that humans are objects that exhibits self-similarity at every level of magnification but who are asymmetric in behavior. If the ambition of the UN system and the UN member states is to convert the asymmetric patterns that people exhibit into becoming symmetric, I consider there is only two ways to do this. One method is either to regulate the birth rates to control the number of bifurcation variable that this process generates, and the other method is to standardize human patterns. Since mankind does not want to control birth rates, and it is not possible to standardize human patterns, because we cannot control what people conjugate when this process depends on human imagination and the changes in the natural and built environment. Therefore, since for as long as humans and the natural world are creating change, and the change that result will not be enough to arrange that people share on equal rights the patterns that all the stakeholders in this global system (i.e., natural world, humans and animals) are each one permanently resizing the other to serve his own benefit and the benefit of his specie, there remain only one solution to my knowledge. This is to empty out the philosophical ideas that contribute to create patterns that keeps the world dynamics.

In physics, the continuity equation states that “the rate at which mass enters a system is equal to the rate at which mass leaves the system plus the accumulation of mass within the system.”¹⁰¹ If people do not want to regulate birth rates, then there are two other methods to control the accumulation of mass within the system. Either by increasing crises and conflicts to increase death rate or by controlling the conjecture that people make. Hence man does not want to regulate birth rate or increase crises and conflicts to increase death rate, then there is only one way to control the accumulation of conjectures within the system. This is to drain from the system conjectures. Hence natural inequality makes it impossible for us to download or to drain the conjecture that makes us

¹⁰¹ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Continuity_equation

narrow the gap between the rich and the poor, then the only choice is to download the philosophical conjectures that existing people use to influence people behavior to be intolerant. What if people need to begin to purge philosophical ideas in order to make people begin to put up with one another?

From antiquity till now, humans purge the patterns that their human ingenuity create and replace them with modern patterns, but they have not been dumping any of the philosophical ideas that pushes them to create some of the patterns that they exhibit. Let us continue to check if we can identify what are the conjecture that people must purge to stop them from being used by people to gain advantage over others thus keeping the social realm dynamic. Most importantly, to establish which most pressing conjecture that people need to resolve or purge first to enable newborns to be tolerant or to exhibit patterns that are in accordance with people aspiration to create peace and security in the world.

8

Do we need to purge philosophical ideas to make newborn become ready to put up with one another?

A movie camera is an apparatus that takes a series of images and inscribe them on film. The recorded images can then be projected or played back. Humans seem to be a complex form of matter that strikes as being comparable to instruments that functions not any different from the way video systems operates. Through their physical body humans explore the idea of reality and help audiences think differently about life, pleasure, pain and themselves.

Simply put, throughout the history of the human life, people have been working on upgrading or transforming their behavioral standards in a manner that is not any different from the series of progressive developmental innovations they introduce to the different devices they engineer. This emphasis brought a dramatic change to the behavior of people since this species began to manifest destiny. The efficacy and the versatility that resulted made people actions become more predictable. However, like all tools, humans have limitations too. The principal one is they are mortal. Most importantly, they are not treated like the different devices they engineer, which can be used permanently throughout their operational life span to serve human needs but only become dispensable because humans modernize. From antiquity till now, humans did not succeed at bringing genetic changes that would replace the character that a human being is born with to come up with personalities that are more versatile in the same way this species managed to create sweeping changes in the devices they engineer. Experts from various fields attribute mankind failure to come together

to harmonize actions based on respect for the principle of equal rights to the unpreparedness of most people in the new postwar world order that the leaders of the nations with great power proposed, including the many natural and manmade distinction that humans have to work around. Indeed, the afore reasons and many other limitations could be preventing mankind from bringing sweeping changes to harmonize actions in accordance with the goals this species all the time fixes to ensure lasting peace, but then finds itself incapable to respect.

On the other hand, if we compare the detention time (or life span) of a person on earth, we find that it is a very small interval in the history of the world. Humans replace or throw outdated ways of doing things and/or material things they engineer to give room for new modern products all the times. For instance, people were in antiquity burning wood to obtain energy, then when new sources of energy were discovered most people shifted. This is not how people have been dealing with other conjectures. Humans do not pursue the same habit with respect to the religious and philosophical questions they pose. After so many years on the appearance of mankind on earth, despite man knowing that there would be many religious and philosophical questions that may remain unanswered, and/or despite the existence of lots of historical data that support the impact those two ideas have played to keep the social order dynamic, people refuse to detach and purge those two ideas from their relations. What if the existence of many unanswered philosophical and religious questions along with our dependence on the power of those two ideas to help some of us use them to get our way is what left peace and security seem as if it is hanging on a pendulum that every generation does not know how to stop them from going back and forth to ultimately ensure lasting peace.

Evidently, when we have a social order, which its members use reproduction as a mean to gain an advantage, could this condition of allowing any newborn to dump new perceptions and/or build on the premise of what was promulgated, and then depart, be what is making newborns unable to put up with one another? Could our practice of not leaving ahead of new people lots of space to explore, ponder or to rediscover themselves the perceptions that others developed about religious and philosophical topics including science in the short time we all have to live, be what is preventing us from being mindful in the

dignity and worth of the human person? Should we start with letting each newborn make up his own mind about the purpose of the human life rather than having others worry about fitting or adjusting ones' own human behavior to conjectures that people split into natural and legal rights because it serves their propensity? What if this practice of making a newborn reflect on the idea of humanness is what is making it impossible to be able to domesticate newborn to be tolerant, because everyone gets aided on how to develop his bias from pre-existing concepts and ideas. What if in order to have people manage to harmonize actions to build social cohesion, we need to stop with having newborn start their life finding so many dogmas thus getting confused? What if the principal reason for people hesitance to put up with one another is because we have many unanswered philosophical question and dogma that we did not discard them from our social realm in the same way we do it with material things that becomes obsolete or when we modernize?

Most importantly, what if because we are continuing to let the earth be a reservoir in which people dump conjecture that we know add dynamics, we are living exactly as per our predecessors lived split between periods of peace and wars? What if the countless number of cumulative religious and philosophical conjecture that we keep is what is making newborns unable to distinguish between right and wrong contrary to what people thinks? What if the time has come to start to domesticate people to provide benefits for our societies by leaving it up to each individual to understand fundamental truths about themselves, the world in which they live, and their relationships to the world and to each other? This realm will spare mankind from continuing to wait until existing humans manage to rise above the weakness of the will so the new people that are continually being injected into the social realm begin to provide only benefits for our societies. What if instead of devoting our time to make people begin to put up with one another as we have been doing so we could manage to have people begin to develop friendly relations on the principles of equal rights, we need to use this energy to resolve most of the philosophical conjecture that prevent people to harmonize actions so newborns do not find themselves having to be bound by their personal power and conscience to resolve conjectures that we already know that no matter how many counter-example are given to disproof the provable truth about their essential

nature it would be impossible to disproof what is being postulated is true or false.

When our societies unload all the conjectures that could wear the tolerance of a person down, this will eventually pause newborns from relying on those conjectures to create crises and conflicts. Most importantly, newborns will not find those present conjectures that we are not able to work around them so they would stop to be influenced by them. The absence of those conjectures would make newborn stop to use their life span to resolve the conjecture that we use to resize each other, and thus begin to use their time to focus on how to reinforce positive results such as how to establish a colony in Mars, which is more constructive or to build floatable cities. Most importantly, the absence of those conjecture will pause the imagination of newborn from being brainwashed by those ideas.

For instance, if we continue to give new people the choice of picking between a superpower having created the universe or another group preaching that humans are an extant members of the subtribe Hormina¹⁰² (the Horminina are sister of the Chimpanzees) and expect that a newborn become capable to harmonize actions to deepen peace and security, there is a good chance that mankind would never be domesticated to attain this goal. If humans are an extant members of the subtribe Hormina, then how can people be domesticated to develop compassion if they are already beasts? If people want humans to be an extant members of the subtribe Hormina, then all the references to humans having been created by a superpower should be abolished and those who preach this teaching should be restrained from conditioning people with such an idea to stop creating confusion.

If we want that future newborns to start to provide only benefits for our societies so all the patterns that those new people manifest in nature become intended to deepen fraternity, could we do it without reducing the number of conjectures that are handed out. When a newborn is not told that humans are wicked as the Bible claim or that man evolved from beasts as some other sources do postulate as well, and pick explanations that does not make a person link his behavior to other than positive pre-

¹⁰² <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Human>

existing justifications only. By the time a newborn discover that humans are beasts, it would be time already for him to depart this life.

Moreover, hence it is not possible to control the information that people gain or the conjecture that they develop but it is possible to control what a person can think about and this is done by not providing to a newborn any material that can aid him to think about what one doesn't want, if the number of conjecture that gives a person ideas to manifest irrational acts are reduced, then it becomes much easier to domesticate new people, because there would be less predetermined ideas out there.

For instance, an orphan does not spent time to reconstruct how to bring his parents back to life, but if he is told that there is a person who is now reviving dead people, that person who established this conjecture (for financial gains) and the person who did fall for such a conjecture (for compassionate reason) would both begin to create patterns that we know would not result in a logical conclusion. If we rewrite all the religious and philosophical books to pause them from including information about the existence of eternal life or talk about how Jesus' resurrection from the dead defeated death and with this gesture forgave our sins, etc. (even if this was the case and is true), thus stopping with giving the human imagination reason or space to imagine setups that we already know that no matter how many counter-example are given to prove or disprove these events it would be impossible to establish their truthfulness or falseness; the people who obtain their awareness from religious or philosophical books to condition other people's imagination to suppose that certain scenarios are possible would stop using such idea as a precursor to scam others. Likewise, the people whose imagination is weak would stop to fall for scams that are built based on religious and philosophical ideas. People would start to have less ideas and less patterns to generate. Religion is not a business. The less patterns religion gets people to generate, the less dynamic people become. The less dynamic people become, the easier it gets to domesticate newborns.

In fact, even if Jesus is the son of God and he defied death, the philosophy that God / Jesus were teaching 2000 years ago, could be a threat to human security after humans began to control the human body to control ethics using technology. The same applies to the interference of any past prophet or messenger that God dispatched to the earth to

have humans harmonize actions based on the teaching that he was instructing.

As of the date mankind disobeyed God as the myth that is reported in the Bible state, and the social order that we began to depend on to harmonize actions became structured based on letting an individual be bound by his personal power and conscience. Since this date, our specie has been working on establishing ethical system based on emphasizing the importance of human reason over the unimportance of theological doctrines. The theological doctrines teach the surrendering to a divine authority, but the human ingenuity is teaching to surrender to this aptitude own authority. The two doctrines are aiming to deepen ethics, but in the case of the theological doctrines, the surrendering is occurring in exchange for protection from this unseen authority upon death; whereas in the case of the doctrine that human ingenuity is teaching, the surrendering is occurring in order to address how human conditions may have been like absent of any political order.

Hence the difference in the political order between the two is that in the case of God, man is not supposed to distinguish between right and wrong (Genesis - 2:17 and 3:21) and in the case of man, human ingenuity was programmed to be doing the opposite, we have two school of thoughts that are totally contradicting each other on what a person should be and/or should not be doing during his life. Now, because the technology that humans want to depend on to distinguish between right and wrong is established based on what the person who developed the algorithm thinks is right from wrong, and because we know that no matter how many counter-example the person who developed the algorithm gives to proof that his conjectures are deepening ethics, it is not possible to determine the truthfulness or falseness of this claim, because in the case of what we have been instructed to be doing during our life to preserve our security, it is suggestions that certain people claim that God passed onto them. In the case of the tools that are helping us to distinguish between what is right from wrong, this is suggestions that man developed or came up with on his own.

However, because the tools that man create are capable to prompt change that the human ingenuity was not programmed naturally to

manipulate, by keeping the philosophical teaching and/or ethical system that God passed through his different messengers accessible, we could be working on achieving a wash or a zero net gain. This is because in the case of God we are supposed to establish ethics voluntarily by relying on human reason, but in the case of how human ingenuity want us to achieve this end, we become required to exhibit it involuntarily. Hence the difference between the two is about how a person should use his human reason to achieve in his lifetime vs what he could be forgoing if he does not, and in both case this is happiness. Then, because one doctrine is teaching to postpone happiness (theological doctrines) and another is teaching to speed it up (human reason), by keeping the philosophical teaching and/or ethical system that God passed through his different messengers accessible, we would be continuing to give reason to the poor about why they should continue to be relying on their personal power and conscience to get their own way.

In other words, people did not keep footprints in the past and only a limited number did it. Technology makes it possible so more people leave footprints such as opinions, ideas, philosophes, etc. The rich nations deny the poor nations' rights to produce especially submarines, aircraft carriers, airplanes, large ships, computers, energy using nuclear reaction, weapons of mass destructions, etc. etc. to prevent the people in those nations from developing know how that could threaten them. Denying the poor nations blueprint to manufacture material things that rich nations consider could pose a threat to their national security, and leaving the philosophical and religious books freely accessible in the hands of the poor nations teaching them about "man being wicked and is programmed with an evil heart from childhood,"¹⁰³ does not help to domesticate a new generation of newborns who are motivated to develop friendly relations, but rather confirm why a person should resort to force to get his way if God, himself, is supporting in religious books that "he regretted having had made human beings on the earth."¹⁰⁴

Indeed, humankind are going to have to make a choice about how to maintain peace and security in the coming years. The choices are going to be between deciding whether to keep in the philosophical and religious books ideas about humans being wicked and other ones that

¹⁰³ <https://www.biblegateway.com/passage/?search=Genesis+6&version=NIV>

¹⁰⁴ <https://www.biblica.com/bible/niv/genesis/6/>

gives human reasons to believe that God is also denying them human rights as the law of inheritance that some religion claim God suggested that everyone must honor teaches or to remove them. The benefit of modifying all the philosophical and religious books to get rid of any idea in them that God has something to do with people denying each other rights, favoring one race over another, or that one race prompted the crucifixion of his only son, etc. and using a standard common religion could make it easy to domesticate newborns in the future.

When most information about humans being a specie that is immoral is removed, and a common doctrine that depict humans as being a moral specie only, there is a good chance that the social order may become less dynamics. In other words, when we let a newborn discover if mankind is a moral or immoral specie, then whatever a person manages to discover before his death and serves humanity, we shall keep. All the thoughts or conjectures that does not serve humanity we burry it with the deceased so other people would not be influence by it. This domestication could spare the need to use global war to achieve what human reason may not want to realize voluntarily.

If mankind gets rid of most of human history pre 1945, and start a new one that sets the start of humanity to 1945 or another imaginary date, it would be perhaps possible to domesticate people to attain a lasting peace. This solution would make all newborn accept a reality instead of being given ideas to change the world, which we know is not something that can be any better than having the rich and the poor be ready to collaborate in the economic field based on the principles of equal rights, which we began pursuing as of 1945. For instance, all the pre-Socratic books that were burnt made humans re-produce them. Humans are programmed with a human imagination which makes it impossible to stop a human being from thinking or supposing. The new people that would be born would no longer form conjecture based on the experience of existing people, because their experiences would be different when human history is erased. In fact, the way we live our lives comes, in large part, from the answer that each one of us gives to what is his purpose as a specie. When all the references to religious denominations such as Judaism, Christianity, Islam, Buddhism, etc. etc. and all the philosophical questions are abolished, and replaced with a single religion that does not include reference to humans being wicked or

reference to a Son of God that the Jews caused his crucifixion, and so forth, but with a new definition for what humans really are and their mission, then the new people would find none of those issues that people use to deny each other rights available to form on their premise motives to act in this way. In other words, when we force a proof on what is a human being for example, we reduce the earth from being a reservoir to dump conjectures that we know would not change nothing if humans evolved from animals or Jupiter or if a God placed humans on this planet. In so doing, we would slow down the reliance of the people on conjecture that gives them ideas to depend on their conscience to justify their actions. Most importantly, when the earth is emptied out or unloaded from all the philosophical and religious ideas that people depend on to deny each other rights, and the poor nations are shown how to build submarines, airplanes and aircraft carriers but with its deck loaded with fields to plant food since dirt and iron are abundant, this strategy would keep people busy their entire life occupied. This strategy would resolve man's challenge to find livable space especially since we are living on a planet that 70% of its surface is covered with water. In the year 3000, those people who would be living in the future would do the same, reset the odometer of the history of the world back to zero.

The purpose of the material that was highlighted in this chapter about emptying out the earth of religious and philosophical doctrines was a suggestion to social engineer a solution that could perhaps make people start putting up with one another. Its principal purpose was to highlight the consequences mankind could face, if people continue to rely on religious or philosophical doctrines to justify their actions when technology is involuntarily making the human behavior become neutral by surrendering the human body first. To ensure lasting peace it is the human behavior that is supposed to surrender freedom first and not the human body. In 1945 the United Nations began teaching people why they need to stop with letting their coping mechanism be directed to convert legal rights into becoming an interest right instead of remaining a will right. This means that the UN is accelerating people motion to foster human rights. Earlier, I said it is increased human motion, what could be contributing to people being intolerant. This means that if the UN continue to make people foster human rights, what this organization could be doing is nothing but increasing people reliance on religious doctrine to justify why they need not to put up with one another, because

people do not share on the principle of equal rights the natural resources that exists or the one the human ingenuity produces. Let us in the next chapter, attempt to examine what could happen in the social order if the UN member states do not pause the UN subsidiary organs from maintaining relationships with the UN, and go back to harmonize actions based on what the founding fathers of this association of nations counseled.

9

Are the iterations that we are always making is what is creating complex systems in the social order?

When people were not interconnected, it was possible through denying knowledge to control the less enlightened people. The founding fathers of the UN counselled that UN member states cultivate their own political status starting from 1945. However, the political leaders who succeeded the founding fathers of the UN and the UN officials chose to have the rich increase production so the poor could begin post 1945 to be sophisticated. The only problem is that the type of sophistication that the rich could offer to the poor delegate to technology / tools the tasks that the human body was perhaps programmed to effect in matter. This programming makes it easy for the poor to finish their tasks faster, but at the same time, prompts a wider manmade inequality and/or division of labor challenge. This type of sophistication that the political leaders who succeeded the founding fathers of the UN and the UN officials want take place in the social realm gives everyone generously access to knowledge as well. Knowledge is what pushes a person to want to improve his life chances. The knowledge that the poor develop makes a segment of the population take its fights against the rich to foster human rights. This knowledge that the poor gain challenges the standing political structure in the different nations as well. Hence to control the poor or the social order, political leaders have two options to stop all those who refuse from surrendering freedom to obtain the benefit of the political order from continuing to challenge them: The first is to remove from the hands of the poor any access to technology / tools so the knowledge that those people gain does not threaten them or the rich. The second is to get the technology / tools that the poor get access to be void

of knowledge so that everyone could not use the information he is continuously gaining to develop bias.

Since it is not possible to adopt either option to stop knowledge from making people not develop bias, the political leaders are testing with building virtual economic and social walls between nations thus making mankind go back to living exactly as per how people harmonized actions or relations were before WW2. Evidently, this politics which prohibits a nation from acquiring territorial gain to increase its access to resources to dissipate the economic challenges that its social order is continuously producing but is obliged to overcome its challenges through internal adjustment to maintain stability has led people to pick between becoming stateless or those that come out of a civil war or remain peaceful convert into becoming a military state.¹⁰⁵ No one knows if mounting stateless countries such as the one that most political experts claim exist in Lebanon^{106,107} since the start of the civil war (or in many African countries for this matter) , and/or military states such as the one that most political experts claim exist in Egypt^{108,109} and many Asian nations would eventually get the people who live in those countries (or the people who are on their way into having to pick between either becoming stateless or a military state) to continue to do as per what Nelson Mandela (1918-2013) once said “it always seems impossible until it’s done,”¹¹⁰ to make them begin to relate to each other on the principle of equal rights or they would all continue to rely, as we have been doing, on this on-going creative chaos programming until we eventually reach this perpetual peace idea that Kant sketched in 1795. That’s of course if the nations with great powers do not become impatient with each other before, and choose to address the economic and political challenges that themselves are dealing with through a

¹⁰⁵ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Fiscal-military_state

¹⁰⁶ https://www.theglobaleconomy.com/Lebanon/wb_political_stability/

¹⁰⁷ <https://foreignpolicy.com/2019/02/20/lebanon-is-facing-an-environmental-and-economic-disaster-hezbollah-hariri-aoun/>

¹⁰⁸ <https://foreignpolicy.com/2019/02/14/western-leaders-are-promoting-dictatorship-not-democracy-in-egypt-sisi-amendments-trump-macron/>

¹⁰⁹ <https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2017/apr/24/the-guardian-view-on-egypts-dictatorship-a-war-of-sisis-own-making>

¹¹⁰ <https://www.usatoday.com/story/news/nation-now/2013/12/05/nelson-mandela-quotes/3775255/>

global war to create ultimately a new global governance system and/or to change the present geographical and demographical distribution.

The challenge is that since all what gaining knowledge helps humans to achieve is nothing but to increase happiness, the decision of mankind to delegate to technology / tools the tasks that the human body was programmed to effect in matter to keep human awareness less conscious about the things human desires is deprived from is creating a situation in which each nation is now using its own economic preparedness to promote its know-how instead of promoting a collective approach to gain advantage. For instance, the government of the Sultanate of Oman opted to depend on oil to support its national economy when the current Sultan came to power in 1970. After the prices of oil began to fall, this country began to look for alternatives to supplement its economy. The Government of the Sultanate of Oman promote how this country could be an attractive hub in non-oil exploration and production sectors. The strategy that the Sultanate of Oman is adopting is the framework that another 192 nations are using to boost their economy. If all the nations, are erecting futuristic cities and/or creating free zones to attract investors, and are promoting that their environment is opportune to invest in tourism, fishing, agriculture or food processing, industrialization, logistics, and the like to boost their economy, can we manage to create economic stability when all the countries who border the Sultanate of Oman, are all of them preaching the same manta as well?

Western Asia is the westernmost sub region of Asia. Lebanon is a country in western Asia, and so is the Sultanate of Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, UAE, and other countries. Petroleum is the major industry in western Asia.¹¹¹ The Lebanese government claim that it passed decrees to begin oil and gas exploration¹¹² to address its own economic problems. Is the solution to address Lebanon's future economic problems rest on this country beginning to produce oil so we now have a new actor selling this commodity, or is it wiser for this country to go back to pre-1900s political status, and be part of Syria so this small landlocked country stands a chance of ever recovering economically?

¹¹¹ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Western_Asia#Economy

¹¹² <https://www.reuters.com/article/us-lebanon-economy-oil/new-lebanese-government-oks-oil-decrees-to-start-stalled-tender-process-idUSKBN14P03E>

It looks as if the population explosion that the world has known from 1945 to now is requiring a new convenient division of the existing social space to create new contemporary states to stop the countries with high population density to continue to displace each other's economy as they are doing? Moreover, it looks as if to control the people who were dependent before 1945, but later the political leaders who succeeded the founding fathers of the UN and the UN officials made them have to yield to a work program that is contrary to the one that the founding fathers of the UN counseled to ultimately ensure lasting peace left us ahead of two scenarios: We put people to start building towers so it reaches to the heaven, so we could all begin to have the minimum vision necessary to avoid that we and our successors continue to live as per the insecurity that we are knowing. Alternatively, surrender freedom to the only country that its people had the courage to stand up against pre 1945 programming in order to fix the political and social order that the political leaders who succeeded the founding fathers of the UN and the UN officials created. This country is the United States. Only the United States laws and rules can save mankind from the disregard that could await our successors if peace and security remain fragile as the case has been since 1945. This is because only the US laws are the one that produced the happiness for its own people as the successes of this country attests.

Therefore, hence the only solution that mankind has ahead to ensure lasting peace is to pick between the new post world order that the United States proposed on the aftermath of ww2, or the ideologies that were practiced pre 1945, this signify that if we want Lebanon, for example, to not become another Egypt, whereby the country's armed forces run and sustain every social sector, we have two choices. We remove all the access that the Lebanese people, for example, have to religion and philosophy and substitute that with how to build airplane, nuclear plant, floatable cities etc., so we keep the human body of those members of the human family engaged thus stopping them from continuing to challenge peace and security. Alternatively, we continue to tolerate the erratic behavior of the people of this specific country after their added knowledge allowed them to use religious or philosophical conjectures to strengthens their bias and to fuel insecurity. Most importantly,

tolerate their refusal to integrate in the efforts that were launched in 1945 to attain the new post world order that the United States proposed.

Historians claim that history provide a "perspective" on the problems of the present.¹¹³ If this conjecture that historian believe in is true, we can say that the French government is the principal orchestrator, of the insecurity that Lebanon is knowing. In other words, if the French Government did not let the Lebanese government be organized post ww1 around religious institutions when it was administering this country, especially after this country fought itself a civil war as a result of the interference of religion in the state affairs and in 1905 passed a law on the separation of the churches and state; we could have spared the Lebanese people from perhaps living in a stateless country since 1975, and even threatening the state of Israel as they have been doing since 1948.

Then again, in 2017, Saudi Arabia, who is supposed to be the cradle of Islam, committed a large sum of its national resources to buy arms from the United States. If the present would present a perspective in the future, how could we be sure that Saudi Arabia would not use the new weapons that it is acquiring to plunge mankind in more incertitude and disorder to deepen the propensity of its leader? For example, in 2015 Saudi Arabia began a military intervention in Yemen. Many countries are supporting Saudi Arabia on its intervention in Yemen including the United States. However, all the countries that are supporting Saudi Arabia, made it very clear including the United States, that their involvement is to redirect the spending that this country is making to finance its war efforts to them.¹¹⁴ When we compare the balance of power between the two, we find that Yemen is not a match as the table below shows.

¹¹³ <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/History>

¹¹⁴ <https://www.politico.com/story/2018/10/11/trump-getting-closer-khashoggi-893494>

Rank ¹¹⁵	Country	Area km ²	Pop.	Density (pop./km ²)	HDI ¹¹⁶ (2017)	GDP ¹¹⁷ (/capita)
174	S. Arabia	2,149,690	33,413,660	16	39	\$22,238
177	Yemen	455,000	28,915,284	64	178	\$590

Many reports have harshly criticized the Saudi intervention in Yemen,^{118,119,120} and no one knows what exactly Saudi Arabia expects to achieve from its intervention. Many commentators claim that the conflict is part of a regional power struggle between Shia-ruled Iran and Sunni-ruled Saudi Arabia.^{121, 122} Religion affects political decisions in many countries around the world. Presently, Christianity is split into many branches. What if Saudi Arabia decides in the future to wage a new war against the church of England over geopolitical, economic influence in pursuit of hegemony? In fact, how could we be sure that the Sultanate of Oman who its leaders are freezing a vast quantity of unused social space because the government decided to uphold a balanced immigrant (or foreign worker) to national ratio¹²³ would not convert this country into becoming a police state in the same way Saudi Arabia free speech is censored in this country according to some experts,^{124,125} ¹²⁶thus plunging mankind in more incertitude and disorder?

Let us not go that far, in 2018, a yellow vest movement began to seek economic reform in France to reduce the gap between the rich and the

¹¹⁵

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_countries_and_dependencies_by_area,_population_and_population_density

¹¹⁶ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_countries_by_Human_Development_Index

¹¹⁷ <http://worldpopulationreview.com/countries/countries-by-gdp/>

¹¹⁸ <https://www.bbc.com/news/world-middle-east-29319423>

¹¹⁹ <https://theintercept.com/2019/04/15/saudi-weapons-yemen-us-france/>

¹²⁰ <https://www.thenation.com/article/war-crimes-united-states-saudi-arabia-yemen/>

¹²¹ <https://www.bbc.com/news/world-middle-east-29319423>

¹²² https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Iran%E2%80%93Saudi_Arabia_proxy_conflict

¹²³ <https://www.arabianbusiness.com/oman-set-limit-number-of-foreign-workers-488716.html>

¹²⁴ <https://object.cato.org/sites/cato.org/files/human-freedom-index-files/2017-human-freedom-index-2.pdf>

¹²⁵ <https://www.dw.com/en/freedom-of-expression-ranks-low-in-saudi-arabia/a-47120447>

¹²⁶ <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2017/may/04/un-accuses-saudi-arabia-of-using-terror-laws-to-suppress-free-speech>

poor.¹²⁷ How could we be sure that France who its leaders are enacting stringent laws to counter against this political movement for economic justice that emerged would not plunge itself in more insecurity, and experience similar incertitude and disorder as per the one Lebanon is knowing.

This erratic behavior that the people of Saudi Arabia exhibited when they encumbered resources to buy arms is not herald from God or is one that confine God's action to the formal covenants of the Islam religion. To the contrary, this behavior support that the unending stream of confusion that emerged in the world post 1945, could be due to the people of Saudi Arabia having become absent minded about what their leaders who lived in 1945 pledged to be devoted to securing, never mind "Islam" also teaches. The threat the people of Saudi Arabia and/or the people of any nation who are still manufacturing weapons and/or acquiring weapons represent the un-readiness of the new people who succeeded the generation that lived during ww2 to respect the international covenant that was agreed upon, which include achieving disarmament in the world to spare humanity from knowing another disregard similar to the one that occurred during ww2. Therefore, if Saudi Arabia, the actual leaders of the United States and the actual leaders of the rest of the UN member states are all canceling former covenants (religious or manmade) to achieve the ends set forth in the UN charter, and are relying on a new wok program to achieve the same ends, do we have any other option ahead of us to stop people from relying on distinction such as race, colour, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth or other status to get their way than to preemptively purge them from our social order before it is too late?

It is possible that the rich are counting on technology to aiding them to control the poor, but this could only create more confusion, because this approach would split societies into becoming made of cops and robbers who are both being peacemaker but at the same time war officers.^{128,129} In other words, hence the role of governments is shrinking, the only way to continue to absorb the large number of workforce that governments

¹²⁷ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Yellow_vests_movement

¹²⁸ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Junior_Murvin

¹²⁹ <https://genius.com/Junior-murvin-police-and-thieves-lyrics>

employment is if this segment is converted into becoming an enforcer / informer. This is needed to give the people who are government officials a purpose or a role to play. This approach would provide the rich protection, but at the same time, it makes people depend more on tribalism to get their way despite the resistance of others, because the job that the government officials would be doing when they would become enforcer/informer is to monitor both the rich and the poor. Because the government officials are working on realizing the full development of their personality (and most of them are to begin with from a social stratification that is poor), then the call for social justice as the case in France show to reduce the gap between the rich and the poor would reciprocally grow. In fact, to show how insecurity would continue to rise in France (who is a developed nation), and even to show how the Sultanate of Oman who is regarded as a peaceful nation could become a police state¹³⁰ as the case is like in Saudi Arabia or Egypt, etc., let us consider this analogy. Let's use the social order in Lebanon to show how this is possible.

Humans divide the social space into a manageable number of world regions for statistical purposes. Asia is regarded as the largest size and the world's most populace land area or continent. Lebanon is the smallest decolonized sovereign state in the Asian continent. Sectarianism existed in Lebanon throughout the history of this country, but only post 1945 did such tribalism marred the country with such acute degree of unawareness. The political blindness that emerged in Lebanon post 1945 it's dreadful signs began after this country obtained its independence in 1945.

In demographics, a country's population is the total number of humans currently living. Population density is a measurement of population per unit area or unit volume. This density terms refers to the number of people living in an area per square kilometer. For example, in the case of Lebanon, France or Oman (or Sultanate of Oman), we have this data.

¹³⁰ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Police_state

Rank ¹³¹	Country	Area km ²	Pop.	Density (pop./km ²)	YrUN member ¹³²
10	Lebanon	10,452	6,065,922	595	1945
68	France	543,965	66,998,000	123	1945
177	Oman	309,500	4,183,841	14	1971

Oman is categorized as a high-income economy.¹³³ This country has a strategical geographical importance in the Persian Gulf and this could be one of the reason why the superpowers protect this country, and do not allow that a large migrant workers constitute a substantial part of this country's population till now.

Lebanon on the other side is a country that its land area is so small compared to the size of the land area of Oman. The number of foreign workers or immigrant must of have been high until 1975 when the economy of the country "was interspersed with prosperity built on its position as a regional center for finance and trade."¹³⁴ In as far as France is concerned, this country is the third-most populous country in Europe.¹³⁵ Based on some statistical studies conducted, "in 2010, 27% of newborns in metropolitan France had at least one foreign-born parent and 24% had at least one parent born outside of Europe (parents born in overseas territories are considered as born in France)."^{136,137}

The Global Peace Index (GPI) "measures the relative position of nations' and regions' peacefulness."¹³⁸ The Global Peace Index for the three countries since this index began to keep records in 2008 is as follows:

¹³¹

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_countries_and_dependencies_by_area,_population_and_population_density

¹³² <https://www.un.org/en/sections/member-states/growth-united-nations-membership-1945-present/index.html>

¹³³ <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Oman>

¹³⁴ <https://www.cia.gov/LIBRARY/publications/the-world-factbook/geos/le.html>

¹³⁵ <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/France#Demographics>

¹³⁶ <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/France#Demographics>

¹³⁷ "Naissances selon le pays de naissance des parents 2010". Insee. Archived from the original on 27 September 2013.

¹³⁸ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Global_Peace_Index

Country	2018	2008	Government type
Lebanon	147	127	Parliamentary Republic
France	61	50	Semi-presidential Repub.
Oman	73	22	Absolute Monarchy
Saudi Arabia	129	105	Absolute Monarchy
Egypt	142	74	Presidential Republic

In the Table above, the peace index of Saudi Arabia and Egypt were added to help in formulating the analysis or relationships.

A scale model is defined as “a physical representation of an object, which maintains accurate relationships between all important aspects of the model, although absolute values of the original properties need not be preserved.”¹³⁹

If no matter what people may do during their lifetime, without a rise in population it will not be possible to develop scientific, literary or artistic production to grow; and, if humans do not inundate their social space with scientific, literary or artistic production to thereby upgrade the abundance and quality of their economy or power, we can say that Oman has two choices ahead of its leadership to pick from: Become the future Saudi Arabia / Egypt, or become the next Dubai. Evidently, the price that Oman would have to pay when its leadership convert the country into becoming another Dubai is that the people who are in power would lose their authority. Of course, the Sultanate of Oman can program to keep all the social space that the great powers agreed that this country be granted to ultimately maintain a development model that is identical to the one that Norway is pursuing (see table below). Then again, this country knows that when its economy begins to compete with Norway, what is going to be awaiting its leadership is what awaited the countries that its neighbors faced when their economies started to displace each other.

¹³⁹ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Scale_model

Rank¹⁴⁰	Country	Area km²	Popu.	Density (pop./km²)	HDI (2017)¹⁴¹
171	Norway	323,782	5,328,212	16	1
177	Oman	309,500	4,183,841	14	48

Moreover, if no matter what people may do during their lifetime, it is not possible for them to abandon tribalism because it is what people depend on to get their way despite the resistance of others; and, if humans do not purge from their social space tribalism to thereby upgrade the abundance and quality of their society, we can say that France has two choices ahead of its leadership to pick from: Become the future Lebanon, or become the next Egypt. Evidently, the price that France would have to pay when its leadership convert the country into becoming another Lebanon, is that the people who are in power would become anarchic / oligarchic.

If it looks as if the choices that the countries who experienced civil strife and the countries whose people are on their way into having to pick between either becoming stateless (as per the way the people of Lebanon are organized), or a military state (as per the way the people of Egypt are organized), has the time come to surrender freedom to the United States so this country show us how we can purge tribalism and many other philosophical and religious ideas from our social order in the same way this country did from 1776 to 1945. Has the time come to stop with letting the earth continue to be a reservoir of ideology or an experimental theater to make people put up with one another when an ideology that we know already works exists.

During Greek antiquity, when the idea of God started to create conflicts for the people to harmonize actions, the people of this epoch changed their complex religious system that was loaded with gods, goddesses, demigods, and mythological creatures with a single all-powerful God. Since, this date, we find that the people who passed down through the centuries and who to this day believe that a superpower created the

¹⁴⁰

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_countries_and_dependencies_by_area,_population_and_population_density

¹⁴¹ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_countries_by_Human_Development_Index

universe stopped with waging wars against each other as they were doing before when the world was inhabited by many Gods and Goddesses, and/or attributing their actions to fulfill God's plan. After, all the Gods of some religions were merged into one, people stopped charging that their actions were inspired from divine rights, and/or to drum people emotions on such conjecture to support their plea. From Greek antiquity onward most people are ready to support that the root cause for all the crises and wars are from here on earth. Most of the people who were bound by their personal power and conscience, and waged wars stopped to create such crises by attributing how their actions could have been derived from divine rights to address a particular God or Goddess plea. The indoctrination in the existence of one God proved that this later development in the history of religions to enact monotheist type God rather than a polytheist version(s) helped humanity to reduce the number of people who were legitimizing how their right to rule or to make people surrender freedom was directly derived from the will of God. When we had less people, our ancestors managed to change their complex religious system that was loaded with gods, goddesses, demigods, and mythological creatures to a single all-powerful God. Now we have a single God (in some religions and not all), but we have lots of people. This is the opposite of what we had in antiquity when we had less people and many Gods. Do we need to purge some ideological ideas to reduce people bias and stop the people who are depending on their power to get their way despite the resistance of others from pausing us to keep the social order peaceful? In so doing, we could perhaps begin to make progress on the goals the founding fathers of the UN proposed in the UN charter. Evidently, to see immediate progress, we should let the United States take the lead, because it is the only country who possess know how to do it, as I said earlier.

In mathematics, Iteration is defined as “the act of repeating a process, to generate a sequence of outcomes, with the aim of approaching a desired goal, target or result.”¹⁴² Each repetitive process is called an "iteration." Most algorithms are built based on employing an iterative process. The output or results of one iteration are used as the input or the starting point for the next iteration. Likewise, a function, in mathematics, is a rule that maps one value to another. In other words, a

¹⁴² <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Iteration>

function is a relationship that captures the dependence of something on at least one other thing. An iterated function system also called dynamic sequence is a rule or a process that takes the output or results of the value of the function and uses it as the input or the starting point for the next iteration.

When our ancestors took all the gods, goddesses, demigods, and mythological creatures and replaced them with a single all-powerful God, our predecessors managed through the centuries to reduce a complex system into a simpler one, but this conjecture seems to have produced a much complex challenge.

For instance, ancient Rome refers to Roman civilization from the founding of the city of Rome in the 8th century BC to the collapse of the Western Roman Empire in the 5th century AD encompassing the Roman Kingdom, Roman Republic and Roman Empire until the fall of the western empire.¹⁴³ The Roman Republic is an era beginning with the overthrow of the Roman Kingdom, traditionally dated to 509 BC, and ending in 27 BC with the establishment of the Roman Empire.¹⁴⁴ The Roman Empire was the post Roman Republic period of the ancient Roman civilization, traditionally dated to 27 BC, and ending in 395 AD with the establishment of the Western [395 – 476 AD] and Eastern Roman Empire [395 – 1453 AD]. The area known as the fertile crescent region in modern time which extends from the Nile River to the Tigris River used to be a geographical area that the Roman controlled. According to Anthropologists and Archeologists, some of the people who used to live in the fertile crescent region used to practice the Jewish faith. Scholars also claim that the people who used to observe the Jewish faith in this fertile crescent region used to revolt against the Romans in the same way how some people in some nations in modern times do to seek social justice.^{145,146}

Scholars place Jesus's birth around 4 BC and claim that he was born in Bethlehem (Jerusalem) a city located between the Mediterranean Sea and the Dead Sea. Most people agree that Jerusalem was at that time

¹⁴³ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ancient_Rome

¹⁴⁴ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Roman_Kingdom

¹⁴⁵ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Second_Temple_Judaism

¹⁴⁶ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/First_Jewish%E2%80%93Roman_War

inhabited by pagans and Jews, that Jesus was Jewish, and that the disciples or students of Jesus who formed the core of his ministry were essentially all ethnically Jewish. In other words, the people who Jesus was preaching to them his doctrines and the people who began to travel with him to spread his doctrine to make Jewish or pagan convert onto Christians were Jewish.

Anthropologists and scholars claim that during Jesus's time and after his death in particular, the apostles of Jesus caused a more complex portrait to emerge in the social realm which led the Jewish religious authorities to expulse from synagogues converts and the Roman authorities to censor the Christian doctrine from spreading and to persecute those who pursue it. The persecution of Christians can be traced historically from the date when the apostles began to spread to Christianity in the first century until the Edict of Serdica, also called Edict of Toleration which granted Christianity rights to be worshiped, and later the Edict of Milan in 313 AD which gave legal status by the Roman Empire to Christianity including preparing the way to make this religion the state church of the Roman Empire in 380 AD under Emperor Theodosius I.^{147,148,149}

I have no way of knowing what exactly was God's goal around 4BC when he decided to send his son to preach ethics that is, in principle, not any different (in essence) than what he had already communicated through Moses earlier. No one knows also why when Christianity began to spread the Kingdom of God and the Resurrection of the dead failed to occur did God not interfere and put a stop to this diaspora that emerged, which at first began to not interest itself in material things but then it claimed that with Jesus' resurrection people could in a way go back to resuming their normal life for as long as they follow principles that are not any different than the one Moses preached. Surely, this intervention that God made has not made people in their entirety exhibit the patterns that he sent his son to communicate. Actually, historians claim that Christianity has had a lot to do with the events that led to the collapse of the Roman Empire. If as per what mathematics claim that the less relationships that exists, the simpler it becomes possible to

¹⁴⁷ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Edict_of_Serdica

¹⁴⁸ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Edict_of_Milan

¹⁴⁹ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Persecution_of_Christians

manage and control patterns, then we can say that if God and our ancestors had relied on common sense, and kept humankind be ruled by the Romans and/or all of us pursuing the Jewish faith, maybe we could have been better off now to deepen peace and security. This is because humanity is now split into 193 nations in which some 4300 religions¹⁵⁰ alone are all working on promoting a respective ecumenism to deepen prosperity and welfare.

I have no way of knowing why our predecessors decided to take all the gods, goddesses, demigods, and mythological creatures and to replace them with a single all-powerful God. This consolidation action removed the reliance of those earlier people on continuing to attribute the changes that they were prompting in matter from one that was motivated by multiple Gods to a mono God. However, this exercise does not seem to have changed the nature of the changes that people are prompting which is the most important factor here to maintain peace and security so far.

It looks as if the replacement or swapping of all the multiple Gods and goddesses into a single all-powerful God so that 4,300 new religions emerge afterwards created a zero net gain. In fact, we do not have only so many religions that people are depending on to legitimize their right to rule or to make other surrender freedom, but we also have a new belief emerged which began to promote that humans are descendant of chimpanzees and other living and non-living things. Moreover, this swapping exercise from depending on multiple God to relying on a mono God shifted all the energy that our predecessors were investing to resize each other through basing the legitimacy of such right to rule or to make other surrender freedom as being directly derived from the will of God into becoming an action that was weighed based on distinction embedded in race, colour, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth or other status.

Indeed, I have no way of knowing how the existence of so many gods and goddesses was impacting on harmonizing the actions of our ancestors thus they decided to consolidate all of them into a single all-powerful God. In the same token, what did our ancestors expected to get out of consolidating all of the Gods and Goddesses into a single all-

¹⁵⁰ <https://www.quora.com/How-many-different-religions-are-there-in-the-world>

powerful God rather than to keeping them all. Perhaps, the reason why our predecessors decided to take all the gods, goddesses, demigods, and mythological creatures and to replace them with a single all-powerful God could have been to stop people from continuing with being bound by their personal power and conscience to get their way to ensure lasting peace or to connive covet objective / conspiracy. No matter what their reason might have been, we could say that the decision of our ancestors to reduce the idea of Gods to a simpler function and the subsequent rise of all the distinction variables such as race, colour, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth or other status that emerged was also based on an incomplete information for which no proof has been found. This conclusion could be perhaps true hence none of the conjecture that was tested with to make people voluntarily be ready to put up with one another succeeded so far. In other words, there is no proof that supports that making people reduce the number of Gods and Goddesses from 1000 to 1 or 10, making everyone speak English or Chinese, and/or setting up a governance system based on a monarchial structure or a republic that such action would deepen social cohesion. Most importantly, we could also say that if from antiquity till the date when ww2 broke out, and despite all the people who passed down through the centuries culminating with our fathers they all failed to harmonize actions to ensure lasting peace thus sparing us from having to do for our successors what was our ancestors job to do for us that the iterations that we were resolving were pushing the peacefulness of the world in one direction or another. At the end of WW2 all what our leaders counseled us to do is to develop friendly relations based on the principles of equal rights, and without any distinction integrated in the process such as race, colour, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth or other status. If from 1945 till now, this programming is producing the complex behavior or dynamic that emerged so far, there is only two scenarios that could have created this defying patterns that some people are manifesting. The first scenario is if the countries that proposed that people abandon their tribalism to create a new world free from fear or want acted in this way to mask incongruity. The second is if we began to practice a new program that its outcome is producing this decreased in peacefulness that emerged.

Once again, we cannot say that the work program that the founding fathers proposed is what is provoking this dynamism that emerged, because all what those leaders counselled us to practice is tolerance. It would be irrational to suppose that those founding fathers who suggested that we all come together to practice tolerance to achieve the goals fixed in the preamble of the UN Charter that their suggestion was motivated to deliberately provoke dynamism in the social order. To the contrary, when people act irrationally, it is the rich or the industrialized nations who would lose the most. This is because it is dynamism what causes people, nations, kingdoms, or empires to be resized. Therefore, it would be irrational to assume that the nations who suggested that we all come together to collaborate in the economic field that they would want to create the complex dynamics that emerged, because they are the ones who would lose the most in social breakdowns.

At the same time, no one really knows what compelled Great Britain to agree to relinquish the power or grip this country/empire extended over all the territories, or trading posts that this country administered, because it was the one who at the end of the day was going to lose the most when all its dependent people or nations are granted independence. Let us review rapidly if those nations who proposed that all people come together to collaborate in the economic field were masking incongruity. In this way, we could comprehend better what might have gone wrong between what the founding fathers of the UN proposed and what the leaders who succeeded them and the UN officials ended up practicing.

Historians claim that the United States and Great Britain who was the foremost global power and who held sway over a quarter of the world population or the total land area till the middle of the 19th century, met in 1941 and proposed a new conjecture for which no proof was found. Those two countries organized a conference to focus on the peace that would follow on the aftermath of ww2. The two countries proposed / agreed that the global governance system that was used pre 1941, and which was based on denying the people of certain nations right to determine their political status be changed with a new global governance system. Those two countries agreed that all the people in all the nations be free to pursue their economic, social and cultural development for as long as they agree to adhere to certain conditions or milestones. Those milestones were policy statement, as such they were

not formal legal document but rather vision. The declaration that were made at the end of this meeting coined the Atlantic Charter¹⁵¹ contained eight principal points that both countries believed could ensure lasting peace if the rest of the nations were to accept them.

Obviously, the policy statement proposed during the Atlantic Charter called on nations to adhere to certain criteria. Indeed, the mindfulness that the two countries express to create conditions of stability and well-being to reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights was approved by all the existing nations. All the nations backed the policy statements that were issued in the Atlantic Charter and formalized their support toward them by signing the treaty that the allies ratified 01 January 1942, known as Declaration by United Nations.¹⁵² Actually, the framework that the United States and Great Britain did propose to allies in the Atlantic Charter became the basis for the modern United Nations.

Surely, the ambition of those two countries of seeing that all people in all the countries “dwell in safety within their boundaries” so all “men in all the lands may live out their lives in freedom from fear and want” cannot be interpreted to mean that those two countries were masking any intention to further the ends of despotism or anarchy otherwise what purpose would those countries have to gain from freeing people so it would become later difficult to control. Likewise, it would be irrational to assume that those two countries proposed that mankind would start to share on equal rights the scientific advancement that we all claim that we produce to provide benefits to our societies and our own. The United States and Great Britain proposed that all people practice “tolerance” to harmonize actions based on the principles of equal rights, and not on equal rights. Those are two different principles. The two countries could not have proposed to harmonize relations based on equal rights, and/or to end poverty everywhere by a given date as per what the UN started doing. It would be irrational that the two countries did not know that the natural environment cannot be shared, when people are born in different places on earth. In fact, the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1990 is a vivid example to support that people cannot have the earth’s resources shared equitably. Definitely, the United States and Great Britain were

¹⁵¹ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Atlantic_Charter

¹⁵² https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Atlantic_Charter

not alluding that they were going to surrender or relinquish their wealth so the people of another UN member state can dominate them.

If as of the date the UN member states proclaimed that all human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights, and began to cooperate to attain the policy statements that were articulated in the UN charter without taking into account any distinction such as race, colour, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth or other status in their relationship with one another, and till now, people are having difficulty practicing “tolerance” to harmonize actions based on the principles of equal rights, then no matter what the reason for the inaptitude of people to practice “tolerance” might be, this indisposition is very serious and very worrying.

If people continue to not put up with one another, and begin to voluntarily develop friendly relations among one another based on respect for the principle of equal rights, humanity could be heading toward a total social breakdown. Humans cannot coordinate actions beyond agreeing that all human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights and in 1945 humanity achieved this milestone. In other words, there is no other method that humans can voluntarily follow to harmonize actions besides or beyond agreeing that all human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights, and in 1945 mankind articulated in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights such milestone. The only additional action that people could do to spare mankind from regressing into a pre-1945 social order is if we let the technology take over to build ethics and to help us harmonize actions in the economic field based on the principles of equal rights. If when people begin to depend more and more on technology to harmonize actions, and the events that would be taking place show that people are not able to program without relying on distinction of any kind to establish ethics, this would mean that the complex system that emerged post ww2 would continue to grow. Thus, only if a global war is fought could this event help to revert the social order to a simpler form. Alternatively, the prevailing civil strife that emerged, which has been producing outcome in nations similar to the one that occur when demolishing a building by implosion (i.e., a structure collapses on itself) would go on, thus helping to evade a global war.

The behavioral patterns that emerged could have been provoked to stop a specific religion, for example, from getting strong to dominate all others, but the complex behavioral patterns that arose does not seem to totally support so far that making people collaborate in the economic field based on the ideas that the United States and Great Britain proposed is deepening fraternity or generating the peace dividend desired.

We have no way of knowing if when our ancestors took all the gods, goddesses, demigods, and mythological creatures and reduced them to a single all-powerful God, this iteration in which they reduced a complex system into a simpler one created a complex system identical to the one that we are knowing or the new complex system that emerged which made people begin to rely on distinction to be bound by their personal power and conscience. The American Civil War¹⁵³, was a civil war fought in the United States in the late 19th century. During the American Civil War, the United States experienced lots of insecurity after the civil unrest ended. The complex system that emerged in the US immediately after the civil war ended was not based on all the people who were born in this country being free and equal in dignity and rights, nor did it emerge right after this country was created and more states were joining this union. Then again, there were no people on both sides of the conflict who were blowing themselves up to promote conjecture for which no proof was found as we started doing post 1945. That is to say, if this abnormal intolerance that emerged post 1945 is due to the world being reorganized so “all the men in all the lands may live out their lives in freedom from fear and want” eventually, the on-going entropy could be a rational motive.

Then again, the difference between all the wars that our ancestors experienced and the patterns that emerged post 1945 is that our predecessors were not harmonizing actions based on the work program and/or principles of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights which all the existing nations ratified in 1948. This complex system that emerged is one that mankind has experience with only during periods of war. Post 1945, mankind did not come together to convert the world

¹⁵³ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/American_Civil_War

into becoming a war zone but one in which every “nations would dwell in safety within its own boundaries.

The iteration of the complex system (i.e., social order) that our fathers resolved on our behalf when they endured two back to back global wars so we pause from continuing to harmonize actions based on distinction should have produced a simpler behavioral pattern that is theoretically void from the visible patterns or complex behaviors that we observed emerged and/or became more visible since 1945. The new behavioral patterns that should have emerged post 1945 should not contain vivid tribal mindset patterns as per the way humans are still manifesting, and new simpler type behaviors should have emerged until more complex ones develop.

All the things that we do is for the future. If from 1945 till now, after almost 75 years on people being supposedly working together on harmonizing actions without any distinction, and the results that we have to show do not seem to support fully that people tolerance improved, how can we claim that mankind is eventually going to abandon distinction or bias to embrace or deepen social cohesion. Moreover, how can we be sure that the set of complex patterns that emerged would not be the challenges that our successors would have to deal with and resolve? Indeed, we are taking on behalf of our successors decisions on why they need to be organized to collaborate in the economic field based on the principles of equal rights when we are not ourselves able to demonstrate a proper behavior. Will the set of complex patterns that exist now become worse or would they begin to ease, and how we do we know which conjecture is causing the patterns that we are observing, so we would know what we have to do to control and regulate actions better? Are we creating or sowing for our successors a new set of complex problems that would not be any different in complexity than when our predecessors made us abandon believing in the existence of multi Gods in favor of only one? When our ancestors stopped to program based on claiming that their actions were inspired by divine rights, everyone began to harmonize actions based on distinction. If after our ancestors stopped to be harmonizing actions based on the existence of multi Gods in favor of only one, and now it is our turn to harmonize actions based on abandoning any relations that is based on distinction, what complex systems would our successors use

to get their way despite the resistance of others? In other words, if there is no other method that humans can follow to harmonize actions besides or beyond agreeing that all human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights, and mankind articulated in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights this milestone, how would peace and security evolve in the future if people refuse to surrender freedom so we begin to achieve the goals the founding fathers of the UN sketched.

I do not have a way of knowing how the future would evolve. What I could only do is to continue to analyze to understand if there is a conjecture that we began to pursue post 1945, that was not included among the issues that the founding fathers counselled? Specifically, to try to understand what exactly the United States and Great Britain meant when they said that their desire is to have all people have “right to self-determination” when all what people do from birth onward is to create patterns to fill void space occupied by others, including freezing social space to deepen their propensity or realize the full development of their personality. I will do this work in the next chapter.

This present work has conjectured that if the United Nations is not paused from continuing to provide solutions that foster human rights, mankind could be heading toward an eventual social breakdown. To slow this dystopia from happening, the minimum requirement that one could expect the United Nations to observe or respect is to have its officials demonstrate civic virtues that does not contribute to the conjectures that I discussed. As I said, the UN member states want the UN officials to provide economic solutions while granted immunities and rights, and while they are pursuing the development of their own personality contrary to what people who choose to dedicate their life to serving all other living beings normally do.

Let us in the next chapter, check how the United Nations is helping the UN member states to make them abandon their own values and traditions to emphasize the values that are enshrined in the UN Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

10

Evidence to support how the UN is fracturing the social fabric

The UN member states approved that the UN create UN subsidiary organizations to offer joint solutions in political, social, economic and cultural development. UNOPS is a UN subsidiary organization that the UN mandated to improve the effectiveness of UN development activities at UN member states country level. UNOPS is a self-financed organization.

In 2013, UNOPS proposed to the Government of the Congo to implement a fraudulent project. UNOPS persuaded the Government to approve a project in which the money for the project would be deposited by the government in the UN bank account, then UNOPS would withdraw its fee plus the money to pay for a small project implementation unit, waive formal procurement and redeposit the remaining money back in the same bank account of the government entity that originally deposited the funds so the latter implement the project with its own cadre.

A UNOPS employee who was a US national expressed his reservations against UNOPS/UN approving this project in the DRC, but then his supervisors offered him two choices to pick one from: Transfer temporarily to Sudan or wait to see his contract run up to its end.

In Sudan, this US national stumbles on another much bigger challenge. He was asked to violate the UN financial rules and regulations by the Department for International Development (DFID) of the Government of Great Britain.

On 02 December 2014, Dfid requested a meeting with this US national in which the DFID representative told him at this meeting that if he refuses to adhere to the requirement of the Dfid to “kiss the DFID funding of 10M British Pound goodbye nor to expect future business from DFID in Sudan.”

The actions DFID was suggesting that this US national approve violate the UN financial rules and regulations. The next day this US national paid a big price for refusing to agree to violate what the US government said its nationals would not do post 1945. This is to always emphasize the importance of moral principles over the self.

On 04 December 2014, two days after the meeting of this US national with Dfid in Sudan, UNOPS senior management placed him on a 3-month admin leave pending an investigation on charges of being a harasser, intimidator, and a threat to the best interests of UNOPS / the UN in the country. On 13 March 2014, UNOPS notified him that his placement on administrative leave would be extended for an additional 3 months. Five days later, on 19 March 2014, he was informed that his contract would not be renewed beyond 30 June 2015. On 04 June 2014, he requested if he could report to work, because the admin leave ended, and the reply he received was to stay home. On 25 June 2015, five days before the expiry of his contract, he addressed an email to UNOPS administration requesting communication regarding the status of the investigation. The reply he received, on the same day, from the UNOPS lawyer was: “The investigation is cancelled. If you have any questions, please let me know.”

In the five days remaining before the end of his contract, this US national informed the UNOPS lawyer/UNOPS administration that the decision to not renew his contract was erroneous, because he was transferred to Sudan from the DRC temporarily and that he was asked to stay in Sudan by the Regional Director. He requested that UNOPS rescind the decision ending his contract so he can return back to his official duty station in the Congo.

The UNOPS lawyer/ UNOPS administration rejected his request. The UNOPS lawyer informed this US national that he violated the UN staff

rule 11.2 which states that “[should] any UN staff who wish to contest a UN administrative decision, he or she shall submit his/her request within 60 calendar days from the date on which the staff member received notification of the administrative decision”. In other words, this US national should have challenged his contract non-renewal before 19 May 2015 while under investigation on charges of being a threat to the UN best interests. By waiting to appeal the UN decision to not renew his contract on 25 June 2015 (or on the day the UN notified him that the UN cancelled the investigation), he missed the deadline to any claim. This US national was also told that even if he had not missed the 60 days’ deadline, his contract was going to be terminated because UNOPS restructured its operation in Sudan and in the Congo.

Upon hearing this news from the UNOPS lawyer, this US national informed the UNOPS lawyer/UNOPS administration that throughout the entire time that he was under investigation (from 04 December 2014 to 25 June 2015), the organization did not tell him who pressed charges against him, showed him the complaints, interviewed him or asked him to comment, which is in violation of his right to due process as defined in UNOPS’s own Organizational Directives for handling allegations of misconduct, which addresses the UN Legal Framework for Addressing Non-Compliance with UN Standards of Conduct. This US national requested the organization to either restore his career and reputation back to its normal standing or pay him damages. The UNOPS lawyer/UNOPS administration rejected either requests.

On 08 July 2015, this US national wrote an email to UNOPS Executive Director, (former Minister of Justice for Norway), hoping that UNOPS Executive Director would be comprehensible and just. He stated that he agreed to be charged under the presumption that the proceedings would be held to standards based on fair dealing and good faith principles. He expressed that this decision that the UN took to disregard its duty of good faith and fair dealing is against the UN charter and requested to restore to have his career restored back to its former standing or to pay him damages. The reply he received was: “I am forwarding your request to UNOPS HR. I have nothing to add”.

This US national approached the UN ombudsman to mediate but the efforts of this office were unsuccessful.

This US national approached the UN Office of Legal Affairs to file an application. In as far as his 1st request to help him to contest the decision of the non-renewal because he was transferred temporarily to Sudan, this office informed him that he missed the 60 days' deadline as per the UN staff rules; and therefore, this office refused to help him. In as far as his 2nd request for damages, this office declined to plea on his behalf his case because the UN cancelled the investigation and didn't charge him.

This US national retained a lawyer and filed an application in the UN tribunals requesting damages. He requested as compensation either the UN to restore his career and reputation back to its normal standing or pay him damages.

When the Tribunal started in early 2017, the judge heard each party and ordered UNOPS and the US national to negotiate. UNOPS agreed to pay this US national the equivalent of 3 months' salary if he drops the charges. In addition, because the organization ended his contract when he was 54, UNOPS agreed to pay him all back pay for pension and insurance for 1 year so he can qualify for UN after service health insurance because he had reached 55 already. This US national refused the offer, and expressed that he would only drop the case if UNOPS agreed to help him to resume his career or pay him for damages.

In the course of the Tribunal proceedings, notably the testimony of the UN Internal Audit and Investigation Group (IAIG) Investigator, it was revealed that his placement on administrative leave was imposed against the advice of the IAIG investigators and that the complaint itself was forwarded by the Director of Human Resources without any initial determination of credibility. The IAIG investigators testified that the allegations were investigated and found to be unproven and that after this office submitted its report, UNOPS kept silent and kept him under investigation until when he wrote to UNOPS five days before the end of his contract. It should also be noted that during the UN tribunal his immediate supervisors in Sudan testified that the Director of the UN human resources attempted to insert negative comments into his appraisal which he considered to be inappropriate.

On 09 May 2017, the UN Tribunal dismissed the case on ground that it is time-barred. The judgement was as follow (from UNDT/2017/xxx):

51. Considering that the Applicant was informed of the decision not to renew his appointment by letter dated 20 March 2015, he had until 19 May 2015 to file his request for management evaluation. The evidence shows that the Applicant only requested management evaluation of the contested decisions, including the decision not to renew his appointment, by letter dated 18 August 2015 to the UNOPS Executive Director. Therefore, the Applicant's request for management evaluation of the decision not to renew his appointment was time-barred and, as a consequence, his application against this decision is not receivable.

54. In light of the Tribunal's conclusions, the application is dismissed.

The lawyer of this US national appealed the decision clarifying that he didn't challenge the decision of UNOPS to end the contract of this American national but the decision to violate his rights to due process. The lawyer stated in the appeal document that the UN Tribunal erred on questions of laws when it decided not to exercise the jurisdiction vested in it by failing to identify and adjudicate the contested decision. The lawyer clearly stated in the appeal document that he was not contesting the decision not to renew the appointment of this American national, nor the decision to end his temporary assignment in Sudan, nor the decision to place him on administrative leave, the decision to redesign the Sudan position, nor even the decision of UNOPS to go back on returning him to his post in the Congo. The lawyer clearly stated that he was contesting the decision of UNOPS to violate the rights of this American national to due process as per the UN's own rules, hence seeking compensation.

On 27 October 2017, the UN Appeal Tribunal upheld the judgment taken by the lower court (UAT-2017-1092) and dismissed the appeal.

Can a person who practiced tolerance and assumed his responsibility and agreed to be charged exactly as per what his government instructed

him to be doing post 1945, and who did not challenge any decision that his employer was taken against him until he was notified that the charges against him were cancelled to raise issues be denied any rights to due process by the organization that claims that it is working to end injustice?

Can we have a UN organization intervene in the social realm integrating combatants so they can become active participants in society, and then at the same time, be denying people rights thus leaving no choice ahead of them other than to be a combatant to benefit from the work program that the UN member states are financing through this organization? Can the UN be aiding combatants to integrate in the social life, and refusing to aid the person that the UN transferred to another country to hide improbity, and later charged him of being a threat to its interests to sideline him so it could continue to earn the income that it expects to get?

Can we have UN subsidiary organs maintain relationship with the UN buying and selling business and implementing economic solution while enjoying privileges and immunities, and are teaching people why they need to abandon their values and to adopt values that deepens a personal attachment to material things instead? Would this domestication by UN organization help us to build the social realm that the United States and Great Britain claimed that they want every member of the human family to cooperate in the social, economic and political field to attain?

Could this bitter dissent that emerged in the world post 1945 be due to all the corruption and bias that the UN through its subsidiary organs are sponsoring to serve the best interests of the individuals that are administering this organization and not the moral mission for which this association of nations was created?

Can mankind allow to have an organization operate in the social realm providing economic solutions and without any checks and balances? Where can a man who the United Nations violated his rights go to seek justice, if the UN member states granted this organization extraterritoriality? Can mankind allow to have all UN member states set up an international court of Justice to settle their disputes and when it comes to when a person has any disputes against the UN he is not

entitled to seek remedy in national tribunals for acts violating his fundamental rights and must seek a remedy at the UN courts only? Where can a person go to obtain protection of the law against interference caused by the UN when the UN member states granted this organization rights to violate the UN Charter, the UN Declaration of Human Rights, and even granted the UN rights to set up its own courts thus in this process denying rights to a fair hearing to any person that this organization destroyed his livelihood to get its way? Are the UN member states looking to set up an arrangement in the world similar to the one that the Catholic church uses whereby clergy are granted immunities and privileges and are not required to be subjected to public hearing in the determination of criminal charges against them but instead subjected to the church's own procedure or courts?

Since 1945, the United States has been working ardently to create conditions of stability to save succeeding generation from the scourge of another global war. Can the United States continue to engage in financing the UN when as this afore case show, this organization is involved in shadow economies that sabotages its work and even weakens its ability and the ability of its nationals to defend their best interests? Actually, even if the US government want to help this US national, this country is blocked because the UN is granted extraterritoriality. No person can launch a case in court against the UN because this organization and its staff are immune from penal offense.

Indeed. no one knows how peace and security would evolve in the future, when the organization who is supposed to be devoted to teaching people to be tolerant is charging people of wrongdoing, cancelling investigation, denying the person it charges rights, and most importantly, justifying through its own court system that the person who this organization victimized provoked his own hardship, because he did not convert his legal rights as per rules into becoming an interest right instead of remaining a will right to avoid the challenges that he had to yield to against his will.

In fact, this method that the UN used to deny this US national rights, which the Catholic Monarchs used when they were abusing their power

is very serious.¹⁵⁴ In 2017, the UN organized a referendum against the United States' decision to relocate its embassy within a UN member states.¹⁵⁵ Could the decision of the United Nations to organize this referendum and before that accuse this US national of being a threat to its best interests including denying him rights and even enrollment in after service health insurance unless he drops his legal application be an action that the UN tacitly sponsored to weaken the US? Actually, how could we be sure that the decision of the UN to organize a referendum against the United States' decision to relocate its embassy was not indeed an act intended to weaken the United States to defend its best interests? Likewise, how could we be sure that Great Britain is not conspiring to weaken the US when this country is sponsoring immoral acts at the United Nations?

It is not possible in this work to corroborate these fears, because no nation can prove the truthfulness of another nation when the latter is providing financial aid or technical assistance to an underdeveloped nation to support a humane cause. In other words, it is not possible to know if the financial aid or technical assistance that UN member states provide or channel through this organization is carried out to deepen fraternity or if it is done to achieve nationalistic ambitions. Then again, anytime a person purchasing power or knowledge is increased, this phenomenon increases in turn one's own expectations. If the UN created UN self-financed organization, and it was granted right to be an economic operator while enjoying privileges and immunities, can the US, Great Britain, or any UN member states pause the UN from not weakening their interests when this association of nation is preaching to people to not be tolerant and to convert legal rights into becoming an interest right instead of remaining a will right to improves ones' own chances!

Disaster management is about how to prevent disasters. Let us in the upcoming chapter check how the conjecture that the rich took to let the United Nations be an economic operator, and to allow that this organization create UN subsidiary who maintain a relationship with this

¹⁵⁴ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Catholic_Monarchs

¹⁵⁵

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/United_Nations_General_Assembly_resolution_ES-10/L.22

association of nations could be helping them to maintain their wealth. In this way, we could also have an idea about how we could expect the world to change if we continue to allow the UN to deepen corruption while using its power differential to deny people rights as per the way its officials treated this American national. This could also help the rich to re-examine if the UN is helping them to attain their goals. Most importantly, allow the rich to reflect on whether they should continue to pursue their goal of seeing that all the people continue to collaborate in the economic field using UN subsidiary organs that enjoys privileges and immunities to injure with impunity, or if the UN is aligning them on a straight collision course to face what this American national faced on the hands of the villains that this organization is harboring.

11

Did Mankind begin in 1945 a reversal of events leading toward a social breakdown?

In 1941, our leaders proposed that all the existing nations that were under colonization have the right to self-determination, the right to freely determine their political status, and the right to freely pursue their economic, social and cultural development.

From 1945 to now, the political leaders who succeeded those founding fathers of the UN modified the postwar international system that those initial founding fathers outlined on how the freed nations shall go about with improving their social, economic and political preparedness to deepen relations between happiness, politics and religion. The founding fathers of the UN proposed that the nations that were freed make use of the international financial mechanisms that were pre-arranged at the end of ww2 to gage the rate of modernization.

The political leaders who succeeded the founding fathers of the UN commissioned the UN to create subsidiary organization and tasked them to provide solutions along the UN member states to create improved labour standards and social security for all the members of the human family. In other words, instead of the United Nations remaining acting as the primary formal organization between states on a global scale coordinating activities between existing nations, the political leaders who succeeded the founding fathers of the UN approved that the UN take separate actions along the existing UN member states to build and maintain this post-conflict world that the United States and Great Britain initially proposed. This work program is not the one which the founding

fathers of the UN counselled us this organization should be devoted to doing post 1945 as existing UN member states are working on their pledge so everyone can dwell in safety. This delegation that the political leaders extended to the UN does not leave in the hands of the colonized nations solely the task of how to get better prepared in the political, economic, social or educational field to secure improved labour standards, economic advancement, and social security. We now have in each UN member states, two governments (i.e., the national government and the United Nations system, with all its numerous bodies, institutions, unions, coalitions,) who are devoted to preparing people to harmonize actions based on the criteria stipulated in the UN Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

This work has supported so far that the abnormal rise in intolerance that emerged post 1945, coupled with this parallel rise in tribal mindset patterns, could be due to the political leaders who succeeded the founding fathers of the UN approving that the UN deviate away from implementing the work program that those initial leaders sketched to make along with the UN a name for themselves.

It is essential to strive to secure faster the common standard of achievement that our fathers proclaimed should be our aspirations to attain post ww2. Indeed, mounting a world in which human beings shall enjoy freedom from fear and want is an ambition that every member of the human family would be ready to support, but accelerating people motion, could be a phenomenon that propagate gridlocks or bottlenecks, in the same way such phenomenon is observed during traffic jams. During a traffic jam people get frustrated and conflicts could break out when people patience wears out or when it does not remain under control. Could the decision of the global leaders who succeeded the founding fathers of the UN to let this international intergovernmental organization take separate actions to prepare people in the political, economic, social or educational field to secure improved labour standards, economic advancement, and social security be the principal reason for this abnormal rise in intolerance that emerged in the world post 1945?

The United Nations System is not domesticating people to harmonize actions based on making people learn how to develop discipline to be

tolerant and/or to have the courage to accept the second best if what one considers the first best is not attainable. Nor the United Nations System is domesticating people on how to compete based on the principles of equal rights which is what the United States proposed people be devoted to doing post 1945 to attain the ends specified in the UN Charter. The United Nations System is prioritizing how people manage to improve their life chances based on equal rights. In other words, the United Nations System is not teaching with the financial aid that they receive from the most well-off nations how can government strengthen the coping of people to manifest deeper degrees of tolerance, thus it would be possible to harmonize actions based on the principle of equal rights, but rather they are taking actions aimed at supporting government on how to advance economic, environmental, social and political program intended to alleviate poverty and reduce inequality to create equal rights conditions. The teaching that the United Nations System is devoted pursuing teaches people why they need to stop with letting their coping mechanism be directed to convert legal rights into becoming an interest right instead of remaining a will right. The United Nations System with all its bodies, institutions, unions, coalitions, etc. along with all the other organizations that were created post ww2 to work in the development aid are not supporting governments principally to domesticate people to deepen their contentment but how to pursue how to reject their existing contentment state and to pursue how to increase their happiness. From antiquity till now, only a very small number of people managed to establish voluntarily a mental contentment state that didn't stress self-improvement. The majority have been devoted to doing nothing but how to pursue how to increase their access to material things to increase their contentment or happiness. The principal perpetrator for people inaptitude to be content and/or attaining a satisfactory state with what they have is driven by both the changes that the natural environment undergoes on its own and the built environment that the human ingenuity perpetrates. In other words, the continuous changes that the natural environment and the continuous changes that human ingenuity produces makes a person unable to prevail over the weakness of the will and to be satisfied with what one has. This condition makes every member of the human family be devoted to improve his life chances to finish tasks faster and/or to manage to realize the full development of his personality faster, because no one knows when death strikes.

Accelerating people awareness about the changes that human ingenuity is prompting in the real world could be a phenomenon that propagate the same phenomenon that occur in traffic jams. People need to have patience and display endurance during a traffic jam. If as the UN started doing on the aftermath of WW2 teaching people why they should not be patient, there is a good chance that the principal cause for the lack of discipline by people to have the courage to accept the second best if what one considers the first best is not attainable, and/or refusal to be tolerant to compete based on the principles of equal rights, could have been prompted by the UN mainly!

Could the decision of the global leaders to let the United Nations System take separate actions to prepare people in areas that are known to man to be a cause for all the social breakdown that mankind has known be what is preventing most people to focus on achieving the ends stipulated in the preamble of the UN Charter? Could this wave of discontentment that emerged whereby people stopped with accepting their status quo in order to increase their happiness be an offshoot caused by the United Nations System decision to accelerate people happiness?

If our political leaders want every newborn post 1945 to be a goal-oriented person intended to provide benefits to our society; and if to be a goal-oriented person a human being needs access to social space and material things; and if humans want their relations to be harmonized on the basis of pursuing policies that measure happiness by how much a person freezes social space or accumulate material things on a cumulative basis; and if the earth's carrying capacity is not ample enough to accommodate the extent of social space or the quantity of material things that a person devote his life to accumulating and then to transfer to his successors to freeze after his death; and if whenever people transfer to their successors livable social space and material things this action shrinks the livable social space even more; and if the existing people want the dead to remain alive and occupying social space even after they pass away; can a person be content when the United Nations is not making it possible for a person to be not devoted to invest reactive coping mechanism to resize the people who are working to strip him from his own state of contentment? In other words, if the UN is making it very difficult for a person to manage to hold on to what one amasses, can mankind manage to harmonize actions post

1945 on the principles stipulated in the UN charter, if the UN is not allowing a person any maneuvering space to be content or satisfied with what one has? Therefore, if our political leaders do not want to regulate birth rates or legalize wars to increase death rates, can a person weigh-in on anything other than distinction such as race, colour, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth or other status to legitimize how to make the rich surrender freedom when none of us is no longer able to justify that what could be driving our action so we would be bound by our personal power and conscience by the will of God.

Indeed, the two sources that could be prompting this abnormal impatience and outcry for social justice that emerged in recent years is if human reason is an aptitude that does not know how to distinguish between good or evil, contrary to what people thinks. The second is if the political leaders that succeeded those who proposed to us to build and maintain a post-conflict world based on the policy statements that were declared at the Atlantic Conference began to implement a work program that is different than the one that those earlier leaders suggested we harmonize actions on its premise to eventually attain.

I do not subscribe to this ideology that promote that humans evolved from chimpanzees, especially that many people do not exhibit animalistic behaviors. The idea about humans descendent from chimpanzees could have come about as a result of philosophers struggle to notice a behavioral change in people attitude. Actually, if this ongoing attempt to deepen connectedness that the United States and Great Britain suggested continue to support that perhaps we need to go back to practice domination and subjugation to maintain peace and security under control, the complex system that this conclusion is going to create would be very serious, because it is now hard for governments to hide brutality or unethical behavior. The more government depend on brutality or unethical control method to maintain peace and security, the more this approach makes people withdraw their support.

It would be irrational to say that the withdrawal that people are expressing to support their government achieve world peace is because most people prefer to live in a state of violence and insecurity contrary to what the people who are in position of public service preach. This

withdrawal could only be because our political leaders began to implement a work program that is not compatible with the one the founding fathers of the UN suggested we harmonize actions on its premise post 1945. We could continue to allow the UN to build and maintain on our behalf the post-conflict world that our leaders said could enable all nations to dwell in safety within their own boundaries, but then again has the time reached to let the United States take control. If not, should our leaders continue to let the UN prompt people to reject their status to accelerate violence instead of teaching people to devote to practicing tolerance to attain the policy statement that were endorsed by all the people in all the existing countries during ww2? Has the time come to go back to practicing the work program that everyone agreed upon in 1945, or shall we continue practicing the work program that we are implementing now.

Surely if our ancestors prioritized how to domesticate mankind on how to be tolerant before prioritizing how to transfigure the tools that we depend on to think differently about life, pleasure, pain and ourselves, we could have perhaps managed to breed a culture of humans who would be able to adapt with the continuing changes that are occurring in reality. However, the preoccupation of our successors with wanting to transfigure or change the apparatus / tools they depend on or use to think differently about life, pleasure, pain and themselves instead of focusing on changing what gives a person motives to be intolerant or dissatisfied first left the challenges that we are trying to sort out for our successors so we spare them from dealing with the insecurity that we are dealing with and even accumulating.

Be that as it may, I have no way of knowing if the United Nations System and all the existing government would manage to reduce inequality and fight the tribal mindset that the natural system and the built environment creates so people would stop to be compelled to do wrong when at the moment the perceived benefits seem to outweigh the costs. What I do know is that there are many paths to deepen social cohesion, reduce inequality or eradicate poverty and none of the methods that man could tap into or use to strengthen social connectedness so “all the men in all the lands may live out their lives in freedom from fear and want” intersects through making people be devoted to implement the work program that the United Nations System

or the rest of the Development Aid organizations are pursuing. If people could abandon their natural distinction in order to convert it into becoming strength, humans would have mastered as of when Socrates suggested to practice the art of measurement and now to put up with one another to prevail over the weakness of their will. This would have spared us from being devoted to figuring out how to ensure lasting peace. In fact, based on what this work tried to postulate so far, the only path to ensure lasting peace is through establishing habits or customs that does not intersect with the policies that the United Nations is pursuing due to their malign effect on pushing people to abandon their mental state of contentment and to be devoted to pursue how to reduce inequality. If contentment / disenchantment is a mental manmade state and inequality which is the main cause of gap between humans it is the natural inequality that creates it, can we let the UN continue to peddle to us that its efforts are making our world safer.

Indeed, the exigency that the United States achieved for humanity in 1941 when this country managed to convince Great Britain and the rest of the Western European Nations to abandon colonialism and to give to the poor people and undeveloped nations independence to ensure lasting peace is a milestone that religion with all its might failed to accomplish for mankind.

On the other hand, if the perception that I am formulating about the United Nations System and the rest of the development aid agencies being a source that fomented this abnormal rise in intolerance that emerged post 1945, because the work program that those organizations are pursuing is not compatible with the work program that the founding fathers of the UN proposed in 1941 to UN member states to pursue, this would mean that mankind could be on a rendezvous with more insecurity and eventually a social breakdown. The only way to reverse the intolerance and to stop people from continuing to remaining prioritizing being bound by their personal power and conscience could be either to increase the death rates or to go back to domesticating people based on the same method that Great Britain and other western European countries treated the people of some nations before ww2 by subjecting them to domination and subjugation.

Actually, the dilemma is much more complex than increasing the death rates or returning to practicing colonialism. If as I am saying this intolerance that people are exhibiting post 1945 does not seem to be a result of the inability of humans to prevail over the weakness of the will but a result of accelerating the number of people who we made them start to be devoted to distinguishing between what is right from what is wrong [Maloof 2005]. This signify that only when a person (or nation) slows down its progress could it slow down its own fall. This also signify that the reorganization that nations are undergoing to deepen collaboration in the economic field to improve labour standards, economic advancement, and social security by making humans distinguish between right or wrong faster, could be creating challenge repercussion that are much more serious than maybe some perceive. This also means that if the global leaders do not pause the United Nations from interfering in the social order and to go back to performing the work program that the founding fathers of the UN proposed (i.e., coordination only), we could be prompting our self-destruction faster.

As I said before, we can no longer say that the intolerance that people are exhibiting is the result of a dynamic sequence that could be related to human behavior because, in 1945, all the behavioral parameters that are known to man to prompt a person to be intolerant were all made “theoretically” equal to “zero”. In other words, we agreed that post 1945, we would all be collaborating in the economic field and with one another without any distinction such as race, colour, sex, language, religion, political or other opinions, national or social origin, property, birth or other status, getting in the way to make us be compelled to have recourse to measure that destabilizes peace and security. If we continue to lack evidence to support that we really began to abandon our biases and began to collaborate in the economic field and with one another on the basis of the principles articulated in the Declaration of Universal Human Rights, this would mean that the conjecture that the United States and Great Britain made to assume that human conditions would improve when people are granted the right to self-determination was a blatant erroneous idea.

Moreover, hence we cannot say that the intolerance that emerged post 1945 is due to overpopulation, economic inequality, people diversity, gap between the rich and the poor, religious extremism, environmental

degradation, etc. etc. because all those factors are a function of the lifestyles that we want to maintain. Besides, human nature has not changed pre and post 1945. This also prevent us from saying that the intolerance that we are witnessing is because there is a gap between the rich and poor, as some critics' postulate. We did we change how we should collaborate in the economic field pre and post this 1945 date and we kept everything the same. This signify that everything relative. The only work program that we began to pursue on the aftermath of WW2 is to eradicate poverty and to reduce injustice. There are two ways to eradicate poverty. The first is through practicing tolerance and the other is trough practicing intolerance. The only difference to achieve either is that in the latter this action requires exercising motion and the former it is required that a person does not accelerate motion and to practice patience. It is motion that create more change faster.

The United Nations started making us create change faster on the aftermath of ww2. The drawback of this work program is that it could be prompting our self-destruction faster as well. Our leaders in 1945 did not counsel us to cooperate with one another so that we eradicate poverty or reduce inequality as per the way the United Nations started doing post 1945 by creating deadlines as per MDG¹⁵⁶ or SDG¹⁵⁷. Our leaders did not want to make us abandon our current values, traditions and emotions to motivate thoughts and actions that are modern and/or as per current behaviors. Second and most importantly, how could we be sure that the UN efforts to make people abandon their current values, traditions and emotions to motivate thoughts and actions that are modern is not prompting our self-destruction? We have no proof that making people abandon their mental contentment state and to be devoted to deepen happiness increase peace and security so we could say that what the UN and the rest of the development aid are prompting is aiding us to put up with one another.

Some historians claim that most global wars were prompted to produce a resizing among the nations who were the most industrialized. When our ancestors established a conjecture that if they replace the gods, goddesses, demigods, and mythological creatures with a single all-powerful God to create lasting peace, those gods were virtual figurine,

¹⁵⁶ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Millennium_Development_Goals

¹⁵⁷ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sustainable_Development_Goals

and not living humans. If many people believe that this new single all-powerful God that our predecessors want us to believe he created us on his own image,¹⁵⁸ this means that we have the same number of Gods alive among us, who as the case was like during Greek antiquity and who are all working like “God” to have their say on how the natural and the built environment shall behave and function.

A mirror image is defined as “An image or object which is identical in form to another, but with the structure reversed, as in a mirror.”¹⁵⁹ In 1945, all the UN member states pledged to set all the behavioral parameters that are known to prompt a person to be intolerant to be “theoretically” set equal to “zero.” In other words, there is no other social, economic or political philosophy that mankind can practice besides developing friendly relations based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination if mankind does not want to go back to harmonize actions based on pre 1945 ideologies. If, in 1945, we began developing friendly relations based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination, then the year 1945 could represent a line of symmetry in a mirror image problem. This also signify that the intolerance that people are exhibiting could be a reversal of events with reference to the 1945 date. In other words, the distinction such as race, colour, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth or other status that people are using or depending on to increase the dynamisms, could be a mirror of the events that transpired in the world leading to ww2. If this conjecture is true, this means that the intolerance that the UN is instigating by making people develop awareness to foster human rights would continue to rise until we stop with being able to control peace and security thus prompting a global war. Evidently, if we continue to be bound by our personal power and conscience as we have been doing, the first major world event that our successors could deal with if reversing events are taking place is to wage a global as per ww1 which was fought before ww2 to forcibly make those who refuse to voluntarily surrender freedom to obtain the benefits of political order do it under force or duress. This new war would reduce people dependence on distinction but would not end it and/or would stop people from continuing to get their way despite the resistance of others unless our successors purge philosophical and

¹⁵⁸ <https://www.biblegateway.com/passage/?search=Genesis+1&version=NIV>

¹⁵⁹ https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/us/mirror_image

religious ideas along. This would be the only way to stop the events to be a mirror image of the ones that occurred before ww1 from perhaps fomenting and then taking place.

How can we be sure that as the world's population increases and basic resources continue to become scarce as a result of the lifestyle that most people want to maintain that we are not setting ourselves up on a reverse trajectory of events to face the same complex system of events that our predecessors dealt with leading to WW3 this time? Likewise, how can we find out if the UN and the development aid are setting us up to face the same complex system that our ancestors dealt with when they had many people claim that it was the Gods and Goddesses that were giving them right to make people surrender freedom to exploit and dominate others? Most importantly, how can we find out that the UN and the development aid agencies are not setting our governments to confront the same hardship our ancestors dealt with when the Christian faith emerged? The teaching method that converts were using to make more people believe in the Christian faith was not any different from the work that the UN started doing to make people invest reactive coping to eradicate poverty and to fight injustice.

I do not have the answer to those afore questions of course. Companies before proceeding to manufacture a product they build a prototype. I have no way of knowing why the political leaders who succeeded the founding fathers of the UN decided to deviate away from the work program that those initial leaders sketched and/or what those actual leaders are working on mounting in the social order. I suppose their concept involve how to establish an ideal state between people or between people and the earth. This work program could help to make people collaborate in the economic field to establish world peace, and/or to live free from fear and want.

Let us define those two relationships as being

$$\text{Person A} = \text{Person B} \quad (1)$$

or

$$\sum \text{People} = \text{Earth} \quad (2)$$

The human behavior resides in the human body. This signify that equation 1 and 2 are both “theoretically” one and the same, because the

human body or the earth are both made of matter. The human body and the earth are also both two objects. Humans are not amalgamated to the earth and if it was not for gravity they would be floating in space in the same planets do. I will use the second equation to make my point.

This second equation signify that we need that the variable which causes the earth to change fulfill conditions that would make it such that the changes that people are also continuously undergoing brings a relationship between those two objects that assert that the two objects have the same “mathematical” value or are in equality. In other words, that neither one is changing or influencing changes that would jeopardize the security of the other.

To my knowledge, there is only one condition that makes it that neither one of those two objects could influence changes that would jeopardize the security of the other. This condition is if the influences that one exert on the other become equal to zero. In other words, that the changes that either one undergoes would not compel one to create change that would destabilize the security of the other.

From 1945 to now, there has not been any sighting of any extraterritorial objects on earth. The only two objects that are on earth creating unnatural changes are humans and animals. Let us put the changes that animals are inducing to make people behave irrationally or as a source for prompting crises and conflicts between humans on the side. This signifies that either the changes that the earth is undergoing naturally and the added unnatural changes that humans are prompting are making humans become intolerable or the changes that people are naturally undergoing plus the added changes that the earth is on its own undergoing is making people become intolerable. Moreover, since we cannot tell if the earth is dissatisfied with the changes that we are generating, but that is not the same with us, because if the changes that the reality is undergoing outside our frame is satisfying all of us, we would then be ready to be tolerant with one another, and we would not prompt changes that prevent the earth to regenerate at the rate that we wish, thus we would be ready to wait until the needs of everyone is satisfied so no one would find himself being left out and obliged to be intolerant or to resort to crises and conflicts to increase his life chances; this signify that if we would be ready to practice tolerance, we could

perhaps achieve the goal the United States proposed and even achieved. Let us not forget that the success or happiness that the US achieved since this country was founded is a proof that we can achieve lasting peace if we duplicate the experience or work program of this country.

On the other hand, since, as I said earlier, that to my knowledge only when one of those two objects is set to 0 (zero) can the changes that either one is undergoing stops to influence the other to make changes, then this signify that if people intolerance increased post 1945, two sources could have prompted this disenchantment. Either we are trying to equate two things that cannot be equitable or human beings do not know how to be tolerant, and/or to distinguish between good or evil, because they are beasts and/or evolved from chimpanzee as some people claim. I already said that I do not subscribe to this ideology that promote that humans are descendants from chimpanzee, I consider that the decision of our leaders to commission the UN to take separate action to be the peddler of the large corporation to increase production, made the world order become destabilized. In other words, the decision of the UN to start to provide economic solutions under the pretext of fostering human rights, stopped people from being content and prompted all this dynamism that emerged post 1945, whereby people are trying to be equal to each other.

Ian Stewart,¹⁶⁰ is a British mathematician, who defined mathematics as being “the science of pattern that detects and studies commonality in diverse phenomena.”¹⁶¹

This rise in tribal mindset that emerged post 1945 which seem to be capitalizing on the same distinction that people said that they would not be harmonizing actions any longer on its premise post 1945, is nothing but behavioral patterns that are not any different from the ones that people were manifesting pre 1945. In mathematics, when we have an observation which is the output of a process that captures the dependence of something on at least one other thing, where that something (or other things) are the unknown input. If one knows (or can estimate with some degree of accuracy) what that something that is causing the observed pattern is due to, then one can determine the

¹⁶⁰ [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ian_Stewart_\(mathematician\)](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ian_Stewart_(mathematician))

¹⁶¹ https://www.cut-the-knot.org/do_you_know/addition.shtml

unknown input. This idea in mathematics is called inverse functions. “Most” functions in mathematics don’t have an inverse, because as I said, when the output or results of one iteration is used as the input or the starting point for the next iteration, the new domain and range should show unique quantifiable behavior. But if we assume that humans are not beasts thus enabling us to say that what prevents people from ensuring lasting peace depends on how people use distinction such as race, colour, sex, language, religion, etc. to alter their behavior; and since we know that human nature has not changed pre and post 1945 and/or the gravitational field of the planets; and that no extraterritorial forces or super power forces intervened on earth from 1945 to now; and that humans did not change how they harmonize actions in the economic field pre and post 1945, then it is possible to consider that what could be preventing people from harmonizing actions based on the principles of equal rights is people continual dependence on distinction such as race, colour, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth or other status.

Since there is a good chance that people are continuing to depend on distinction, and on their rights to deny each other material things and social space; this means that if we didn’t allow the United Nations post 1945 to start to accelerate people happiness, and we left existing governments do it, then people would not be compelled as they are now to depend on their diversity to seek social justice. Those people who are now demanding social justice would have been content as they were doing pre 1945, and would have not abandoned their traditions or values to be modernized to keep the assembly lines up and running. Most importantly, we would have spared the world from all the on-going disorder that we began to pursue as of 1945, when we already know that even if we have the best intention to make everyone happy, it is not possible because the natural inequality makes it impossible to share on equal rights basis material things or think alike. This also means that the abnormal rise in intolerance or complex behaviors that we began to observe post 1945 could be reversed patterns identical to the ones that our predecessors who passed down through the centuries dealt with except in our case the direction is going back or is in the opposite direction.

Once again, if the conjecture that I am making contain any element of truth, then all the insecurity that we are observing could be provoked by our destiny being perhaps going in an inverse direction to the one we iterated in 1945 when we agreed to stop to harmonize actions based on distinction embedded in race, colour, sex, language, religion, and other status. As I said before, there is no other method that humans can harmonize actions besides being organized to compete in the economic field based on the principles of equal rights and mankind began to harmonize actions supposedly as of 1945 on this premise. It follows that if we do want to indeed induce a different destiny for our successors, we need to either go back to harmonize actions based on what the founding fathers of the UN counselled us to be domesticated like post 1945 (i.e. by letting governments only domesticate people and without having the UN or development aid teaching people why they need to stop to be intolerant and to invest reactive coping to eradicate poverty or reduce inequality) or to pause reproduction so as to maintain a world population that equates with how people decided post 1945 to live and that is to allow everyone to realize the full development of his personality.

Evidently, if the choice is going to be to let the US take the lead to help us establish the cultural authority that this country managed to build from 1776 to 1945, we would have to redraw some nations, or let me say start to social engineer realms. For example, Lebanon could go back to being dependent on Syria as was the case before WW2, so this country's economy can have a breathing space. So some social space from Syria can be granted to Lebanon. The initiative that the US proposed to make the Golan Heights part of Israel is a sustainable idea to help this country to solve its own need for social space. Likewise, when the map of Saudi Arabia and Egypt are redrawn to give the Palestinian people social space, they can also begin to be on their way to be happy instead of remaining living in insecurity and making other people experience the same. Then again, if the decision would be to do nothing then it would be imperative that our leaders, manage to stop corruption and to control and regulate how humans develop knowledge about the nature of reality to pause newborns from accelerating the rate at which this inverse function is progressing if it happens to be going back in the opposite direction exactly to what it was before.

In the previous chapter, I shared how the UN is violating the UN charter and so there could be a price that humanity would have to pay if we continue to let this organization deepen corruption in the world.

Let us check in this upcoming and last chapter in this work, how we could expect the world to evolve in the future in order to be able to better determine if the conjecture that the UN member states established to allow the UN be an economic operator would reduce injustice, eradicate poverty, reduce inequality and so forth, and/or if this decision is aligning mankind on a straight collision course with a total social breakdown.

12

Perspective on how we could expect the social order to change if mankind chooses to continue to let the UN interfere in the social order

This work has showed that that there is nothing worth living for after birth then to contribute to finding out how to slow the aging process to prolong longevity. Henceforth, the idea to push the boundaries of our scientific and technical limits may have been born. This awareness could be what prompted our ancestors to begin to delegate to technology the tasks that the human body may have been programed to serve as well. The work also tried to support that if mankind does not properly differentiate between what mankind needs to continuously be doing to slow the aging process as compared to how to structure people interaction with one another based on the political order that the strong impose on the weak mankind would not be able to make progress on this precious goal. In particular, to not use the scientific progress that mankind is pursuing to slow the aging process to control the human behavior.

Indeed, the biggest risk to humanity is a meteor striking the earth and therefore, space exploration is important to prevent foreign objects from entering the earth gravitational field. Likewise, any exploration aimed at finding source of energies that frees social space on earth is also very important if people want to continue to harmonize relations based on freezing social space or accumulating material things on a cumulative basis. Surely, this will also require that birth rates are not slowed down to find the specific human ingenuity who could push the boundary of

our scientific and technical limits to provide benefits for our societies even farther. At the same time, because human knowledge is unlimited given how it is linked to human imagination, this makes progress become an endless endeavor. This also means that the possibilities that the human body can benefit directly from technology could shrink and even become limited. This also signifies that providing too much technology around the human body to free this mass from serving what it could have been programmed to achieve to deepen the happiness of the human imagination may be harmful. In other words, the human body can only take food or liquid internally and be in motion or at rest physically. The air that the human body breathe, it is the body who is programmed to do this work naturally. Science limits the ability of people to exercise their unique aptitudes and capacities to cater for the body. If we continue to automate things around the human body, we would reach a limit in as far as how the human body will interact with the natural world. The maximum humans could achieve is to convert themselves into living in the same way old aged people who depend on total assistance or care live. The people who depend on total care to meet all their needs for their activities of daily living, suffer mainly from less accommodation for personal needs and from loss of freedom to makes their own choices. Therefore, the more and more science limit people choices (i.e., as in the case when a person is sitting in a driverless cars), the more humans convert into becoming a specie who would be living in the same way people who depend on total care do but devoted to reinforce their biases.

For example, a knife is a tool that our predecessors engineered to slice or chop matter. Dynamite is also another tool that our predecessors invented to help us with slicing or to chop matter faster. Let us put the threat that knives or dynamite prompt on the side. Those two means are needed to help us figure out how to push our scientific and technical limits to provide benefits to our societies, but they are also a threat. If the rich would be ready to prohibit the use of dynamite to move earth, we would not be dealing with having to figure out now how to line up new tasks to keep up with the large number of human bodies that dynamite makes them idle faster. If people were a specie that hibernate at the end of a task, then making people finish with their tasks faster could have been useful. However, making people finish task faster where there is not new task lined up, all what such action does is create

bottleneck and confusion in a world that does not control birth rate and follow a policy that allows any individual to freeze social space including transferring the material things that a person amasses or accumulates on a cumulative basis to designated successors. In other words, by wanting the human ingenuity prioritize how to come up with a new tool that could help humans do its cutting faster, while at the same time pursuing relationships or policies on how all the things that exist on the outside of the human frame be dealt with on the basis of limits or rules of engagement, could be creating a threat that is much bigger than the rich predicate, because as we know humans are not going anywhere by making them finish tasks faster. The only task that the poor would have when they are driven to finish with their tasks faster is to plot how to resize the rich to increase their happiness. The decision to prioritize how to make people finish with tasks faster, accelerate people motion faster, but at the same time require that people be at all the time searching to find new tasks within the shrinking livable social space thus creating the need for people to be more dynamic than necessary unnecessarily. Most importantly, this type of social programming does nothing but open the door to have so many human bodies idle and with so many human desires roaming expressing needs. In other words, by adopting a policy that prioritize subcontracting out to machineries the job that the human body was programmed to be in charge of naturally facilitating for the self (i.e. food) to stay alive we would be continually giving rise to tensions that if it is not dealt with now accordingly, it would be impossible to do it later without subjecting humanity to a massive resizing exercise. This also means, keeping technology away from people is required not necessarily to deny people access to improve their life chances, but to reduce the number of roaming human desires that the more machineries idles their human bodies, the more desires / bias would be floating and thus pushing those implicated to address and to come up with new rules to challenge the political order that people fix. Actually, keeping technology away from people is needed for a reason that is even more profound.

The decision of our leaders to want us to address fundamental questions about our place in the universe while enforcing policies or laws that allows a person rights to freeze social space or accumulate material things on a cumulative basis create social and economic inequality as the past world history shows. When this policy is combined with

measures intended to idle the human body, this programming creates even more drawbacks. This policy that we pursue to push the boundary of our scientific skills to the limit to provide benefits for our societies makes one's own security become dependent on human reason rather than on human ingenuity which is how things ought to be, so one's own security does not become the forgone security of another person. In other words, when the western European countries were prior to 1945 colonializing the poor nations and denying them knowledge, those countries were managing to achieve this supremacy because they were prioritizing their human ingenuity over their human reason. It is important to keep in mind that it is human ingenuity in partnership with human imagination that connive plots to destabilize peace and security. Post 1945, when those western European countries agreed to prioritize their human reason over their human ingenuity and handed the poor the tools that frees the human body, those western European countries freed the human imagination along. Before this date, the poor had their imagination impounded because the priority of the human reason of the poor was focused on how to sustain the human body. The more we automate and make more human bodies free or idle, the more we would be prioritizing human reason over human ingenuity. Hence the rate at which human reason is growing is greater than the rate at which human ingenuity is capable to control the poor, the rich could start to have difficult time to get their way despite the resistance of others, because when everyone is idle (i.e., rich and poor), human reason becomes equal to human ingenuity and equal to human imagination.

Hence the poor outnumber the rich, once technology is shadowing people actions it would start to get more and more difficult for the rich to get their way despite the resistance of the others. Moreover, because the rich are inferior in number to that of the poor, the rich dependence on technology would grow. In other words, there are two ways to control and regulate people behavior. One method is through controlling the human body and the other is through making the human behavior surrender freedom voluntarily. Science and technology can control and regulate the human body thus allowing the domestication of people according to coherent guidelines. The challenge with making the behavior yield through controlling the body is that science does not know how to distinguish between the rich and the poor. This means that either the rich would have to forgo their right to prioritize the self over

the collective or they would have to be benefiting from exceptions in the same way government officials do. But since automation is not a process that the rich operate but is the one that they own, this signifies that the freedom of the rich would eventually become restricted because it would be controlled and regulated by the poor.

On the other hand, because the poor outnumber the rich, the poor would have no other job to pursue as technology frees more human bodies than to be devoted to scrutinize the rich to narrow the gap between the rich and the poor and create social justice. Likewise, hence the things that people want to share is happiness and this is measured by how much livable social space a person seizes and/or material things a person gets to accumulate, people stratification would begin to be structured based on the power to create tools/technology or how to override the latter. This means that as more and more technology is developed and more and more a segment of the population is getting its way despite the resistance of others, the more this social realm would be getting us to relive the identical events that our predecessors lived leading to ww2 (i.e., a mirror image). The only difference is that instead of the rich (or rich nations) this time controlling the poor (or poor nations) using weapons, this action would be done in combination with technology.

Indeed, if this afore conjecture occurs, this would mean that all what we are doing when we are approving policies that distances the human body from being occupied to make it become idle faster, and to employ the human ingenuity and/or human reason to focus on controlling the behavior of others instead of focusing on how to keep the human body fit, this action increases the interaction between people thus increasing simultaneously dynamism. As I said earlier, when a person increases his relation with the natural world (or object) this is when security becomes static and a person stays healthy. This also goes to say that the decision of most people to stop with wanting to depend on the programmed human body to change matter in favor of letting technology do the bulk of the work when life is all about real experience and not virtual experience, is helping the rich increase their wealth much more than the poor. The real experience people gain in the factories, in the fields, through travelling and not through watching a video on a computer. Likewise, the more the rich modernize the poor, the more they are bound to lose much more than the poor eventually.

It would be absurd to assume that the social configuration or governance system that I conjectured could take place if humans continue to delegate to technology the role that our human body may have been programmed to effectuate naturally to sustain this mass be what our leaders wanted us to mount or institute on the aftermath of WW2. This social system that the world events seem to be driving us to setting could not be what the founding fathers of the UN counselled to collaborate in the economic field together to mount. This work program does not entail making different communities of people compete on equal rights basis in the economic field while human reproduction is uncontrolled. The founding fathers of the UN could not have expected us on the aftermath of WW2 to cooperate so that all people in all nations shall have access on equal rights to the things that human ingenuity produce post 1945. The founding fathers of the UN knew that human ingenuity is always being creative and that it would be impossible to domesticate people to prevail over the weakness of their will when all what humans do is to produce long knives, short knives, fat knives, narrow knives, electric knives, etc. so that the more options exists, the more difficult it gets to make people cope.

The realization of the full development of the personality is not a mean to some other end, but it is something that is more complex than that. We all have only one life to live, and the natural and manmade inequality makes it impossible to arrange that everyone live a fulfilled life in all its meaning as per how each person perceives his coming into being among the living is intended to accomplish. At the same time, it would be irrational to assume that those founding fathers of the UN wanted us to interconnect with one another so as to ensure that everyone would possess the same knife, or car so we could all perceive that poverty or injustice is eradicated as per what the work program of the UN consist about. Most importantly, it would be absurd to assume that the social configuration that the founding fathers of the UN wanted us to mount is what is now taking place in reality or when a person now wants to take an elevator to go to a particular floor in some buildings. The person punches the floor number he wants to go to in the lobby and no longer in the elevator as the case was like before. Once in the elevator, the person cannot make the elevator stop at another floor besides the one he specified before entering the elevator. This signify

that there is no difference between how when an inmate is living or in motion is in prison and with when a free person want to go from one floor to the next in a building now. The displacement of both, the inmate and the free man, are controlled. This signify that when the rich finish with automating what the human body would be able to do and not do so algorithms can start to control displacement, living in prison or on the outside of a prison would be one and the same. The only difference between the two would be the area in which the human body is living and displacing matter under the same controlling mechanisms as compared to living in prison. In other words, the same disenchantment that prisoners express about technology and guards denying them rights and interfering in their freedom, the same phenomenon should be what we could expect people to begin to live and emphasize, thus as I said, giving rise more to tribalism exactly as per how the social environment in prisons is like. This also means that the more modernization makes it harder for people to be free or displacement is controlled, the more the motivation of the rich and the poor would be inclined to favor tribalism thus making it much difficult to domesticate people and consequently to emphasize virtues, or ethics.

Humans can continue to declare that what makes life worth living is to experience pleasure, but if from as of when our predecessors handed to us this story that Eve is the mother of all the living and till now no posterity managed to harmonize actions according to God's laws or the manmade laws that man derive in parallel, then the choices ahead are clear: We can continue to call those newborns who agrees to not challenge the laws that we (i.e., existing people) come up with pious because when those new people do not exhibit irrational behavior to challenge them they do not weaken our ability to defend our best interests or we call those who disobey sinners / criminals. If for as long as we are going to harmonize actions based on laws that reserves the right to any person who becomes among the living to protect the material interests resulting from any scientific, literary or artistic production of which one is the author, could our successors manage to live a pleasurable life, if we don't begin to regulate birth rates so newborn pause from continuing to argue that just because they are human being this gives them rights to share on equal rights the natural and built environment?

As I said before, humans were not granted rights to forecast the future. How peace and security could evolve in the future is not something that any person can predict. It seems as if the rich are going to have to decide between revisiting the policies or laws they depend on to justify the social space that they freeze or the material things they accumulate on a cumulative basis or continue to reduce birth rates through civil strife's to control and regulate competition. Alternatively, the rich would have to tolerate until more automation reduces even more human – human relations to make more human – machine grow, thus making more people not be inclined to prioritize procreation due to how expensive the cost of living would get. Actually, when the world would become automated there would be no need any more for so many people to be alive and/or for reproduction to serve the process that it was fulfilling. The utility of procreation as a mean to attend to the human body during the two intervals when a person is not capable to take care of himself on his own (i.e., birth, and old age), during wars and to make progress, would no longer be required. When humans become automated, there is no need for so many real humans to be alive if robots are more efficient and are not programmed with a behavior. Indeed, it was the scourge of war that our predecessors experienced twice in their lifetime what compelled them to counsel us to practice tolerance and to be united to collaborate in the economic field to eventually evade. But if we already know that in the event of a future global war, the traditional perception that nations use to employ whereby they would pit their citizens, mercenaries or militaries against that of another nation until one group surrenders is no longer going to be the case because as Albert Einstein in 1949 said “I know not with what weapons World War III will be fought, but World War IV will be fought with sticks and stones,”¹⁶² this signify that mankind has another dilemma to resolve. If as commentators speculate that ww3 would be likely nuclear, this means that humans would be shrinking even more the livable social space.

In this third millennium that we have just ushered, the only reason why procreation seem to be still required is to pinpoint the individual that can show humanity the way to extend longevity, and of course to enable that when a person stops to be able to change matter on his own (old age) to trade the material things he accumulates for the assistance

¹⁶² https://en.wikiquote.org/wiki/World_War_III

required until ones' own detention time is over. Hence the existing knowledge that exist now does not pose any longer challenge to figure out how everything that exists on the outside of the human body become delegated to technology so humans live in the same way people who are handicapped do and requiring assistance, this signify that reproduction and/or peace and security is now needed not necessarily to create conditions where everyone would live free from fear and want, but to ensure that among those children that are being killed every day around the world that among them is not vanishing the person that can show the powerful nations how to extend longevity or how to intercept to neutralize the weapons of mass destruction of the nations that possess such weapons before being fired.

In conclusion, many wealthy families live in Western Europe to this day. In fact, some nations in western Europe maintain to this day a form of constitutional monarchy. Max Weber [1864 – 1920] claimed that three factors form the stratification of any hierarchy.¹⁶³ These three factors are class, status, and power. The upper class is defined as referring to people who hold the highest social status, usually they are the wealthiest members of society, and wield the greatest political power.¹⁶⁴ The United Kingdom is a constitutional monarchy. For example, in the year 2017, Forbes magazine estimated the wealth of the British Royal family to be \$88 Billion.¹⁶⁵ In the United Kingdom, many political controversy have ensued when the British monarch intervene, even when the case involve a possible illegal action. Some commentators feel that the neutrality of the Crown gets compromised in favor of a partisan goal.¹⁶⁶

This work tried to support that if the decision of the rich include linking how to control the poor using technology rather than depending on human reason, this work program would make it impossible anymore to be able to improve the life chances of the poor by adopting a gradual progressive modernization program to bring them to be content. The

¹⁶³ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Max_Weber

¹⁶⁴ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Upper_class

¹⁶⁵ <https://www.forbes.com/sites/ceciliarodriguez/2017/11/23/the-british-royal-family-is-worth-88-billion/#1f038d98629c>

¹⁶⁶

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Constitutional_monarchy#Modern_constitutional_monarchy

work tried to also show that it is not possible to accelerate the modernization of the poor except through using technology, because this is the only knowhow that exist in the realm. If the more people use technology, this reduces the involvement of real humans in the domestication of people in order to produce a movement that seeks social justice.

In other words, if we continue to occasion material destruction through violence (including increasing death) but at the same time, we continue to engineer new tools that distances the human body from changing matter, the more this situation, would be freeing more human bodies that are composed of both rich and poor people alike. Hence the policies or laws that people employ to freeze social space or accumulate material things on a cumulative basis would continue to squeeze people only in small livable space but would not stop the poor to want like the rich to have a bicycle, a car, a boat, an airplane and the like, the virtual reality that the rich are now making the poor live in because everything around them is automated would not stop the poor to acquire knowledge to seek social justice. In other words, increasing material destruction (including increasing death rates) is only converting form of matter from one state to the next. This method does not change the human behavior which is the key to make people surrender freedom to maintain peace and security. In as far as the rich are concerned, this segment of the population could depend on technology to control the human body of the poor using technology to maintain their power. But because technology cannot control the poor without controlling the rich at the same time, humans would not be able to purge their tribalism because this is what humans depend on to get their way despite the resistance of others. Then again, because technology is preventing the human body of both the poor and the rich from acquiring real knowledge to continue to possess real understanding of themselves, mankind could be on its way to plunge into a social breakdown.

Given, how it is not possible to predict how the teaching that the UN is prompting in the social realm will affect peace and security, then as was the case with our predecessors, we can only take the past world events, and analyze them to objectively conjecture patterns of cause and effect. This also signify that the international families of financiers who control the money supply of the world and the rich who are going to have to

ascertain if allowing the UN to pursue on their behalf conjectures that makes people be devoted to invest coping mechanism to reduce inequality could be weakening their ability to defend their best interests or not. In other words, it is the rich who are going to decide if it is useful to them to have their assembly lines up and running while the United Nations is on the side teaching the poor why they should not be tolerant until poverty and injustice ends, or to risk getting it reverted to a simpler form due to the increased scramble by people for power and wealth.

However, the biggest threat that this work tried to show that the rich are going to have to figure out a solution for it is how to not let the UN challenge them. This work tried to show that the work program that the rich commissioned the United Nations to undertake to end poverty or injustice in the world is not the one that the founding fathers of the UN proposed. All what this work program that the UN is implementing does is to keep the assembly lines from not slowing down but it could be creating two drawbacks that could be impacting negatively more on the rich than on the poor. The first one is that the decision of the UN member states to make the poor abandon their ways of doing things to replace them with modern tools make the poor want to challenge the rich. The second threat and the most important one, is that the UN official could resize the rich easily, because this organization is providing economic solutions in the social realm using staffs that was granted rights and immunities. We saw in the previous chapter how the UN used its power differential to deny this American national rights to protect its interests and not the interests of the UN charter which this organization was made a custodian!

The work tried to show that even if mankind become voluntarily ready to create this ideal state of equality that the UN is pursuing, it would not be possible to create this condition that the UN is working to achieve for as long as there is natural inequality and/or the division of labour is prompting naturally the rise of economic and social inequality. In other words, the patterns that emerged so far as a result of the UN intervention in the social realm does not appear to support that the rich are going to have it as easy as it appeared when they agreed to let the UN interfere in the social realm thus enabling that their wealth would grow hence and/or the poor continue to be domesticated according to the way they want them to behave.

Therefore, hence we also do know that the security of one person is the forgone security of another, the work tried to also show that if the rich do not want the quality of their life to be surpassed by the people of other nations, then they are going to have to choose between continuing to hand to the poor material things that makes the human body idle or maintain this wave of social strife that emerged to keep competing nations resize each other through occasioning internal resizing instead of the resizing occurring outward. The second option is to begin to purge from the social realm the patterns that has potentials to make the poor inpatient, and to let as I said earlier the US take the lead with respective government to implement the work program that the founding fathers sketched. The only country that has knowhow with transferring the American culture to other nations is the United States.

In as far as the option of allowing the UN to continue to preach to foster human rights, it is highly unlikely that the poor would stop to challenge the rich. For the poor to not challenge the rich it would be imperative that this upper leisured class does not try to demonstrate that it is getting its way despite the resistance of others. This is in order to not let the poor feel that this select group is being bound by its personal power and conscience, and is refusing voluntarily to surrender freedom in exchange for protection of its remaining rights. This also include creating equal right patterns. When humans begin to create equal right patterns, the net gain would be zero. This option is not possible.

If the rich around the world do not want the UN to render them into a simpler form in the same way this organization rendered this US national, there is only one choice ahead of them. Of course, that is if the rich want to continue to domesticate people to not develop bias when the knowledge that human ingenuity/imagination is gaining about from computers, TV and other communication sources is teaching them otherwise. This option is to begin to purge from the social realm the patterns that has potentials to make the poor inpatient.

This work tried to support that if humanity's interest in addressing fundamental questions about our place in the universe is not sorted out in the same way our predecessors sorted out during Greek antiquity the question about the number of Gods / Goddesses that certain people were

claiming were granting them rights to manifest action that reinforce bias, this would mean that after a newborn develop awareness he would be bound to extend this prevailing conception of what a person should perceive his coming into being among the living is supposed to accomplish for his own sake and society. This is to create patterns intended to provide benefits to our society, and deepen one's own happiness without integrating into this equation how one's own body mass could have been programmed to serve conjecture that are contrary to what mankind thinks. Concurrently, the different politics that mankind has been pursuing relative to how to distance the human body continually from what this programmed aptitude may have been programmed to achieve in the natural world including freezing social space on a cumulative basis to later hand them to designated individuals, could continue to be challenging indefinitely the people who falls on their back the charge of domesticating newborns to make them abide to existing guidelines or rules. To this, we need to add the stock or endless number of conjectures that existing people are always coming up and using their personal power to influence and make others pause from continuing to be compliant or domesticated according to prevailing guidelines or mandated political order, in order to reinforce their bias or views.

This signify that since it is not possible to control and regulate how people could think but we could regulate what people could think about by removing whatever could give a new person ideas to reinforce his bias, this latter course could help slowdown newborns reliance on conjecture that does not offer any benefit other than to support one's own bias. This course could also usher a new era in human domestication whereby the new person does not find himself being devoted to determine policies to wrong hypothesis or conjecture thus creating more confusion and problems. Furthermore, since what create lasting peace depend on how to make people tolerable or content in this sea of natural inequality first, and then, moving to find answers to all the philosophical issues that people are still debating about and looking for solutions to most of them, when we purge or come up with arbitrary answers to ideas or conjecture that have no conclusion, people would stop to depend on them to deepen their bias. In this way, governments could then de devoted principally to figure out how to keep the human imagination of people busy with mega projects in which some people

are destroying while others are building. This would be much healthier for our societies than to have people being devoted to deal with conjecture that does nothing but deepen instability.

This proposed curriculum would also stop the new people from putting the blame on the inaptitude of existing people for failing to prepare the way ahead of them to be able to harmonize actions based on the principle of equal rights or according to the work program that they would like newborns then to adopt. When religion and philosophy are removed from the history of the world or modified in such a way that they become standardized and do not include stories or reference to humans being wicked by nature or encouraging a newborn to establish conjecture that puts into question the purpose of humanity, this would reduce the number of ideas in the social order that those new people would be depending on to deepen conviction about inequality being manmade or programmed.

I have no way of knowing which unanswered religious or philosophical questions from among the ones that people pose should be removed or arbitrarily answered (i.e., purged) first so its interference does not create patterns that would continue to confuse people. In this way, governments could go back to domesticating people and to build connectedness as per what was agreed upon in 1945 as well.

This work has tried to support that the world does not seem to require as much humans as before after mankind invited technology and robots to take care of a big chunk of the tasks that the human body was programmed to carry out.

From antiquity till now, reproduction has been predicated to comply with God's wish to increase in number, and the other reason was to trade with the material things that a person amasses to a designated person, etc. when the body becomes unable to change matter on its own, so other living organisms does not prey on one's own body.

Hence old age and death are the only truth so far, this means that mankind could begin by purging all the religions and all of human history in order to replace them with a new religion / history that does not make people develop bias. Let us recall that some religion teaches

that humans are wicked, and so unless all those religions that make people develop bias and replaced with a single religion that highlight that the human species was placed on earth to strengthen goodness, people cannot purge tribalism from their mind. Accordingly, strengthen belief in a common ancestry, thus making it possible to bring people together to domesticate them on the idea that all people are equal, and/or on the idea of continuing to develop independent national identities to preserve specific culture over others.

On the other hand, I have no way of knowing what good it would serve mankind to purge religion and/or erase the world history would make people begin to put up with one another if the UN is continued to make people foster human rights staffed with officials who are granted rights and immunities to injure with impunity.

Any solution to the global human security problem has to include both a philosophical and a solution to control motion. Humans were till 1945, controlling human motion through religion. Surely, Christ suggestion to postpone material things to after life, helped mankind from experiencing the bottleneck that emerged in the world after the UN began to preach the opposite.

Then again, it is the rich and the religious leaders who are going to decide if they want the UN to go back to serving the role that it was designed to serve only so governments could be back to controlling people behavior. and/or if they want this organization to continue to inflame the social order by preaching to the poor why everyone should invest reactive coping to seek social justice to increase death rates. This is also to say, if they want the UN to continue to have right to convert into a simple form the people who respect the goals set forth in the UN charter as per what the UN officials treated this US national to preserve their interests.

Surely the rich and the religious leaders knows that if religion could have managed to figure out how to make people share on equal rights material things, the UN would have not been created. Indeed, when the United Nations is allowed to continue to foment intolerance among people and make them set goals that has no other objective than deepening dynamism, this organization would be for the most part

serving its interests and the interests of the powerful forces we would also gain when we reverse the democratic institution that we built.

Last but not least, it is not possible to know why the rich and the religious leaders are letting the United Nations take separate actions to make people invest reactive coping to eradicate poverty or reduce equality, when we know that natural inequality makes it impossible to have two people displace the same quantity of matter or occupy the same void space. Likewise, to deviate from what the United States proposed that existing nations do to domesticate people like post 1945. Indeed, the damages and confusion that emerged does not resemble patterns that people have had previous experience with throughout the history of the world or since humans began to keep written records except when God decided to interfere on earth. Actually, the events that we are experiencing seem to resemble a lot what historians claim has taken place before the fall of existing empires or the fall of cultural systems.

When Christ and his apostles began to pursue the opposite of what the rich wanted to poor to pursue to deepen their own wealth, they managed after their death to bring the Roman Empire on its knees. We can continue to blame Islam for the dynamism that the world is knowing, when the people who believe in this faith are praying 5 times a day. When a person is praying five times a day he would not be making the social order dynamic but static. This is not what the UN is teaching in the real world. This organization is teaching people the opposite.

Then again, when Jesus Christ or Mohamad, were alive those two prophets were preaching their philosophies, they were not teaching people to deny each other rights are per what the United Nations did to this American national who refused to emphasize the importance of the self over the values that are enshrined in the UN Charter. Those two great messengers were not preparing people to observe the work program of God while working at the same time at realizing the full development of their personality and with immunities and privileges?

Indeed, I have no way of knowing if the UN would resize the successors of those international families of financiers, and revert them to a simpler form in the same way this organization did to this American national.

However, what I do know is that in the 19th century John L. O’Sullivan [1813-1895], American Columnist, coined a held belief by the Americans that it was their God-given mission to expand the virtues of the American people and their institutions across North America as “Manifest destiny”.¹⁶⁷ This mindset which O’Sullivan came up with in 1845 had at its epicenter an expansionism agenda by the Americans to remake North America into becoming an agrarian society.

Many critics debated around that time when O’Sullivan coined this term to understand what this motto really means or to see it as a specific policy. Frederick Merk [1877 – 1977], An American historian, coined that this perception by the American settlers to modernize the west to have been born out of "a sense of mission to redeem the Old World by high example ... generated by the potentialities of a new earth for building a new heaven."¹⁶⁸ Since 1845, many experts tried to put this mission that the American settlers manifested to want to expand the American values into the west into a context and Historian Albert K. Weinburg in his book *Manifest Destiny: A study of Nationalist Expansionism in American History* captured perhaps a good perception of what such policies could be. Weinburg said that this idea was intended to create security and virtuous governments in those enfranchised new territories.

Indeed, the special virtues of the American settlers and their institution which was based upon values such as equality, rights of conscience, and personal enfranchisement helped them to extend the US constitution to unenlightened people on the rest of the continent to create a continent without the Balkanization of European countries. They managed to create a nation that extend throughout a vast territory over the entire eastern continent with few borders. Their enlightened governmental thought helped them to build their nation based on democratic, republican and liberal policies. One that was based on the will of the governed and not the government. Surely, the decision of the US to oppose the meddling of the Europeans in Latin Americas was not

¹⁶⁷ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Manifest_destiny

¹⁶⁸ Merk, Frederick (1963). *Manifest Destiny and Mission in American History*. Harvard University Press. ISBN 978-0-674-54805-3.

appreciated for many years,¹⁶⁹ but the world history has showed that this studious policy spared this region from being fragmented in the same way other nations in other parts of the world are dealing with now.

Maybe the United Nations believe that it is on a mission to redeem the entire world in the same way the American settlers believed that they were on a providential mission to bring light from the East into the West. But for sure, the new heaven that the United Nations is building cannot be based on values based on democratic, republican and liberal policies, because if this was the case, peace and security should have improved in most UN member states post WW2 and not retroceded as evidenced by all the on-going wars. If human nature has not changed from 1845 to 1945, and if this new heaven building that the United Nations embarked on erecting is not being tumbled by supernatural forces, the failure of this organization to prevent wars could only be due to two reasons. This is if the United Nations is not acting as an example to achieve this moral mission or the idea to harmonize actions based on democratic, republican and liberal policies is wrong for world peace.

Therefore, since we cannot say that harmonizing actions based on democratic, republican and liberal policies is wrong for world peace, because the United States is a good example; what could be hindering our ability to make progress on the idea our forefathers suggested we harmonize action on its premise to ensure lasting peace, is only if the United Nations is not acting as an example to achieve this moral mission. In other words, the UN is pursuing a thesis that the American settlers did not pursue. The thesis that the UN is pursuing cannot be one that is based on equality, rights of conscience, or personal enfranchisement.

Heraclitus claim that everything is undergoing a consistent process of change. Shall the rich and the religious leaders start with purging from the social order the different UN subsidiary organizations to stop them from resizing them as this work tried to support could happen if they are allowed to go on with maintaining a relationship with this association of nation. I cannot answer this question on behalf of the rich. This work tried to support that the UN is going to use its power differential to

¹⁶⁹ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Monroe_Doctrine

weaken the interests of the rich in the same way this organization did when it denied this American national rights. Only the future will hold the answer to whether the rich would face on the hands of the UN the same fate that this American national faced when this organization prioritized its best interests over ethics!