

THE WRITING ON THE WALL

The ramifications of dismantling the
United States after WW2

**The Character Assassination
of the United States**

Salim Maloof, Ph.D.

Copyright 2021 by Salim Maloof

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

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

Suggested Citation:

Maloof S., The Character Assassination of the United States, 2021

This is a work of non-fiction.

Salim Maloof
THE CHARACTER ASSASSINATION OF THE UNITED STATES
The Writing on the Wall

For more information on reproducing section of this book or sales of this book,
go to:

Center for Modernity Planning and Assessment
www.centermpa.com

In memory of my beloved parents
with special dedication to my late aunt Taljina Maloof Ayub

TABLE OF CONTENTS

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

PREFACE

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

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

PART TWO: Political Correlation Breakdown

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

PART THREE: A wandering World

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

PART FOUR: The Dismantling of the World Political Order

23. The political security problem

PART FIVE: The Character Assassination of the United States

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

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

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

Motive that propelled the author to prepare this work

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Special Note to All UN Member States

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Special Note to All Staff Members of the United Nations

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Special Note to All People of Faith

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

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

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

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

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

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

Special Note to All Readers

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Special Note to the People of Lebanon and People of Egypt

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Definitions

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

PREFACE

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

24

A look into how human imagination is threatening the idea of freedom

Every threat or disruption is different. There is a saying in disaster recovery – “once you've seen one disaster you've seen that disaster.”¹ This explains why none of the crises prevention programs that people (governments, companies, etc.,) carry out to produce strategies for safety defusing axioms, have never managed to deactivate any hostile or violent behavior at the earliest possible stage. Indeed, these long preparation lists that governments or companies produce to prevent crisis or make it easier when in the midst of a crisis to control the disruption or threat have not been as helpful as their creators promotes them to be or hopes them to be.

Then again, all the snooping that governments are carrying out supposedly to protect democracy and makes it easy to catch criminals and terrorist does not seem to be creating a great deal of improvement in how to prevent or in how to better respond to disruption or threats. To the contrary, all the snooping and eavesdropping that government and companies are sponsoring in the name of good seem to be stepping mankind into a world where every member of the human family seems to be getting to be a spy.

Throughout history, people in position of power spied and surveilled their citizens in the name of sovereignty and integrity. The decision of the rich nations to install cameras that continuously record (spy and surveil) in real time the actions of people adds nothing new to improve

¹ https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=invVSKqMc-o&list=PLnkTvfccUkjHr_V7NMAVXvwHoqFF8GO9B&index=3&ab_channel=Aaron

the odds of the rich nations not becoming converted to a simpler form. This is because humans are known to possess photographic memories. In other words, there is no difference between having a video camera recording in real time the actions of people or having a person follow another person and writing down what he saw on a piece of paper. Both methods give plus or minus the same result. In fact, if carrying out digital and human surveillance on journalists, activists, criminals, opposition groups, etc., could prevent a nation from collapsing, the Soviet Union would have not disintegrated in the not-too-distant past.

If this medium that the rich nations have relied on to protect their power, status or wealth since antiquity (i.e., the human brain or the technology that record in real time events) has failed so far to be a good watchdog (scrutinizer) who is capable to filter the information received and to present the information in a way which best represents the story, this means the complex relationships that the rich nations are permitting by letting the invention of the camera (the video camera) to have dual functions (in the one hand to take pictures that can tell a story through images and in the other as a tool to deny people right and freedom) could not be providing practical results for society. To the contrary it seems the invention of the camera to be a tool that is not any different than the invention of the knife or the dynamite! This is very serious and worrisome.

To put it differently, there are two types of threats that can revert a person to a simpler form. One is a natural and direct threats and the other is emotional threat. For example, it is possible to write down the type of threat or disruption that a person can expect from a natural threat or when a nation decides to declare a war on another nation) (i.e., death, power disruption, water and shelter disruptions). Emotional threat, on the other hand, carry significant impact on the emotional well-being of a person just as illnesses do. However, it is not possible to predict if the disruption that they cause would push a person to the point of manifesting the disruption that natural and direct threats engender. In other words, human aspire to live free from fear. This is because there is no difference between a person living constantly under the fear or being denied freedom, and a person who is constantly devoted to strengthening his power. They are both living under fear.

If the powerful families/dynasties and the rich nations want that every creation be used as a tool to deny with it people rights and a tool to benefit them, the jerking that they could be subjecting their emotions to continuously deal with, could be weakening their (the powerful families/dynasties and the rich nations) strength and stability much faster than they think. This is because humans are not a specie that knows how to not take side.

To put it differently, governments can filter information and present information in a way which they believe best serve their interests or represents the “story,” but they cannot secure that the story would influence their citizens in the way they want them to be affected. For example, collateral damage is common in wars. Governments always blame honest mistakes for civilian casualty, including supporting how their action was not in violation of the Law of War. The rendition or confirmation bias that governments employ to justify that there was negligence, justifies to the individuals involved that the conduct was an error but not to the family of the victims. The families of the victims will not consign the justifications.

Simply put, governments can come up with all the stories that they can think of to have citizens view them as force for good, but in a world where complex processes involving both mutual and competing interests’ dictate how emotions changes, selecting the stories that governments consider important or interesting does not cut it if the story (narrative) that is being told lacks the truth (i.e., backed by evidence).

In other words, until 1983 when the United States government (global policemen of the world) was making speeches to the American people about how the Israelis were entitled to right to defend themselves against the aggression of the Palestinians, the video camera was not accessible or popular. Today, every person is walking with a camera in his hands. The United States (global policemen of the world) can have all the US officials make all the speeches they want about how the Israeli are entitled to right to defend themselves against the aggression of the Palestinians, but if one video emerges that support the opposite of what officials in this country are sidelining with, the credibility of the United States as a force for good becomes at stakes. This is because the new truth that this one video presented switched the interests of people

(emotions) from continuing to solely focus on learning about how the US government decision making process works into becoming arbitrators.

No matter the emotional threat that an individual knows, there are only a limited number of disruptions that any person can cause. But when the number of people who refuse to obey and begin to be bound by their personal power and conscience is large, historical testament shows that the prevention strategies that governments prepared for, or used to thwart threats failed to control the people disenchantment or violence that citizen provoke. This is very serious and worrisome.

In other words, if no matter what type of disruption a government prepares for or type of threat a government comes up with, it is not possible to thwart threat, then the more governments adopt double standards, prioritize their self-interest instead of the common interests, make promises that they cannot keep, or make promises because they want to make citizen happy, the more they could be accelerating people's distrust with the system.

Distrust is “the confident expectation that another individual’s motives, intentions, and behaviors are sinister and harmful to one’s own interests. In interdependent relationships, distrust often entails a sense of fear and anticipation of discomfort or danger. Distrust naturally prompts us to take steps that reduce our vulnerability in an attempt to protect our interests. Accordingly, our distrust of others is likely to evoke a competitive (as opposed to cooperative) orientation that stimulates and exacerbates conflict.”²

I have no way of knowing if the decision of the most powerful families/dynasties (victors of WW2) or rich nations to upgrade the mode of communication and mode of transportation of all people is to blame for this abnormal rise in intolerance that emerged in the world post 1945. What I do know is that people (nations) solidify their power by denying each other rights. In other words, nations go to war either to dispense with dynastic or hereditary authority (i.e., to preserve good democracy), or to extend power and wealth hereditarily. If the destructive potential

² <https://www.beyondintractability.org/essay/distrust>

of distrust prompt people to disobey their rulers no matter if the social order is organized democratically or autocratically each time rulers make promises that they do not keep, the decision of the most powerful families/dynasties or rich nations to be in favor of letting every member of the human family possess a camera while the intergovernmental organization named United Nations is teaching people about why they should not trust them (i.e., by increasing the awareness and knowledge about human rights) could be equivalent to prompting a scenario whereby instead of them (the most powerful families/dynasties or rich nations) waiting to die so God could judge them, they are inviting people to do it here on earth instead.

In Ecclesiastes 5:6, the Bible counsel people to not let their mouth make one sin, or to tell that the promise made was a mistake, because that would make God angry, and he might wipe out everything a person had achieved

I have no way of knowing if humans are as understanding and are as patient in bringing judgment as the author of the book of Ecclesiastes says God is. The apostle Peter in his second Epistle letter to various churches in Asia Minor, he reminds his friends of the importance of making every effort to learn self-control, because this quality, he said would help a person to not stumble. [2 Peter 1:6 and 10] Peter also says that God is patient, because he does not want people to perish, but to have everyone to come to repentance. [2Peter 3:9]

I have no way of knowing if the decision of the most powerful families/dynasties (victors of WW2) to let the rich nations convert all members of the human family into becoming unknowingly spies instead of insisting on the rich nations to make every effort to lead by example so everyone goes back to using their phones to store personal photos instead of to be recording how governments are violating human rights, just as governments are recording how citizens are not obeying the laws. This is because this strategy could be cancelling each faction out, and producing a social order with a zero-sum game, as the world history attest to that.

Therefore, since the choices that the most powerful families/dynasties appear to have consist of doing what the apostle Peter suggested in his

2nd Epistle to the various churches in Asia Minor and that was to pay attention to the prophetic message “as to a light shining in a dark place, until the day dawns and the morning star rises in their hearts” [2Peter 1:19] (that is to say to let the work program that the founding fathers proposed in the UN charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights be the shining light), and the other is to remain steadfast under trial in the hope that all the snooping and excuses that governments give to refuse to obey the work program proposed in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights thus compelling citizens to have a reason to be unprepared to surrender freedom and to be ready to obey, we can say that the victor in this test (race) is going to be the one who can demonstrate the most perseverance.

For example, the warlords who started dominating the political fabric in Lebanon have been refusing to relinquish control of the government so citizens can begin to exercise their right to cooperate based on the principle called for in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights since 1975. Many political commentators are suggesting that the upcoming elections set for 2022 will determine if the people would be ready to continue to tolerate living with no water and electricity as they have been doing since 1975 (i.e., which could lead to engulfing the country in a new civil war), or if the warlords would continue to get their way despite their resistance of others.

Then again, Lebanon is only 10,542 km². Even if the Lebanese people kick the warlords who are ruling Lebanon since 1975 out or fail, the victors or the losers in this game of thrones will not gain or lose much, because the winners / losers would be gaining / losing political power and not royal power (regional or global power).

The power struggle for royal power (regional or global power) is at a different scale of trial altogether. The bloodshed and level of destruction that the struggle for royal power could tax mankind can even include the wiping out of the entire human progress before one of the rivaling forces who would be fighting in this weight class wins.

Therefore, since it would be necessary that the most powerful families/dynasties (the victors of WW2) be at all the time doing what the apostle Paul suggested in his letter to the Romans to be doing, and

that is not to conform to this world to win, but be transformed by the renewal of the mind, [Romans 12:22] this means that any renewal should be flawless so that whatever impact those strategies would have, they will not pay back with harm.

I have no way of knowing if the renewal that most UN member states are adopting to strengthen oversight would prevent intelligence contractor like Edward Snowden³ leak information about the double standards that governments rely on to get their ways despite the resistance of others. Then again, if in theory, when this surveillance was happening using the human intelligence as a tool, this tactic was not able to prevent the collapse of the Soviet Union, then it is highly likely that if the most powerful families/dynasties continue to allow the rich nations to strengthen their surveillance capabilities and to make it harder to be breached, that they would not be able to prevent their royal power from eventually collapsing. This is because it is real humans who operate those surveillance systems. It is people who make decisions, and it is people who preside over those surveilling institutions.

In fact, financial intelligence is defined as “the gathering of information about the financial affairs of entities of interest, to understand their nature and capabilities, and predict their intentions.”⁴ Most people (governments) believe that “greater financial intelligence greatly improves an individual's ability to make wise and meaningful decisions in their job, thereby allowing them to have a greater positive impact on their organization. estimates.”⁵ I have no way of knowing if whenever a person grows his financial intelligence (collection and analysis), this skill brings a host of practical benefits along. Indeed, the manner in which the financial market has been evolving since the start of the last century does not support that people are saving money and/or that governments stopped from making financial mistakes. For example, as of the date rich nations granted large financial institutions right to have enormous power, none of the knowledge that was collected or analyzed managed to prevent the financial market from collapsing due mainly to corruption or wrong economic thinking.

³ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Edward_Snowden

⁴ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Financial_intelligence

⁵ <https://www.setpointinc.com/why-increase-your-financial-intelligence/>

If in theory, there is no difference between the surveillance that financial institutions (governments) employ to be better equipped to use that information to work and manage more effectively (stay in business), and the security surveillance that governments do to stay in power (collection and analysis), then it is possible that the international order crash in the same way the financial market crashed. This is very serious and worrisome. This is because when the financial market crashed, the governments bailed out the financial institutions, organizations, thinkers, etc. who were planning for the future erroneously. If the international order crash, it would not be the rich nations who would be doing the bailing, but the nations who would be happy to see the rich nations become reverted to a simpler form so they can take over. This is very serious and worrisome indeed.

In other words, if all what humans do is explore to increase their own access to money (happiness and power) including providing practical results for society, but at the same time, wealth (money) is what the rich societies (nations) rely on to make the poorer societies (nations) acquiesce to their ideas, this means that the more a rich nation rely on means or tools (artificial intelligence or digital intelligence to increase its wealth or solidify its power, the more that nation could be accelerating its own reversal to a simpler form. This is because it is not Lebanese or Egyptian thinkers or executives who are determining economic thinking or leading those financial or governmental institutions that are based in the rich nations, but their own nationals who is doing it.

Simply put, if when means or tools such as artificial intelligence or digital intelligence increases the intellectual or financial intelligence of a person, the intellectual or financial knowledge that a person develops increases naturally that person's bias, this signify that the more a nation accelerate the awareness or knowledge of its citizens, the faster the preparedness of its members to evade tax, launder money or be involved in criminal activities grows (unless the government is picking the tab as in rich nations). Furthermore, because the more the citizen of a given nation evade tax, launder money or be involved in criminal activities grows, the more this nation is required to create structures to collect information on suspicious or unusual financial activity reciprocally grows, this means that the more law enforcement agencies a nation

create to report suspicious transactions, the more the number of people who would be engaged in criminal activity would grow. In other words, the financial market would have not crashed in 1929 (Great Depression) or in 1987 (Black Monday), the 2001 dotcom burst, or the 2008 financial crisis, if all the law enforcement agencies, regulatory agencies, intergovernmental networks, that were responsible to see that none of those crashes occurs were not implicated in the unlawful activities that prompted those collapses. Furthermore, if the more people and financial institutions become suspected of being involved in tax evasion, money laundering, or criminal activities grows, the more the number of people who become involved in dodging fiduciary and judiciary obligations grows (due to added number of corrupt people on both the public side and the law enforcement side). This also means that the more the number of people in a given nation (the public in general and the staffs who work at all the law enforcement agencies) use ways to dodge fiduciary and judiciary obligations grows, the more the scrutinizing that would be carried out would be centering on tightening the freedom of the common people and not necessarily public servants (government officials, criminal justice officials etc.) because no one who is in control of violence-wielding apparatus want the fingers be pointed at them. This means that the more the people who control the government try to dodge fiduciary and judiciary obligations to make things benefit them, the more people's disenchantment with their government grows. The more people's disenchantment with their government grows the more the preparedness of citizens to withdraw their obligation grows. The more the unpreparedness of people to obey grows, the more social unrest grows. The more social unrest grows, the more the likelihood of a country to plunge in a civil war grows.

If we compare how people's unpreparedness to obey in the United States changed from 1929 (Great depression) to now (2015), we find that after each financial crash that occurred since, the number of people who are evading tax, laundering money, discovering safe haven to park money, finding ways to have financial records disappear, etc. was growing into becoming more complex than the previous one (i.e., crash) despite all the new agencies that were created to control oversight after each specific financial crash.

Throughout history governments have jumped to prevent their ruin after a financial crash. For example, on the aftermath of the 2008 financial crash, the United States bailed out the US banks including financial institutions and injected hundreds of billions of United States dollars to stabilize the economy.⁶ I have no way of knowing if the American people improved oversight after the financial bailout or rescue that the United States government effected on the aftermath of the 2008 financial crash, and are beginning to cooperate with one another in accordance with the work program that the founding fathers of the UN suggested. The additional financial crisis that the United States knew from 2008 till the present support that the American people addressed the shortcomings that are perpetuated in the erroneous way the economy in the country was run till 2008 to prevent that another financial crisis does not develop, but did not address how citizens begin to cooperate with one another in accordance with the work program that the founding fathers of the UN suggested since the latter is a function of the former. This also indirectly means that the US government believes that bailing out the financial institutions (US banks) who their own beliefs and ideas causes financial crashes in the first place, including adding agencies to oversee oversight and ensure that all those who are involved lead by example, would make it possible to prevent the economic institutions that this country is trying to preserve from decaying further including helping its citizens to maintain their strength and stability.

Then again, if after every financial crash that US banks perpetrate and the US government rushes to bail them out, the existing agencies who are responsible to oversee oversight and irregularities and the new ones that are usually added after each new financial crash fail to detect threats to prevent new ones from occurring fail to make citizens cooperate with one another in accordance with the work program that the founding fathers of the UN suggested, then there is a good chance that all the bailouts of US banks and financial institutions that the US government is effecting are not stabilizing the economy of the United States or helping this country to continue to maintain its strength and stability. This is very serious and worrisome, because we now already that no matter how many new financial crashes occurs in the US in the future, the government cannot refuse to bailout the US banks and financial

⁶ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Emergency_Economic_Stabilization_Act_of_2008

institutions to stabilize the economy. This is because inaction would lead to riots, and most importantly, to citizens demanding that leadership be changed.

This afore dilemma is very serious and worrisome. Some investigators suggest that the Great Depression of the 1930s and the economic protectionism that followed served as a catalyst that led to the breakout of World War II.⁷ The persistent protests, high unemployment rates, rise in crime or relaxed laws, etc. that the American people are knowing since 2008 does not support that the comprehensive steps that this country took to prevent further erosion of confidence in the US credit market or the US judiciary system has improved. The same can be said about the confidence in the credit market and judiciary systems of other UN member states.

An economic depression is a “period of sustained, long-term downturn in economic activity in one or more economies.”⁸ Lots of literatures suggest that the outbreak of WW1 and WW2 were marked by economic depressions that preceded the outbreak of those two world wars.⁹ Of course, not all economic depression lead to a global war. However, if most thinkers believe that economic depression can unravel such catastrophic circumstances, this signify that if the most powerful families/dynasties (the families/dynasties who control the international order and the money supply of the world) continue to allow the rich nations (United States, Great Britain, China, Germany, Japan, Scandinavian nations, Italy, etc.) to let the intergovernmental organization named United Nations and the rest of the UN member states violate the work program that is stipulated in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, mankind could be reconstructing the same circumstances that would lead the world to another global war.

Then again, even if the world is to become engulfed in a new global war, this would not be the first time that mankind would be knowing such type of calamity. The threat of a war is not the death or destruction that such event engenders hence this is evident. The danger of any war

⁷ <https://www.investopedia.com/articles/markets/022516/economic-conditions-helped-cause-world-war-ii.asp>

⁸ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Economic_depression

⁹ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Economic_depression#Global

centers on its potential to threaten the continuity of the reign of a leader, a king or a ruling dynasty. This is because it was not the nation who possessed the most relative military firepower who was the victor in wars all the time. The societies (and fighters) who demonstrated that they possessed perseverance, or were good in deception defeated many powerful armies throughout history.

To put it differently, if governments (around the world) continue to use the complex networks of surveillance as a commodity (buy and sell) or as a tool to prioritize their self-interests instead of the interest of the common good (the rule of law), it would be the international rule based postwar world order that would crash if people continue to lose confidence in its utility as a tool to increase their happiness. When the international rule based postwar world order collapse (crash), the wealth of the nation would not be able to persevere its stability, nor its relative military firepower would do it. The nation who its populace possesses the most mental fortitude (discipline, patience, resilience, persistence, valor, etc.) would be the one who would outlast. Ibn Khaldun, from as far back as seven hundred years believed like Andrew Grove in modern history perceived that “Success breeds complacency. Complacency breeds failure.” If success is the seed (yeast) that accelerate or lead to the self-destruction of a living culture (human being or a society), this means that today the American people are not better equipped than the Lebanese (living with no electricity, water, or rule of law for the last 50 years) or the Egyptians (living with no right or freedom for the last 50 years) to overcome adversity, no matter the challenge that would be faced. This means that if the United States (the global policemen), for example, does not pick between two paradigms before it is too late, this country could easily become reverted to a simpler form if its citizens continue to be determined on violating the work program stipulated in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights or seek to achieve the same standards of living that the superrich enjoy. The first shift is to begin to deny, voluntarily or involuntarily, freedom to US citizens to train the human body and the mind to be tough. In other words, do what the Spartans were doing to their newborns to prepare their bodies for the harshness of war (agōgē)¹⁰, or as Jesus counselled doing when one is not able to stop sinning (i.e., cut off a limb) to be tough, [Matthew 18:05]

¹⁰ <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Agoge#Purpose>

The second is to begin to lead by example, so the awareness that citizens develop does not lead them to believe that all this network of surveillance system is being used to limit the accountability and oversight of how the powerful use their power, and henceforth become unprepared to obey.

I have no way of knowing if all the investments that the rich nations are making in UN member states so people preoccupy themselves with installing high end spying machines that would provide information on what each one is doing in real time is an activity that build discipline, patience, resilience, persistence, valor, etc. as compared to using this money to putting people to build towers that reaches to the sky as our ancestors were doing in antiquity, thus preoccupying people with not having to speak different language. In other words, instead of preoccupying people with figuring out or establishing if their government is doing its job correctly or not, people would be preoccupying themselves with bricks (as the rulers of Egypt are preoccupying the military complex with doing since 2014 building cities). Surely, this strategy that the rich nations are adopting as of 1945, and which evolve around keeping people preoccupied with how their governments is performing its duty appear to be challenging the rich nations much more than helping them. If the people distrust with government becomes a worldwide phenomenon, then this divisiveness can evolve until making people starting to oppose their governments. This is very serious and worrisome. This is because this situation could push people to coalesce and to begin to depend on private unchallengeable methods to shakeup the government or do business such as relying on bartering, which is an old method to exchange services and goods without the use of money, or the use of a monetary system such as a credit card or dependence on banks or financial institutions. In essence, the income tax or VAT system is the largest single revenue source for almost every government in modern history. If people begin to barter or rely on digital methods that leaves governments cut out, governments would not be able to collect taxes, because they would not be able to know where people's income is coming from exactly. In fact, the blockchain technology and crypto currency which are becoming, more and more, part of the people, is a form of digital (electronic) bartering. Hence, it is not possible for governments to control how people could be bartering using blockchain

technology and crypto currency in the same way how they are able to monitor what people are saying, then governments could be losing their principal source of income if people's distrust with their role continues to grow. This could activate a complex chain reaction in the already tense relations between the people and governments that could return mankind into living as was the case during the dark ages.

It looks as if the big challenge of the rich nations after 70 years has elapsed on their aspirations to let the intergovernmental organization named United Nations teach people why everyone need to stop to be content is how to go back to make the common people be patient without the stark division that this strategy created dividing people in the same way the Spartans were divided leading to the families/dynasties who control the rich nations presently face the same end that the rich Spartans faced: reversal to a simpler form.

I have no way of knowing what the group of men who all nations and people dread and fear them (the most powerful families/dynasties) are planning ahead for the future. In other words, I have no way of knowing how the most powerful families/dynasties (victors of WW2) intend to have the world remain divided into two factions, one with no right and poor, and another rich but with no right, without this double standards leading to their collapse as happened to the families who were ruling the Spartans ultimately. Indeed, outright conquest, unequal alliances, etc. as the Spartans rulers were doing in antiquity could buy time and help the members of the most powerful families/dynasties (victors of WW2) to continue to achieve significance and greatness along with the rich nations who are acting as their protectors. However, if as Harry Truman reminded the American people in his farewell speech in 1953, about how "in the long run justice and freedom will prevail over any political, economic and social system that has no respect for neither God nor man,"¹¹ this means that virtues must be a weapon that man has no authority over.

Indeed, there is a great resemblance between the series reforms that rich nations are adopting in modern history to make their country great again, and the one that the Spartans were doing in antiquity. I have no

¹¹ <https://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/documents/the-presidents-farewell-address-the-american-people>

way of knowing if the series of debts relief, debt forgiving strategies, subsidies, building of border walls, including agōgē (training, guidance, discipline) that the rich nations are sponsoring would eventually create the necessary transformation. In the case of the Spartans, those strategies had some success but ultimately were not enough to prevent their reversal to a simpler form. This is very serious and worrisome. In other words, after the Spartans were reverted to a simpler form, the powers that absorbed them (Macedon and Romans) forced the Spartans to style themselves in the manner of their new masters. The most powerful families/dynasties do not have this luxury of restyling the social order in a manner than is much better than the one the founding fathers of the UN proposed. In other words, there is no new political dogma that man can style than the one mankind started practicing as of 1945. The dogma that the founding fathers laid out in the Universal declaration of Human rights (or US ideals) is the end of the line. This means that if the group of men who all nations and people dread and fear them (the most powerful families/dynasties) continue to be fixed on not letting the rich nations (western European countries, the United States, etc.) lead by example, the world could only be spiraling back to pre-1945 dogmas.

I have no way of knowing how the victors of WW2 and the wealthy (rulers and political class) perceive that they could bring stability (including solidifying their power) while they are empowering governments to eavesdrop on peoples' conversations, and while they are allowing governments to create an atmosphere of impunity. In particular, if governments continue to make it easier for themselves to punish people, or rely extraordinary rendition or torture on moral grounds to solidify their powers. If there is nothing concealed that will not be known or brought out into the open [Luke 8:17], eventually people are going to catch up, and are going to realize that all those tools and measures are intended to better control them.

Furthermore, if throughout history people used the rise in their awareness and knowledge to withdraw their obligation to obey, this means that humans may not be a specie that was programmed to be naturally governed by dominance hierarchies as the social system that ants or bees adhere to show is possible. If so, this means that people could be supposing that they can take advantage of the division of labor

which the natural world prompt naturally to create dominance hierarchies. The reason why this dominance hierarchy that people create collapse in the course of time and things is simply because this dominance system is manmade and was not programmed naturally. If the other way was the case (i.e., we were programed naturally to fall in line), humans would not be having, till today, wars to determine who should be carrying the orders of the strongest before taking actions of their own. The afore also means that for as long as people continue to rely on their power or wealth to create unnatural dominance hierarchies, the more this strategy makes people work toward strengthening their own selfish ends instead of the common ends, which explains why most leaders leave the people who they rule over worse off than they found them initially. In other words, the reason why people are not able to stay the course and uphold the four cardinal values that Aristotle suggested are necessary for a society to not fall behind (i.e., prudence, justice, fortitude and temperance), is because everyone gains when selfish ends are prioritized over common ends (i.e., natural ends). To put it differently, if we take a room and fill the air with dust those particles will not be able to freely go from one end of the room to the other, as compared to going ahead and placing a fan in the center. The fan makes it much easier for the dust to move around in the room.

This means that if the individuals who believe that their wealth or power grant them right to play the deputy of god role on earth are not managing to let their selfish ends stay the course (i.e., to get their ways despite the resistance of others forever), this reason can only be tied to their inability to keep the dynamics in the social order not die out or the dynamics that they are creating is compelling complex relations.

Sandstorm, tornado, rip current, whirlpool, etc. are natural phenomenon that keeps the elements (objects) that are trapped in their zone of influence dynamic until encountering resistance and then this phenomenon dies out. However, this phenomenon creates complex relations for the elements that gets caught.

If the individuals who want that everyone consider their opinions before taking actions of their own are not able to continue to legitimize the ideas that solidifies their power (i.e., they are not able to make people not withdraw their obligation to obey), this means that the complex

relations that their actions is producing must be causing this decline (leading to them becoming absorbed by another growing power), or this fall is happening naturally in the same way the natural order builds resistance and makes a tornado die out.

This also means that if the individuals who are playing the deputy of God role do not want that their status or power diminish, they need to either keep the social order dynamic permanently thus stopping people to build resistance, or keeping the social order less persuasive to minimize the buildup of dynamics.

To give an example, the cold war which ended with the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1990, was a war that was fought between the government of the United States and the government of the Soviet Union. In this war, the armed forces (citizens) of either bloc did not fight directly with each other, but each bloc tried to isolate the spreading of the ideology of the other from ones' own territory or the territory that either controlled. In addition, the two countries "continually antagonized each other through political maneuvering, military coalitions, espionage, propaganda, arms buildups, economic aid, and proxy wars between other nations."¹² As of the start of the 21st century, a new kind of cold war seem to have struck the United States, Russia and all the rest of the UN member states. This new cold war is the increased distrust of citizens with governments. This declining trust has led citizens and governments to be engulfed in a race that is not any complex than the cold war that the United States and the government of the Soviet Union waged. This is because this new cold war is not one that is being fought between governments, but between governments and their own citizens.

This is not the first time that governments and citizens have been entangled in a show of force to determine who acquiesce the other. The on-going debate to legalize the consumption of recreational drugs (Marijuana), alcohol use, gun ownership, prostitution (actions that people consider to be examples of victimless crimes) have been on-going endlessly.

¹² <https://www.jfklibrary.org/learn/about-jfk/jfk-in-history/the-cold-war#:~:text=Soldiers%20of%20the%20Soviet%20Union,proxy%20wars%20between%20other%20nations.>

However, in all those victimless crimes that governments depended on to restrict unwanted behavior and actions, it was not the government who “was not doing the right thing” but citizens. Now the distrust (or frustration) that exist between citizens and governments is one in which citizens are no longer ready to accept statements (reports) to support how their governments is doing, but want the social and economic issues that the government says is doing a good job on to be reflected or be demonstrated on the ground. This is very serious and worrisome.

The role of government cannot be to help people get out of poverty, but rather to restrict unwanted behavior and actions. This is because there is only one method known to man to reduce poverty and this technique involve decreasing greed which is what people refuse to do. All the disregard, contempt, corruption, betrayal, etc. that people exercise is because the rich refuse to lead by example. Humans do not manifest the same intolerance when they are within their own homes.

This dilemma means that if governments do not want citizens to distrust them they need to be doing more to solve problems. The problem is that when governments start doing too many things better left to businesses and individuals to do, this swells the size of the government. The more the government swells, the more the trust in the government shrinks (because the government stops to be an independent neutral party).

Hence it is not possible to stop ethical concerns from weighing down on any government (i.e., we cannot ensure the honesty of elected officials or the right conduct by civil servants), the rich nations have two choices to stop the disillusionment or cynicism of people with governments. The first is to continue to let people foster disregard for the laws in the hope that as the social order erode and become inefficient that citizens would become exhausted, and be in favor of letting government or warlords do more than to have violence take a harder toll on the quality and nature of the social order. It is important to keep in mind that it is required that the law and order erode in order to avoid that citizens perceive that the gridlock is in the elected officials who lead governments and not the conduct of the civil servants who do the administration, thus prompting people to withdraw their obligation to obey and re-elect new politicians. The second choice is to let all the non-essential potential created by technical progress wait until citizens

lack of faith in the political system and in the honesty and ethics of government leaders improves.

I have no way of knowing if the rich nations plan to prioritize, in the near future, how to address lack of faith in the political system including ensuing moral decline, or if they would be in favor of focusing on delegating more to technology the role that humans may have been programmed to serve for the natural order including favoring developing their own crypto currency to force people to trade with their own digital currency systems and nothing else. In other words, give the crypto currency that they develop value only, in the same way man gave to gold or diamond value of all the precious elements or previous stones.

Once again, I have no way of knowing which factor from the afore two would the rich nations rely on to solidify their power and control. Of course, the rich nations could resolve the lingering distrust and discontent that citizens are increasingly perceiving about how politicians and civil servants are using the idea of government to secure their best interests instead of securing the goals specified in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights by entangling the world in a new global war. In other words, given the difficulty involved in making people regain trust with governments when the latter will always would be denying corruptions allegations, wars are very effective remedies when the social order becomes entangled in gridlocks that involve questions of distrust, or questions that it is not possible to figure out for them the specific negative behavioral or attitudinal consequences that they can have on the social order. This is because wars flush the problem out instead of solving it.

For example, if the rich nations entangle the world in a new global war in the near future, this development would kill two birds with one stone. The rich nations would be able to resolve the cause and effect of distrust of government, and reset the monetary order among independent states as the allied nations did in 1944 (while WW2 was still waging) in the Bretton Woods Agreement.¹³

¹³ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bretton_Woods_system

I have no way of knowing if a better sense of purpose would reignite around the world if the rich nations wage a new global war including resetting the monetary order. So far the reset that occurred on the aftermath of WW2 did not create a climax of acceptance by citizens as rulers (government officials) are exempting themselves from obeying the principles stipulated in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. If the rich nations reset the political and economic order before figuring out how to control people's perceptions about the idea of government not being simply a mean towards an end (to benefit the individuals involved and not necessarily to strengthen morality), this distrust that citizens are manifesting toward governments would continue to grow.

Simply put, there are two ways to judge any government. One method is based on performance (outcome) and the other is based on the quality or health of the government (input). The emphasis of the UN system in the last seventy years on ending poverty and inequity instead of on teaching people to be content and tolerant to strengthen the connection of citizens with governments, shifted the awareness of people from being about how to rate government based on their performance (outcome) to how to rate its quality (input). To put it differently, when we judge a government on performance (outcome) it is possible to tolerate illegal activities in the system, but when the judgment is based on quality (input), the system would be operating free from any political corruption, because the group of men who would be administering the government would be running business for the benefit of all the people and not their own bias.

In 1863, Abraham Lincoln (1809 – 1865), 16th President of the United States, delivered a speech known as the Gettysburg address. In this speech Lincoln reminded the Americans that the United States was established under the promise that all men were created equal, and that if this hope is to succeed, the government should be devoted to improving the common welfare of the people and not the individuals involved only (i.e., by the people, for the people, and of the people).¹⁴

The government of the United States managed to administer a lot fairly from 1776 to 1945 as compared to how the old powers (the western

¹⁴ <http://www.abrahamlincolnonline.org/lincoln/speeches/gettysburg.htm>

European nations) were doing in Europe and in the nations they were administering for the same period, including showing that it is possible for a just government to exist. If all the UN member states are not able to transcend to experience the good measure of liberty and equality that the American people managed to achieve from 1776 to 1945, this means that people are not able to not let their emotions or bias not interfere in the attainment of the goals (or war aims) they themselves set out to achieve. Those goals are “to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war, reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights, establish conditions under which justice and respect for the obligations arising from treaties are maintained, and to promote social progress for better standards for life in larger freedom.”¹⁵

I do not know of a resolution that could rectify the lack of cooperation among countries, or redress the political and economic rivalry that emerged in the world subsequent to the decision of the rich nations to let the intergovernmental organizations named United Nations teach people to withdraw their obligation to obey when their government fail to increase their happiness than to rely on tolerance as the founding fathers of the UN counselled. To put it differently, the control of the social order is only done using practicing tolerance no matter what the starting conditions of the social order are. Simply put, no matter how erratic the behavior of men gets, there is no other solution to rely on to control the behavior of people than through practicing tolerance. This means that even if the rich nations decide to reset the international order via the burden of a new global war, the only outcome that could such recourse reproduce would be nothing but the system of rules, institutions, and procedures that were determined and included in the resolutions that were adopted in all the international treaties that ensued on the aftermath of WW2. This is very serious and worrisome. This is because this reality limits the options that the group of men who all nations and people dread and fear them (the most powerful families), have to continue to transform the conditions and outcomes that matters to them to two. The group of men who all nations and people dread and fear them (victors of WW2) could put a stop to all the double standards that the rich nations have been manifesting since 1945, including instructing them to lead by example, thus no society would have a

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

reason to disobey. Alternatively, the group of men who all nations and people dread and fear them could continue to let the disregard and contempt that the rich nations are permitting to go on in the hope that the complex relations that this strategy would be producing would be properly managed by them to prevent things from reaching a dangerous level.

Once again, I have no way of knowing which option from the afore two the group of men who all nations and people dread and fear them will pick to continue to solidify their power. What I do know is that man was programmed with certain power and denied other powers. For example, man was granted power to see the power of the sea. However, man was denied right to see the dynamic that people's disregard and contempt generate.

If the group of men who all nations and people dread and fear them (victors of WW2) decide to let the disregard and contempt that the rich nations are permitting to go on in the hope that the complex relations that this strategy would be producing would be something that they could ride out, then we can say that what the group of men plan to do is ride out the dynamics that people are creating in the same way boats do at sea when they ride out waves.

Man has always struggled with his hopeless power to forecast how the dynamics of the sea develops. This powerlessness continues to this day to cause many ships to sink when confronted with large waves. This also means that all the ships (boats, oil platforms) that are in service and were spared, the survivability of those mode of transport (objects) occurred only because they did not come face to face with a rogue wave or a freak wave yet.

Indeed, when we compare how the fate that awaited all the powerful families/dynasties who presided over kingdom or empire that disobeyed the values proposed in the biblical scriptures, we find that the wrath that awaited those powerful people was not any different than the demise that awaited the ships that came face to face with big waves. In fact, even when the rulers who committed disregard or contempt were not punished before dying, their children (successor kingdom) were later punished for the sin of their fathers. [Deuteronomy 5:9-10] In other

words, the unpreparedness of their fathers to obey the system of rules, institutions, and procedures that they legitimize was a burden that their children paid for.

Then again, when we look into how the sea actually works (i.e., into the nature of reality), we find that the energy that produces the waves comes from the wind. If for as long as the wind is going to be blowing over any body of water, this phenomenon is going to create rippling effect (capillary waves) that would eventually grow into big waves when the speed of the wind increases, this means that the cleverness will always center on how to avoid getting caught in big waves to avoid the demise that certain ships encounters when they come face to face with one. What is also very useful is to have a backup ship so that in case one ship gets caught in a rogue wave (a wave that develops suddenly), the other ship can carry the load on board. For example, an aircraft carrier never leaves home alone. An aircraft carrier is always escorted with an extensive flotilla of other ships.

To put it differently, if irrespective of whether children pay for their parent's sin [Deuteronomy 5:9-110], or existing people bring the consequences of one's generation's sin upon the next [Jeremiah 32:18], or each person will die for his own [2 Chronicles 25:4], no cohort has interested itself in cooperating in a brotherly spirit except when the matter has involved a threat or spheres in which the love of money was not the root of evil; this means that it would not be possible to stop the complex relations that people's continuous exploration to deny each other rights and achieve practical results for the greater well-being of society. If so, this signifies that all what the group of men who all nations and people dread and fear, and the rich nations who protect them need to do to continue to transform the conditions and outcomes that matters to them is to continue to ride the wave as they are doing. In other words, continue to build up militarily, and rely on their relative military power and wealth to divide and rule.

Unfortunately, the challenges that the most powerful families, and the rich nations who protect them must stand up to in order to avoid that their wealth and status does not be reverted to a simpler form is not something that can be resolved by riding the wave like everyone else, in the hope that when the storm calms down, they would continue to be

holding on to their power. First if the idea of building up militarily and dividing and ruling is a strategy that prevent a society or a kingdom from collapsing, the Romans, the Spartans, the Pharaohs, etc. would have been ruling till today. Second, and most importantly, the complex relations or transformations (i.e., energy) that humans develop on land are more complex than the energy that wind and water work together produce in the sea. For example, the complex transformation that the wind forces the sea water to take does not follow a life cycle that changes what the water looks like or is made of during the stretching, cresting, deformation, etc. that is happening, but the water stays composed of its same constituents throughout this process. Said differently, from the moment, the life cycle of the wave start to when it ends (i.e., from when the wind that is acting on the water stops to look as if it is exhibiting a flat nature (static), till when it forms a crest while distorting and deforming dynamic) including until it tries to reestablish a flat nature (static)), the entire process follows a physical change and not a chemical change.

In the case of how humans relate and transform on land, the human body is continuously undergoing a physical change but the mind behaves according to the way chemical change behaves. In other words, the mind is always imaginings things and changing in the head how those things look like including what they are. In addition, humans are always taking the things that they are imagining in their head and testing them on the things that exist on the outside of their human body. This process is always making the things that people are introducing changes in them (i.e., the objects) to stop from continuing to serve their own best interest as they were doing before man interfered in their stability, or the best interests of the natural world, but to serve the best interests of man. As the afore shows, man is all the time changing the way things looks like to make them stop to serve the initial purpose they were created for and serve new ones.

Actually, one way to depict the complex relations that humans are creating could be done by relating this process to how sandstorm behaves. In a sandstorm, all the objects that gets in the path of the whirling wind (vortex) lose stability and get tossed in all directions. However, when the wind dies out, the objects that were caught in this phenomenon, do not find themselves having gotten transformed into

becoming new objects that starts to serve a different purpose. For example, if a droplet of water gets caught in a sandstorm, it will either connect with another droplet of water or a sand particle. Even if the temperature drops to a freezing point when the droplet of water and the sand particle are tossing and turning in the sandstorm, when the wind calms down and the temperature go back to ambient, the water droplet stays as water (two hydrogens and one oxygen molecule) and the sand particle stays as sand. In other words, the water drop or sand particle does not become salt or iron.

If we suppose the whirling (vortex) motion that manifest in a sandstorm to emphasize the scramble for wealth, status and power that newborns navigate their way through till death, we find that the mind evolves in a manner that continually swaps the initial conditions that is knowing for newer relations that are more complex than what the initial ones were. Put differently, each cohort believes what it thinks. For example, the present cohort adapts different style of habits (values, clothing, food, mode of transportations, mode of communications, etc.) than the one that the last generation used. Generally speaking, each generation wants nothing to do or let's say want little interaction with the values, clothing, food, mode of transportations, mode of communications, etc. of the past generation. This is very serious and worrisome.

If humans believe that their purpose is to explore to find new values, clothing, food, mode of transportations, mode of communications, etc. because the ones that our predecessors were using were not efficient or "clean" solutions, then this means that man could be letting the filtering of his own bias warp humanity (or reality) in a much more complex relationship than people are imagining.

For example, The Paris Agreement is a convention that the United Nations launched in 2015 to stabilize greenhouse gas concentrations "at a level that would prevent dangerous anthropogenic (human induced) interference with the climate system."¹⁶ There are two ways to produce net-zero emissions. One method is to go back to living as per the way our ancestors were doing it (i.e., using the human body as a mode of

¹⁶ https://becauseipcc.thesuccession.ca/what-is-the-paris-agreement-and-whats-the-science-behind-it/?gclid=EAlaIQobChMIpuWXuuCS8gIVngaICR3auQpIEAAYAiAAEgKlbPD_BwE

transport for example). The second method is to produce systems (tools, machineries) that drive down carbon emission to generate zero emissions.

It is great to read in the literature about the commitments that the rich nations in particular are making about being in favor of their societies cutting carbon emissions to zero by specific dates. However, this aspiration begs many questions. For one is how did the most powerful families/dynasties and the rich nations who are protecting them reach that they could be in favor of accelerating the transition of their societies to a net-zero emission while still being capable to continue to solidify their power at the same time, when throughout history the societies who managed to make others consider their opinion before taking actions of their own relied on complex chemical and physical transformations to exercise power.

In other words, if it was only when different societies accelerated (increased) their carbon emission did they manage to make the societies who were producing smaller footprints to consider their opinion before taking actions of their own; and now, the families/dynasties who control the rich nations want their societies to move away from relying on complex chemical and physical transformations to be in favor of relying on “clean” or natural based solutions to solidify their power when our ancestors already found that “clean” solutions do not increase their happiness as well as better equip them to deny each other rights, this then means that either the families/dynasties who control the rich nations do not know what they are trying to accomplish, or those families/dynasties who control those rich nations are counting on the power of certain conjectures that they believe could allow them to continue to solidify their power.

It is important to keep in mind that the technology that exists today is the result of very complex chemical and physical transformations, and the solution such outcomes generate has the potential to solidify the power, status and wealth of the victors of WW2 or rich nations much better than before. However, this gain is happening on the back of weakening human ingenuity. Mankind cooperate in the economic and political field to preserve the human life and not inanimate lives (computers, robots, tools). In other words, it is how humans become

courteous what mankind is seeking to improve, not how computers, robots, tools could be considerate or polite.

I have no way of knowing how the rich nations can prevent that their power does not get disintegrated or be absorbed by another growing power, if they continue to be in favor of computers, robots, tools become civilized more than real humans. However, what I do know is that there are two methods that people (societies) could use to solidify their power or transform the conditions and outcomes that matters to them. The first is the reliance on simple complex transformations and the other is reliance on sophisticated (difficult) complex transformations. For example, converting iron ore to become a knife is a simple complex transformation, whereas converting uranium to be a nuclear bomb is a very sophisticated or difficult complex transformation.

If understandably, carbon dioxide is a natural byproduct of any breakdown, and the rich nations are looking to accelerate the transition of people (societies) to a net-zero emission while still expecting that such transition would not have any bearing on their power or strength, this means that the rich nations must be counting on sophisticated (difficult) complex transformations which has the potential to emit smaller quantities of carbon while helping them to continue to solidify their power rather than on simple complex transformations doing it.

A prerequisite for any nation to be a superpower entail demonstrating significant progress in transportation or communications. If the rich nations want to achieve net-zero carbon dioxide or CO₂ emissions in those two sectors, but without the superiority that they have attained in either sector be compromised, this means that the rich nations are hoping that either the renewable resources and the product that these resources generate provide them the means from which they would be able to continue to solidify their power, or the technology that is employed do it.

We cannot say that the rich nations could be counting on the renewable resources and the product that these resources generate provide to continue to solidify their power, because those resources do not generate a very sophisticated or difficult complex transformation but simple complex transformations.

For example, there are only a few methods that the rich nations could rely on to generate the energy they need to power their transportation or communications sector. Those forms are either via solar energy, wind energy, geothermal pressure, hydrogen, biofuel, etc. The production of energy from those natural solutions does not generate very sophisticated or difficult complex transformation but simple complex transformations. In other words, ethanol is a biofuel that gets produced from sugar cane. The plantation and harvesting of sugar cane including the production of ethanol from sugar cane are not complex systems. Simply put, a person cannot threaten with sugar cane or ethanol (C_2H_5OH) others or use those two things to deny other rights. Sugar cane and ethanol do not explode or create the devastation that a nuclear weapon does.

Hence scaling up any natural based solutions that has the potential to reduce carbon emission does not produce very sophisticated or difficult complex transformation, which is necessary for any society (nation) who want to make others consider its opinion before taking action of their own, this means that the rich nations must be relying on the technology that is built in the equipment which generate net-zero emission provide them protection. To put it differently, the rich nations could be counting on their technological superiority (research and development, production and distribution) to provide them the protection. Simply put, the rich nations could be conjecturing that because they control the complex systems (i.e., nanotechnology, solid state processors, automation, computers, satellites, etc.) that makes airplanes, flying cars, flying bicycles, wind turbine, solar power, ethanol plants, etc. function, they could along with their stock of nuclear bombs, secure their continuous protection.

Indeed, the adoption of laws that gives anyone right to protect the moral and material interests that result from any scientific production has always helped the societies who are wealthy to invest money in research thus becoming able to forgo the security of others from right to fully develop their human personality. Likewise, the legitimization of laws that prevent a newborn who is born in the wrong family, society, or environment to freely fully develop his human personality, along with the legitimization of specific material of terrestrial origin such as gold

and silver on ground that such things possess greater values than others, or currencies for this matter did help the societies who legitimized such norms to increase their happiness more than others. Then again, ever since man started to deny other fellow men rights till 1945, we find that man was prioritizing his self-interests over the self-interests of others through relying on the human brain (human ingenuity) to maintain this superiority. As of 1945, the group of men who all nations and people dread and fear them (victors of WW2), and the rich nations who protect them stopped to rely on the human brain to maintain this superiority and began to rely on technology to help in the monitoring including delegating to such tools right to operate in certain ways under different conditions.

I have no way of knowing how the most powerful families/dynasties and the rich nations reached that letting technology be granted right to interfere in the social order and to take on their behalf (i.e., on behalf of human ingenuity) actions is a strategy that could allow them to continue to deny other rights and thus manage to transform the conditions and outcomes that matters to them.

To put it differently, ships are the oldest form of transport in history. While most ships today are often considered safe thanks to newer technology (instrumentation, sensors, radars, etc.), and not a whole lots of ships are sinking in bad weather as the case was like till the start of the 20th century, the only invention that man has come up with so far to avoid that old and modern ships do not sink when the ocean swells is simply to avoid navigating in rough seas or to outrun the storm (big waves).

If till today man (sailors) has not managed to understand what causes the wind and the sea to change and behave violently when up to minute weather forecasts or warnings tell a different story (that the opposite would be happening when seafaring), then it is highly likely that the most powerful families/dynasties and the rich nations could be entangling themselves in the same challenges that ships and sailors face today after man (sailors) stopped to rely on his human ingenuity to make this natural aptitude make this decision for him on when to steer into the storm and when to not do it, in favor of letting tool act in between or feed (influence) this decision making process.

Surely, not all the modern ships who get caught in storms sink and a large number sustain what a storm throws at them, however, this does not mean that the repeated crashing waves on the ship steel hull could not be weakening such vessel through something called fatigue stress or the molecular structure of the steel making it less strong over time.

I have no way of knowing if the repeated cycle of stress and strain that the social order is knowing since 1945 (i.e. wars, civil strife, violence, etc.) is weakening the power of the most powerful families and the rich nations in the same way steel fatigue or large waves makes ship break apart. The most powerful families/dynasties and the rich nations could be doing what ship builders are doing today building ships that have incredible thick steel hulls and strong internal support structures to increase the endurance limits. In other words, the most powerful families/dynasties and the rich nations that protect them could be relying on security webs that helps steer them away from troubles or makes it very difficult for anyone to threaten them.

Then again, oil platforms are floating ships that are usually built with incredible thick steel hulls (pontoons) and are equipped with the most modern technology that man has developed to keep such vessel (oil platform) stable, level and safe. In February 1982, the oil platform Ocean Ranger¹⁷ (regarded by the ODECO¹⁸ as the world's largest semi-submersible oil rig to date)¹⁹ sank with 84 crew members on board. There were no survivors. The cause of the sinking was not attributed to extreme harsh conditions at sea (i.e., winds or waves), but rather to a rogue wave that gushed some water into the control room through an open porthole. The salt water then caused a short circuit forcing the valves and pumps that operate the ballasts that keeps the oil platform stable and level opening and closing of their own accord.²⁰ In other words, the operator of the control room had no longer any control. The valves and pumps were switching themselves on and off on their own. Actually, the challenges that the operators of the oil platform Ocean Ranger had to surrender to are exactly what happens when soldiers rely

¹⁷ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ocean_Ranger

¹⁸ <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/ODECO>

¹⁹ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ocean_Ranger#History_and_design

²⁰ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ocean_Ranger#Sinking

on drones to carry out strikes against targets that soldiers genuinely believe is an eminent threat, but later the target end up being innocent civilians. The drone (tool with artificial intelligence) made the soldier (real intelligence) compel a confirmation bias or execution error.

It looks as if after the company that built the oil platform ocean ranger favored relying on instrumentation, sensors and computers to open and close the valves and pumps that let water into the ballast of the vessel, instead of relying on the human ingenuity solely to keep the platform float, stable and level, this choice was not the right one to prevent this vessel from sinking. Since the start of the 21st century, execution errors by soldiers who relies on drone to strike innocent targets is numerous.

Then again, throughout history the fittest dictated to the weakest rules. Nonetheless, it looks as if when the fittest delegates to tools and machinery (artificial intelligence) a segment of what he needs to be always doing to continue to solidify his power (i.e., margin of errors very small), he is unable to achieve this standard despite the fact that the power of artificial intelligence to detect threat over human intelligence is far greater. This is very serious and worrisome. This is because in a system (the world) that most of its rulers prioritize material things over the human worth, it is easy to replace the lost lives that execution errors of tools (drones) compel (not exactly for their families of course), but the cost to replace an oil platform is complex. This also means that the victors of WW2 and the rich nations are either oblivious about the danger of letting artificial intelligence play a role in the maintenance of their strength or stability, or they think that because they did not encounter a threat identical to the one the operators of the oil platform Ocean Ranger confronted, or the one that soldiers prompt when they kill civilians accidentally that they are immune.

I have no way of knowing if the most powerful families/dynasties and the rich nations are capable to steer events in such a way that can prevent unforeseen conditions from impacting on their strength and stability leading to their demise as the builder of the oil platform Ocean Ranger yielded to. In other words, the builders of the oil platform Ocean Ranger supposed that if they build the oil platform Ocean Ranger with incredible thick steel hulls and install laser sensors that measure stability and levelness including opening and closing valve automatically they

could prevent their assets from sinking. Regrettably, this was not the case when the odds stacked against them (i.e., wind, storm, wave, open porthole, short-circuit, etc.). This also goes to say that it is not totally true that some newer ideas that supersedes older ideas are better for the most powerful families/dynasties and the rich nations that protects them to continue to get their ways despite the resistance of others.

In other words, it is not totally true that when the most powerful families/dynasties and the rich nations who protect them control the systems that build and operate oil platforms, ships, airplanes, flying cars, flying bicycles, wind turbine, solar power, ethanol plants, satellites, space shuttle, etc. that such strategy could help them to steer the social order in a way that prevent their collapse. When the odds stack up against an individual, a business, a nation, a kingdom or an empire, the chances of surviving when all else fail is very slim.

To put it differently, the most powerful families/dynasties could be conjuring that the monetary order (and the stock exchange trading posts) which they legitimized at the end of WW2 (i.e., Bretton Woods system), and forced on all people and nations would never be threatened pursuant to the rich nations that protect them acquiring weapons of mass destruction to defend its legitimacy. Then again, when we compare between how Great Britain and the rest of the old powers controlled the monetary order before 1945, and how this affair began to be managed on the aftermath of WW2 by the victors of this global war, we find that instead of all this integration fortifying the wealth and power of the most powerful families including making it easier for people (nations) to prevent their financial and economic downturns, most nations are plunging into financial and economic bankruptcy one after the other similar to what happens in a domino effect. This is very serious and worrisome.

Said differently, the most powerful families/dynasties and the rich nations who protect them need to be organizing societies (nations) under an organized monetary order to secure financial stability between nations, but at the same time, to help them determine which nation they (the most powerful families/dynasties) need to engulf in a civil war to shrink its wealth and power, and which society (nation) they need to increase its wealth to get it to rival a nation that its wealth and power is

growing. Then again, the organization of societies (nations) under an organized monetary order does not aid the most powerful families/dynasties and the rich nations who protects them to maintain their strength and power intact but to the contrary weakens it. This is because when societies (nations) foster global monetary cooperation, this endeavor can easily prompt divisions or concessions which are outcomes that can weaken the power of the most powerful families/dynasties (money is the root of all evil). Therefore, since the most powerful families/dynasties do not only use the monetary order to govern monetary relations between societies (nations) but also use the data that this accounting system generate to ensure that their wealth, power and status does not fall back, this means that if many nations are starting to go bankrupt post 1945 as compared to before this date, then this development makes it very difficult for the most powerful families/dynasties to know if the crashes that societies (nations) are knowing is happening as a result of the targeted efforts that their record keeping exercise ensue, and on its premise determine if they slow down the wealth or power of a nation or not, or if inflation, unemployment, etc. are prompting these falls independent of the shortfalls that the most powerful families are provoking. This is very serious and worrisome.

Once again, I have no way of knowing which motive between the afore two could be unraveling the accelerated bankruptcy (financial crisis) that most nations are knowing post 1945. However, what I do know is that Great Britain (the largest empire until the start of WW2) and the rest of the old powers were keeping all the financial records of all the nations that they were administering before WW2 erupted in log books that its administration was done manually. In fact, there is hardly any reference in the literature to Great Britain (the largest empire until the start of WW2) stumbling on challenges to keep the societies that this empire was administering not go bankrupt as a good number started confronting after the victors of WW2 (i.e., the most powerful families/dynasties) decided to secure the maintenance of their strength and stability through economic and political integration instead of through by force as was done before WW2.

Furthermore, we cannot say that what propelled all this abnormal financial and economic downfall that nations began knowing as of 1945 is tangled in the decision of the most powerful families/dynasties and

the rich nations beginning to rely on sophisticated or complicated ways to monitor the financial and economic evolution of nations (i.e., through computers and algorithms) instead of continuing to do it as Great Britain and the rest of the old powers were doing it before WW2 erupted manually or simply. This is because accounting and bookkeeping rely on counting and humans started counting before man started to keep records. This signify that if the victors of WW2 (i.e., the most powerful families/dynasties) are not able to prevent nations from going bankrupt despite all the data that computers started to permit them to collect, then the most powerful families/dynasties could be confronting a much bigger problem to maintain their strength and stability intact.

To put it differently, if on all the problems that we do not know the answer in advance for them, or someone has not shown it to us in advance, all what we can do to get to understand how to approach such problems is to gather data; and if despite all the financial and economic data that computers and algorithm are generating for the most powerful families/dynasties and the rich nations to help them to continue to solidify their power, the powerful families/dynasties are not able to prevent the financial crash that nations are knowing, this then signify that the most powerful families/dynasties do not know how to predict or be ready for what is ahead. If the most powerful families/dynasties and the rich nations are not able to take all the financial and economic data that computers and algorithm are gathering to help them determine what could be prompting the bankruptcy of nations, this means that they cannot construct ideas that can explain what could be causing this breakdown. This is very serious and worrisome.

In other words, if the most powerful families/dynasties and the rich nations cannot construct or formulate solutions or remedies to prevent the financial and economic order of nations from crashing despite all the commercial and financial relations that they are monitoring, this means that the most powerful families/dynasties and the rich nations are doing it based on trajectories. Then again, if all the trajectories (patterns) that the most powerful families/dynasties and the rich nations are relying on to keep the financial and economic order of nations stable and not crash, their efforts are failing, then it is highly possible that the forces that could be acting on the monetary order to keep it dynamic are one that

oscillate in the same way objects that are not able to establish equilibrium (a pendulum).

A pendulum is “a weight suspended from a pivot so that it can swing freely. When a pendulum is displaced sideways from its resting, equilibrium position, it is subject to a restoring force due to gravity that will accelerate it back toward the equilibrium position. When released, the restoring force acting on the pendulum's mass causes it to oscillate about the equilibrium position, swinging back and forth.”²¹

For example, ships are free objects that continually swing back and forth due to the wind continually putting pressure on the ocean water (creating small or large waves). In other words, ships or oil platform are pendulum. The job of sailors is to ensure that when they are navigating ships between ports that such vessels stay stable or upright. To keep ships leveled in the water, ship builders build at the bottom of ships water compartments tanks, known as ballasts, which sailors fill up or empty depending on how much cargo the vessel is loading, or the dynamics of the swell (waves). The job of the ballasts tanks is to provide the necessary moment to resist the lateral forces on the hull thus preventing the ship from tipping or heeling excessively in high winds or waves.

If the thinkers and economists of the most powerful families/dynasties, and the rich nations are not able to maintain the monetary system stable (levelled), and not tipping and heeling, including crashing regularly, this means that one of two scenarios are prompting this chaotic formation. The first is that all the forecasting systems (theories) that economists are using to predict the financial and economic changes that people are effecting in the social order, are till today ineffective. The second is that this vulnerability is coming because of the most powerful families/dynasties and the rich nations are not taking in consideration John Maxwell²² (born 1947), American author and pastor, suggestion to avoid that the wrong person is in the right place. According to Maxwell

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

²² https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/John_C._Maxwell

when the wrong person is in the right place, one cannot avoid frustration and regression.²³

I have no way of knowing if what is prompting this intolerance that people around the world are manifesting in 1945 is because the theories that thinkers and economists are coming up with to help the most powerful families/dynasties and the rich nations solidify their power are erroneous, or if the decision of the most powerful families/dynasties and rich nations to place the wrong people in the right place as of 1945 is what has prompted this abnormal frustration that people are manifesting including regression in the degree of peace and security.

Indeed, the United States savored the effect of placing the wrong person in the right place in 2020. The USS Bonhomme Richard (LHD-6) was a Wasp-class amphibious assault ship of the United States Navy that was also capable to act as light aircraft carrier if needs be.²⁴ In 2020, the ship was engulfed in fire. After a long investigation into the cause of the fire, it was established that a sailor started the fire.²⁵

Once again, I have no way of knowing if the most powerful families/dynasties and the rich nations are doing the same mistake that the United States did when it placed the wrong person at the right place to protect its interests and maintain its strength and stability. In other words, I have no way of knowing if the most powerful families/dynasties and the rich nations are improving their wealth and power better after they switched from controlling the financial system of nations manually as was done till 1945, or if their decision to rely on sophisticated computer systems to doing it (i.e., using computers and trading posts like the stock exchange) has been more advantageous. Most importantly, I have no way of knowing if the decision of the most powerful families/dynasties and the rich nations to scrap the work program that the founding fathers of the UN suggested to them to maintain their strength and stability in favor of letting the intergovernmental organization named United Nations become an economic operator who is devoted to teaching people why everyone

²³<https://www.azquotes.com/quote/789320#:~:text=The%20Right%20Person%20in%20the,in%20the%20Right%20Places%20%3D%20Multiplication.>

²⁴ [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/USS_Bonhomme_Richard_\(LHD-6\)](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/USS_Bonhomme_Richard_(LHD-6))

²⁵ <https://www.bbc.com/news/world-us-canada-58091854>

should not be content with the speed at which governments are securing the goals set forth in the UN charter including working to end poverty and injustice along governments has helped them to improve peace and security better around the world, which is a prerequisite to enable them to maintain their strength and stability. The same can be said about the decision of the most powerful families/dynasties and the rich nations to allow that other individuals or families in different UN member states start to regard themselves just like them as the deputy of God role in those distinct territorial boundaries instead of being devoted to leading by example.

Surely, the number of wars that the world has known from 1945 to now tell a different story. The abnormal intolerance that people of all ages and sexes are exhibiting support that the rich nations are not arriving at being able to keep the world order stable in the same way sailors fail to this day to keep ships upright and stable. This is very serious and worrisome.

In other words, if man does not want to use the things that the natural world programmed to serve with them his best interests or the best interest of the natural world especially that mankind depends on this force for his survivability, but want that all the exploration that he makes with all the things that exist on the outside of his human body be used to serve his self-interest only, including how to deny others right to realize the full development of their personality from whatever new thing that gets created, this means that the complex relations that people's continuous exploration are producing could not be a process that simplify things, but rather complicates things more.

To put it differently, if nothing can come out of complex except more complex, this means that if the most powerful families/dynasties, and the rich nations continue to be in favor of letting complex systems secure the maintenance of their strength and stability (i.e., rely on complex electrification and automation processes over simple ones), they could be scaling up to rely on processes or transformations that would be solidifying their power further, but at the expense of their power and status being reverted to a simpler form at the same time. Simply put, if no matter what kind of improvement mankind made to avoid that created things do not go to waste, its outcome did not solidify

the power of the authorities that went along with throwing away the old to welcome the new, this means that if the most powerful families/dynasties, and the rich nations continue to be in favor of supporting policies or research work that aims to stop people from playing an essential role in the exploration that is required to sustain survival needs and to satiate earthly desire, they could be at the same time accelerating their demise. This is because mathematicians have managed to show that there are certain mathematical relations that it is not possible eventually to figure out for its solutions that its outcome would be all the time favorable. Examples of such mathematical relations is the Collatz Conjecture,²⁶ the Josephus Problem,²⁷ and even the kids game called snake.²⁸

It looks as if the decision of the most powerful families/dynasties to let human imagination use the human ingenuity to reengineer reality so tools (computers, satellites, etc.) continue to help them to transform the conditions and outcomes that matters to them is not solidifying their power. To the contrary, the resolve of the most powerful families/dynasties to let human imagination succeed at reengineering reality and the negative effect this aspiration has been having on keeping people content or tolerant illustrate what happens when perception collide with the real world. The exploration that human ingenuity has so far carried out on behalf of human imagination and the great practical results that this aptitude has managed to achieve so far in communication and transportation act as testimony of the potential of human ingenuity to translate ideas into products that can be forces for good or evil. At the same time, the transitioning of people into becoming governed 100% digitally, and the delegation to artificial intelligence and machines the role of sustaining the survival needs of people including what is required to satiate earthly desires appears to be returning mankind to live as per the way our ancestors were doing it.

Surely, when the companies (scientists) that the most powerful families/dynasties are supporting reach to make people rely on businesses or processes that does not generate any carbon emission or

²⁶ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Collatz_conjecture

²⁷ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Josephus_problem#:~:text=The%20problem%20is%20named%20after,committing%20suicide%20by%20drawing%20lots.

²⁸ [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Snake_\(video_game_genre\)](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Snake_(video_game_genre))

make the human body start to displace itself from one place to another using driverless airplanes, ships, cars, bicycles, etc. (i.e., without the need for man to rely on the legs in this process), the most powerful families/dynasties would have managed to transform something that was tedious and complex (i.e., walking or laborious) into something that would become simple and easy. Put differently, the most powerful families/dynasties would have figured out a way to stop people from continuing to rely on the basic method that the natural force that programmed man wanted the legs to serve in this displacement process of the human body so everyone adopt the new sophisticated method.

Fortunately, when the companies (scientists) that the most powerful families/dynasties are supporting reach to make the human body start to displace itself from one place to another using driverless airplanes, ships, cars, bicycles, etc., this accomplishment is not going to only show God (the natural force) that man is much clever than him, but is going to solve for God the only challenge that I believe he either left unsolved on purpose so mankind could do it, or he left it unsolved because he himself did not know how to solve it. This opportunity is the unwarranted need any more for mankind to worry about the threat that the division of labor has been prompting in keeping the world dynamic since the appearance of man on earth. Since the more the most powerful families/dynasties favor letting human imagination delegate to technology the role that the natural force programmed the human body to serve on earth on its behalf, the more this transformation would be resolving the complex system that God left unsolved for mankind (i.e., division of labor) thus sparing mankind from continuing to be fighting with one another to determine who would be telling the other to consider his opinion before taking actions of their own. This is because when robots and computers are going to be doing the lion share of the work that the natural force programmed the human body to serve on earth on its behalf all people would become equal. When basically automation makes the rich and the poor become equal, the most powerful families/dynasties would have unblocked a relational dilemma that man did not know that it would have been possible to resolve before the discovery of the computers (robots, sensors, etc.)

Then again, our successors are going to be fortunate living in a world that delegate to technology all the things that is needed to sustain their

survival needs and satiate their earthly desires (i.e., through just letting their fingers do the walking, through voice recognition software or other biometric data). However, there is one question that would always be begging an answer. Will the heir of the most powerful families/dynasties be ruling as their fathers are doing today, or would those heirs be absorbed by another growing power? In other words, would the people be truthful to the heirs of the most powerful families/dynasties when everyone would be in the future sitting watching television while robots are doing the lion share of the work, or would people would be rivaling those heir for their wealth, power and status? After all, it was the fathers of those heirs who approved all the explorations that brought the comfort that our successors would be knowing.

I have no way of knowing if the people who would be living in the future would be as truthful to the heirs of the most powerful families/dynasties in the same way people are doing it today. However, what I do know is that all computers, satellites, mobile phones, TVs, are made with some of the rarest materials on earth. If the most powerful families/dynasties do not quickly figure out a way to make the physical world produce those material of terrestrial origin, chances are that the same historical confusion, dynamic and disorder that emerged as of 1945 would go on.

Once again, I have no way of knowing if when our successors begin to produce ships or airplanes that are run on wind power and are made from fibre instead of steel (to reduce carbon emission during production as well), if the people who would be living in the future would be ready to be content, and not mind if they do not manage to fulfill the full development of their personality as all the cohorts who lived till today failed to accept to do. I do not know the answer to the afore conjecture. What I do know is that the answer to this afore conjecture will depend on the power of the heirs of the most powerful families/dynasties and the people who would be living in the future to be truthful to one another. This will also require that the sophisticated complex system (i.e., computers, machines, etc.) that the most powerful families/dynasties, and the rich nations would be depending on to solidify their power be truthful as well, so the case of sinking of the Ocean Range Oil platform does not repeat. The forces that controls all

people and all the manmade created things (i.e., nature or God), need to be doing the same equally (i.e., with less earthquake, floods, etc.).

I do not know if the sophisticated complex system (computers, machines, etc.) that the most powerful families/dynasties, and the rich nations constructed and are operating would be helping their heirs to solidify their power or be truthful to them as human ingenuity of man is capable of being. The same can be said about the forces that controls all people and all the manmade created things as well. Nonetheless, what I do know is that if the exploration that man is continuously making does not change the character of this living creature in the same way the things that exist on the outside of man's human body change when mankind does work on those things, and only trust continue to be the only power that is capable to change the behavior or attitude that would make man be voluntarily ready to surrender freedom, this means that the most powerful families/dynasties would need to pick up between two choices if they want to avoid that people's continuous explorations to produce complex systems does not revert them into a simpler form in the course of time and things. The first choice is to clean up or repair the shattered trust that people are having with the international rule based postwar world order pursuant to their decisions to let the rich nations exhibit double standards. The second choice is to reset the social order by increasing death via the intermediary of a new global war, or by a manmade pandemic.

I have no way of knowing if reliance on increasing death rates (pandemics, wars), would improve people's confidence in the international rule based postwar world order, while the rich nations are exhibiting double standards, the United Nations is being an economic operator, and the different families who control the different UN member states refuse to cooperate in accordance with the work program that the founding fathers of the UN proposed, thus having many people playing the deputy of God on earth (i.e., beside the one that the rich nations and the most powerful families/dynasties are already playing).

To the contrary, if the character (behavior or attitude) of people is a property that behaves in the same way that the transformations that humans are always carrying out in the physical world whereby the things that each generation create have little or no actual connection

with the creation that the previous generation carried out (i.e., each created things act as an initial condition for the new thing that would be created out of it), this means that the more the most powerful families/dynasties allow the rich nations, the United Nations, and the different families who control the different UN member states to play the deputy of God role and not the role that the founding fathers of the UN proposed for them and that was to lead by example, the more the most powerful families/dynasties would be letting mankind to set them up to face the same detrimental end that their predecessors dealt with. This was the reversal to a simpler form of the families/dynasties whose authorities had gotten weakened, and the absorption of the weakened authority by a stronger one.

In other words, if all the social contracts that our predecessors have come up with and legitimized to deny each other rights fell, because all the complex outcomes that people are producing is never the same but it is always different, the families/dynasties who control the international order or the money supply of the world presently cannot expect a different fate, because human nature has not changed. Simply put, if man does not know how to put his human ingenuity in a conquering mode against events or relations that are continuously being transformed into something new at all the time, because man was not programmed to forecast the future, and was only granted right to use the past to give his human ingenuity perspective of the present, this means that the most powerful families/dynasties have two choices to avoid that the complex transformations that governments are effecting from being their own detriment. The first is to continue to let governments continue to be devoted to installing cameras to monitor people in real time instead of being devoted to leading by example. In other words, wage on the power of such apparatuses (i.e., cameras) to achieve practical results for the greater well-being of society (i.e., improve peace and security), and deny with them (the cameras), at the same time, rights so other could fulfill the development of their own personality. Simply put, wage on increased snooping not diminishing people's trust with governments, which can prompt people to disobey. This is because when people's unpreparedness to obey rise, the power of the most powerful families/dynasties diminishes. The second choice is to go back to implementing the work program that the founding fathers of the UN proposed.

I do not know what the most powerful families/dynasties (i.e., the group of men who all nations and people dread and fear them), and the rich nations who protects them are programming ahead for them to get them to continue to get their way despite the resistance of others without the distrust of people catching up. What I do know is that when people take a tree and chop it down or slice it into becoming lumber, humans change what the natural world programmed trees to serve to protect its interests in order to create a new stuff out of it that would start to serve men's best interests instead. Next when people produce out of the chopped tree paper, which is another substance; then move next to produce, ash out of paper which is another substance altogether; but then turn around and throughout each transformation that they were making take the new thing that was created to deny with it rights (i.e., when the tree was converted to lumber man made knives out of the lumber to kill other people with, when the wood was converted into paper man used paper to easily set other people on fire, and when man created lumber, paper and ash they were making it much easier to endanger the planet); this means that if the most powerful families/dynasties or the rich want to use every created things to control people, and, at the same time, see to it that they deny with it rights, they would need to make sure that all the new complex systems that people are creating does not threatens them.

I have no way of knowing how the group of men who all nations and people dread and fear (the families/dynasties who won WW2), and the rich nations who protect them could prevent their collapse when the complex system that they are depending on to solidify their power is a system that they also depend on to develop the counter measure that they need to have in place so no harm or threat disintegrate them.

For example, when man invented the knife to use it as a tool to deny with it right and equally use it to achieve with it practical results for the greater well-being of society, man then moved to invent the shield to be protected from being stabbed or pierced. In other words, man invented the shield to prevent the person who wants to get his ways despite the resistance of others from getting his way, as well as to have the shield protect people from the wickedness of man. Likewise, when man invented bombs, he then moved to invent the body armor to obtain protection. Likewise, when man invented nuclear bombs, man built

protection bunkers to deflect the blast wave and block radiation. Presently, the most powerful families/dynasties or the rich nations, know how to protect themselves from those three afore complex systems (knife, bomb and nuclear bomb) that man produced. However, when we take those three threats, we could say that even though they all satisfy Newton's third law of action and reaction, in the case of the threat that a knife pose, its threat is confined. However, when the threat involves the usage of a bomb or a nuclear bomb, the threat is not one that stays confined to a localized effect, but rather it becomes widespread.

In other words, if the most powerful families/dynasties or the rich nations have not figured out a way to contain the distrust that grows in the heart and mind of people toward any issue so it resolves itself (i.e., stay local and not become widespread and all encompassing), we can say that if all the snooping that government are carrying out under the pretext that it is used to catch criminals and terrorists does not begin to shape outcomes in society, the economy, culture and politics that reduces discrimination and inequity, then it would not be possible for the powerful families/dynasties to avoid that the distrust that people would be knowing become a cultural sickness.

When distrust becomes a cultural sickness, we cannot say that its threat becomes a localized one (i.e., producing the threat that a knife stabbing generate), but it becomes as complex as the threat that a bomb or a nuclear bomb provoke (dispersing shrapnel or chemical aerosol). This means that the most powerful families/dynasties or the rich nations would stop to know how to not be threatened, because when a bomb or a nuclear bomb explode, it is not possible to predict who would be spared and who would be condemned.

However, what we do know is that when trust in governments fade and distrust become a cultural sickness, the most powerful families/dynasties or the rich nations who protect them would have allowed their reliance on technology to protect them engulf them in a much complex problem, then the case was like before WW2, when the snooping was done through reliance on human ingenuity. The decline in interpersonal trust that would be widespread, would be much complex to resolve as compared to the precursor way (initial trust). The

shrinking trust would be deepening suspicion, cynicism, and most importantly, preventing people from distinguishing fact from fiction. This is very serious and worrisome.

To put it differently, lack of knowledge produce fear. Fear also occurs when a person does not know from where to get knowledge to resolve the fear that the individual is perceiving or detecting. When a person faces his fear, he gets knowledge which helps afterward to overcome the fear in question. This is because when a person lives the fear, he can hear, see and feel what he or she is fearing.

When interpersonal trust fades and people stop to know how to distinguish fact from fiction, fear will grow. However, if the only way to determine the threat that any fear pose dictate that a person live the fear, hear the fear, see and feel what one is fearing to be able to really assess its threat (or to overcome it), this means that after the most powerful families/dynasties and the rich families delegated to technology, the United Nations and governments the task of assessing on their behalf threats, it is not possible for them (i.e., the most powerful families/dynasties and the rich families) to distinguish fact from fiction. This is because the knowledge that is feeding their decision making process is not being fed through their own senses but rather through the perception of others.

I have no way of knowing how the most powerful families/dynasties (i.e., the group of men who all nations and people dread and fear them), and the rich nations who protects them plan to resolve the struggles that people are having with truth, accuracy and accountability after they delegated to the intergovernmental organization named United Nations right to be teaching people why everyone need to embrace individualism instead of tolerance and collaboration. What I do know is that if the intergovernmental organization named United Nations continue to teach people selfishness, while at the same time is buying and selling as people are doing on the outside of the UN ground (i.e., prioritizing corruption and dishonesty), the social trust which act a societal bonding agent between people would continue to diminish. When civility and moral behavior decline, the complex social forces (patterns) that would be sweeping the social order would be amplifying confusions according

to two scenarios; Simple complex patterns or complicated complex patterns.

I do not know what type of “swamp” the most powerful families/dynasties and the rich nations would be cultivating if they continue to let the intergovernmental organization named United Nations be an economic operator who is devoted to denying people rights and outsourcing its services to the highest bidder to benefit its self-interest instead of serving the work program that the founding fathers of the UN counselled be practiced to avoid disregard and contempt plunging mankind in a new global war. What I do know is that “when paper is burned oxygen from the air combines with carbon and hydrogen in the paper turning some of it into carbon dioxide and water vapor, which waft away with carbon particulates in the smoke. This, not surprisingly, leaves the solid ash leftover lighter than the original paper. However, when we burn a common metal such as steel, copper, or aluminum and the oxygen from air actually sticks to the metal forming an oxide instead of producing heavy smoke, making the whole mass heavier.”²⁹

I have no way of knowing what type of complex social system between the afore two (i.e., the simple solid leftover ash, or the complex heavy mass) the intergovernmental organization named United Nations is fueling in the world after the most powerful families/dynasties and the rich nations decided to trade the work program that the founding fathers of the UN counselled them to be faithful to its principles to solidify their power and ensure lasting peace, in favor of making the intergovernmental organization named United Nations become an economic operator that buys and sells in the same way Jesus found merchants do it in the courtyard of the synagogues.

Then again, when Jesus visited the synagogues and saw how the chief priests and the Pharisees neglected the law—justice, mercy and faithfulness [Matthew 23:23] and converted this house of prayer into a den of robbers [Matthew 21:43] to serve their self-indulgence [Matthew 23:25] just as the intergovernmental organization named United Nations is doing presently, he warned the families/dynasties who were

²⁹ <https://indianapublicmedia.org/amomentofscience/burned-burnt-paper.php>

controlling the social order about how their power would be taken away from them, and given to a people who will produce its fruit. [Matthew 21:43]

I have no way of knowing if the wealth, power and status that the most powerful families/dynasties and the rich nations are enjoying would be taken away from them and given away to other people if they continue to allow the intergovernmental organization named United Nations to deny people rights and not practice what its administrators are preaching. It took few centuries between the time when Jesus was cautioning the families/dynasties who were controlling the social order about how their power would be taken away from them, and given to a people who will produce its fruit and the fall of the Roman Empire.

The families/dynasties who were controlling the Roman Empire knew nothing about when their power, status, wealth would be taken away from them just, as happened to King Belshazzar (the son of King Nebuchadnezzar). King Belshazzar knew nothing about the day and hour when he would be reverted to a simpler form.

Therefore, since the wealth, power and status of the most powerful families/dynasties and the rich nations would be taken away from them in the same way the wealth, power and status of the families/dynasties who were controlling the Roman Empire was taken away from those cohorts if they continue to be against leading by example or resetting the intergovernmental organization named United Nations as happened to the League of Nations to stop it from spreading false hopes, all what the powerful families/dynasties and rich nations could do is to keep watch of how betrayal and hate is evolving in the world, and hope that what happened to the families/dynasties who were controlling the Roman Empire or to King Belshazzar (son of King Nebuchadnezzar) does not happen to them.

I gave no way of knowing how the powerful families/dynasties and the rich nations could prevent that their wealth, power and status of the families/dynasties would not be taken away from them, when this abnormal rise in corruption, dishonesty, intolerance, wars, betrayal, deceit, etc., that emerged as of 1945 and swept the whole world by now serve as evidence to support that the love of most is growing cold.

If the excessive rise in intolerance that the international order is knowing can only be a sign in support of how interpersonal trust is fading and wickedness is rising, this means that the patterns that are emerging in the social order pursuant to the decision of the most powerful families/dynasties or the rich nations to deviate away from the work program that the founding fathers of the UN counseled them to remain faithful to its principles to continue to solidify their power in order to let the intergovernmental organization named United Nations and governments of UN member states act like them as deputy of God on earth cannot be representative of simple complex relations (i.e., simple solid leftover ash that gets produced when paper is burnt) but complicated complex patterns (i.e., complex heavy mass that remains when metals are burnt).

For example, the group of men who are controlling Russia after the collapse of the Soviet Union are less flexible and more dystopic than the ones who were controlling this country before the collapse of this bloc. The same can be said about the group of men who succeeded the ones who were controlling Egypt before the 2011 Egyptian revolution. Many commentators who follow the Egyptian politics claim that the regime that is presently in power is moving Egypt closer toward totalitarianism than strongman Hosni Mubarak did.³⁰ If nothing can come out of complex except more complex, then the bottleneck that the rich nations could be creating for the most powerful families/dynasties and the UN system may not be as simple as this group of men who all nations and people dread and fear them are perceiving.

In other words, it is possible for the rich nations to detect today how the military complex in Egypt is ignoring the constitution, amassing power, cracking down brutally on Islamists or anyone who questions the way this complex rules, because the members of this complex have not reached the shrewdness that the group of men who control the Russian or Chinese regime achieved. Can the most powerful families/dynasties or the rich nations manage to acquiesce or coerce the Egyptian government and other governments so as to make them continue to consider their opinions before taking actions of their own when success

³⁰ <https://foreignpolicy.com/2019/02/27/worse-than-mubarak/>

depend on the power to see the invisible, and man is a species that is programmed with power to mask true feeling?

I have no way of knowing if the decision of the United States to impose sanctions on Iran in response to the Iranian nuclear program and Iranian support for groups that are considered terrorist organizations such as Hezbollah, Hamas, Palestine Islamic Jihad, etc., by the US is wiser to prevent unintended consequences than letting the intergovernmental organization named United Nations be administered by people who make speeches that acclaim righteousness but when it comes to practicing what they are teaching, they discriminate and violate the fundamentals they are protecting just as thieves do. Most importantly, when the United States is allowing the intergovernmental organization named United Nations to victimize the people who refuse to prioritize their self-interest over the US ideas or the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, including using extraordinary rendition with its court system to cover, hypocrisy, wickedness, or greed. The same can be said about allowing that 192 UN member states pursue political aims that violates the work program stipulated in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights instead of ensuring that only righteous leaders who can lead by example and without the influence of lobbyists and moneyed interests provoking citizens to distrust their leaders and take matters into their own hand because of their struggle to know what is true or not when listening to them.

Simply put, I have no way of knowing if the decision of the United States to not place the Muslim brotherhood as a foreign terrorist organization because such labelling would make members operate clandestinely as compared to promoting their ideology openly which makes it easy to survey them versus letting 192 UN member states violate the Universal Declaration of Human Rights openly while everyone is keeping tribal values and beliefs veiled carry more consequences. If humans obey the general and permanent laws and codes that are published in books and journals the world would have been peaceful as of a long time ago. Likewise, if humans do not backstab, crisscross, etc. the British Empire would have been still in power to this day.

Indeed, this laissez-faire attitude that all UN member states are exhibiting post 1945 (including the United States as a nation) would not be taking place if the most powerful families/dynasties (victors of WW2) did not grant right to the rich nations to promote civil liberties and freedom as stipulated in the UN charter, while letting UN member states openly violate the obligations contained in the UN Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (for the exception of the United States).

It is important to note that the United States (nation and global policemen of the world) is being included among the nations who are relying on laissez-faire attitude as of 1945, because this country is violating the UN Charter when seeking to improve morality.

If this laissez-faire attitude that UN member states are adopting could be helping the most powerful families/dynasties (victors of WW2) or the rich nations to solidify their power post 1945, people from around the world would not be today asking themselves if indeed the standing constitutional monarchies that are still standing and operating in western Europe while mankind is working to strengthen equal rights is solely a symbol of national unity (i.e., members retain a non-party political role) as the government of those nations argues, or if those structures are part of a concept that lets someone else sit in the driver seat while they are doing all the navigation. There is no need to cite the complex systems (patterns) that the rich nations prompted in the world after they decided to let monarchs who hold supreme autocratic authority rule in the middle east post 1945 for obvious reasons, or pursuant to the discovery of oil in this region, or while those rich nations were at the same time preaching to dispense with dynastic authority. When Adam Smith³¹ (1723 -1790), Scottish economist and philosopher who is also known as the “Father of Economics and the “Father of Capitalism,” suggested that the less the government is involved in the economy, the better off business will be, and by extension, society as a whole, he was not counselling the British Crown to make sure that the Monarch does not interfere in business affairs in the island of Great Britain and then anywhere else where Great Britain had interests to install governments (or UN offices) who shall interfere and deny citizens right. Likewise, in

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

the countries that Great Britain had little interests, allow that those societies rely on supply of capital to secure their economic health or power.

When Adam Smith prepared his magnum opus the *Wealth of Nations*,³² electricity was not invented yet. Great Britain was bringing to the island of Great Britain all the raw materials back so everything could be processed and manufactured in this island (mercantilism). Therefore, when Adam Smith said that competition constitutes a "natural order," and that there is no need for business and industrial affairs to be complicated by government intervention for as long as the British government was controlling trading post, he could not have known that one hundred and fifty years later after his death that the future rulers of Great Britain were going to be granting to all the societies (territories) that this monarch was administering independence (i.e., on the aftermath of WW2 in 1945), and man was going to invent robots so those new guests that mankind invited compete against them.

To put it differently, when Adam Smith proposed to the British Government to control the trading post and not interfere in the economy except to preserve property, life, and individual freedom; he was not suggesting to the government that it should stop with being the one who places restraints on the economy (imports and exports) so every merchant in Great Britain start doing it. Nor was he saying to let automation resolve the problem of the division of labor.

Simply put, when Smith proposed to the British government to lessen its control of the economy, he was expecting that the government would be building institutional frameworks that would be steering humans toward productive pursuits that are intended to benefit the common good and not the well-being of specific individuals only.

In other words, Smith was most probably expecting that when Great Britain would enter the war during WW1 to kick the Ottoman Empire out of the middle east so mankind begin to recover the oil that was found in the Arabian Peninsula that there would not be an international cartel made up of large international financial institutions who would be

³² https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/The_Wealth_of_Nations

determining the price of oil on the international market afterwards, and another cartel at the national level who would be determining the type of right that a person who lives in the Arabian Peninsula can have. Smith counselled that the group of men who would be doing business lead by example, just as the founding fathers of the UN proposed that all hatred and warfare that occurred till 1945 be overcome by integration and tolerance.

Surely, the peace and security in the GCC countries³³ would have been much better today if Great Britain had kept the GCC countries under domination on the aftermath of WW2, and did not grant them independence in 1945. To put it differently, if in theory, it is British companies who built and operated all the petrochemical plants in the middle east, who are determining the price of oil on the international market, and who are the one who are not promoting free and fair competition in those countries, because if this was the case, those countries would have not been autocratic to this day (meaning they are an extension of Great Britain), this means that Great Britain is doing everything that Adam Smith said Great Britain should not be doing if it does not want that its wealth to shrink.

To put differently, when nations go to war, and bring all their tanks, rifles, airplanes, ammunitions, they do not leave them in the hands of the people who helped them to win the war when the war is over, or in the hands of the people who they used their territory to stage their war operations, but bring them (the weapons) back with them to where they came from. This strategy does not split their wealth or power.

Then again, it looks as if Great Britain's ongoing efforts to protect what is left of its power and wealth stopped to be as effective post 1945, or as the case was like for this kingdom before WW2 erupted. It looks as if the decision of Great Britain to deviate away as of 1945 from what one of its most famous thinkers (i.e., Smith) suggested in the 18th century to not be doing so the wealth of this kingdom does not shrink is compounding since this 1945 date. Likewise, it looks as if the decision of Great Britain to deviate away as of 1945 from what some of its most famous thinkers during WW2 such as Winston Churchill³⁴ (1874 –

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

³⁴ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Winston_Churchill

1965), British politician, and philosopher, and Jan Smuts³⁵ (1870 – 1950), South African politician and philosopher, suggested to not be doing so the power or status of this kingdom shrink is also compounding since this 1945 date.

I do not know how this “long standing” kingdom (i.e., Great Britain) can avoid that its power does not continue to shrink after its leaders decided to turn their back on what their great thinkers suggested to not be doing so betray and hate does not continue to rise in the world, or after this kingdom managed to obtain during WW2 the readiness of all the people to rely on political and economic integration to ensure lasting peace instead of on hatred and warfare.

Then again, the challenge the group of men who control this kingdom (i.e., Great Britain) are confronting this time is not resolvable in the same tenacity that their predecessors applied or used before ww2 to dissipate threat thus enabling them to continue to get their ways despite the resistance of others. To put it differently, the challenges that are confronting the most powerful families/dynasties are not any different than the ones Daniel interpreted to King Nebuchadnezzar his dream with. In the book of Daniel, Daniel interpret to King Nebuchadnezzar his dream, which was on what would happen on earth after his death.

Daniel told King Nebuchadnezzar that after his death another kingdom will arise, inferior to his in interpersonal trust will arise but not in power. Next, a third kingdom, one of bronze, will rule over the whole earth, but which will display the same criteria (i.e., lesser interpersonal trust than the previous kingdom, but with much greater power). Finally, there will be a fourth kingdom, strong as iron—for iron breaks and smashes everything—and as iron breaks things to pieces, so it will crush and break all the others. In other words, in this kingdom, the interpersonal trust will be at the lowest, but its power would be the mightiest. Daniel also told King Nebuchadnezzar that all those four kingdoms would be interconnected to each other in the same way stand a human statue. The head of the statue was made of pure gold (the fourth kingdom), its chest and arms of silver (the third kingdom), its belly and thighs of bronze (the second kingdom), its legs of iron, its feet partly of iron and partly

³⁵ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Jan_Smuts

of baked clay (the first kingdom or king Nebuchadnezzar kingdom). Actually, Daniel did not stop at prophesizing to King Nebuchadnezzar the three kingdoms that would emerge and rule the world after his death, but also told him what would be happening in the end of times. Daniel said that a rock would be cut out, but not by human hands. It would strike the statue on its feet of iron and clay and smashes the whole statue. Then the iron, the clay, the bronze, the silver and the gold were all broken to pieces and became like chaff on a threshing floor in the summer.

I do not know if the four kingdoms that Daniel was referring to were people's kingdoms or if he was referring to four things that each one will have its power reign over the other until the rock that was cut out, but not by human hands, would strike this statue and convert the whole thing (i.e., the statue) into a chaff.

However, if we take the description that Daniel gave to King Nebuchadnezzar about what the feet of this statue would be made of, partly of baked clay and partly of iron, we can say that the human mind can be said to depict this kingdom. The human mind has always behaved like a divided kingdom. Most people can be partly strong and partly brittle. Also since antiquity, humans refuse to be united just as iron and clay are incapable to do it.

Likewise, it is possible to say that the fourth kingdom can be said to refer man's discovery of the computers or automation starting from the second half of the 20th century. It is impossible for man or any machinery to outperform the power of automation.

I do not know what those second and third kingdoms that Daniel mentioned could be referring to exactly. Let us just consider them to be two stages within mankind's own human development. Let the second kingdom refer to the invention of the knife, spoon, wheel, etc. (i.e., the Bronze kingdom). Let the third kingdom to refer to the invention of the wash machine, gas engine, airplane, nuclear bomb, etc. (i.e., the silver kingdom).

If we take anyone of those four tools (i.e., human ingenuity, knife or wheel, gas engine or airplane, and computer or automation) that human

imagination has been relying on since antiquity to get its ways, we find that the reliance of human imagination on any one of those four tools has never helped it till now to transform the conditions and outcomes that matters to it indefinitely.

For example, when the British monarch decided to have all the refineries and the petrochemical plants that would be servicing the world from oil be built in the GCC countries instead of in the island of Great Britain so the wealth of this realm only grows; and granted right (i.e., Great Britain) to different autocratic governments to exercise authority in those newly formed countries that Great Britain partitioned after WW2 but without placing oversight on rulers to respect the international rules based postwar order that this country (Great Britain) was promoting, this strategy did not show any evidence so far that when a group of men (the rulers of those autocratic nations) are allowed to pursue their self-interests over tools and machines that are part of the silver kingdom that they would be ready afterwards to protect the weakest in society. To the contrary, the more laissez-faire Great Britain is letting the rulers of those autocratic nations enjoy (i.e., the oil producing nations), the more the poverty and economic imbalances is growing in those GCC countries. As a consequence, before the end of the 20th century, we had two societies who considered themselves the deputy of God on earth. The people of Great Britain and the people who live in the GCC countries.

In like manner, instead of Great Britain securing that all the nations that it chose to install in them the factories that produce computers, telephones, etc. (i.e., the tools and machines that are part of the gold kingdom) so everyone in those societies promote free and fair competition, the group of men who are ruling those autocratic nations are not showing evidence that after they were allowed to pursue their self-interests over tools and machines that are part of the gold kingdom that they are beginning to protect the weakest in society. To the contrary, the more laissez-faire Great Britain is letting them enjoy, the more the poverty and economic imbalances is growing in those technology based countries. As a consequence, we now have as of the start of the 21st century more than half of the different societies that exists around the world who consider themselves the deputy of God on earth. The people of Great Britain and the people who live in the GCC countries, Europe, the United States, and most of east Asia.

If we analyze how the scramble of people for power, wealth and status is evolving in recent years, we find that only few countries have not been fully contaminated or engulfed in this on-going race to reengineer the physical world. In other words, there are presently only few people who do not have solutions on how the natural and legal rights should be distributed on earth.

I have no way of knowing how the social order would transform when the majority of the world population would abandon their old ways of doing things (i.e., traditions and values) in favor of adopting modernized values that increase loneliness, and which makes people embrace excessive individualism. However, what I do know is that after Great Britain and other old powers in western Europe started moving away from reliance on oil in order to embrace strategies that reduces their carbon footprint and increase their digital influence, this strategy does not seem to be frightening nations. For example, the GCC countries who are going to be the most affected by this switch to green energy, because their wealth is derived from oil revenue, and in the last 100 years they spent all their wealth in modernization instead of on learning in how to be farmers, they do not seem to be concerned about Great Britain managing, for example, in the future to turn all their computers and machines silent just with the flip of a switch, thus bringing them back to live as the majority were doing in tents and mud houses until the start of the middle of the 20th century.

If the people who are living in the GCC countries are not frightened about the prospect of co-existing in a world that very soon Great Britain and other countries could become capable to dominate them with by the flip of a switch and no longer with the help of guns or cannons, then they must be relying on something that is much powerful then the new weapons that this rich country is planning on starting to threatening them with to enable it to continue to solidify its power.

I do not know what that weapon that the GCC countries are counting on confronting Great Britain with might be to prevent this kingdom from continuing to expecting them to consider its opinion before taking actions of their own knowing that they do not possess nuclear bomb and when Great Britain finishes with interconnecting the world digitally, it

is going to be capable to turn the screen of all their computers dark (i.e., transportation and communication) with the flip of a switch. I can only think of one weapon especially that Great Britain did not transfer any military technology to any GCC country or even any technical assistance for this matter (i.e., all the critical equipment that were used in the oil refinery installations were fabricated in Europe and elsewhere). This weapon is awareness and knowledge.

I do not know if this rock that Daniel told King Nebuchadnezzar was cut out, but not by human hands, who would be striking the statue on its feet of iron and clay to smash it is the awareness and knowledge that the rich nations delegated the intergovernmental organization named United Nations as of 1945 to make all people start to prioritize and to depend on to increase their happiness. However, what I do know is that if the most powerful families and the rich nations do not take firm steps to update their economic model, or return the UN to fulfill the role that the founding fathers of this organization programmed for it, including making all the governments in the UN member states start to lead by example, this rock is going to continue to grow until it strikes the most powerful families /dynasties and take away from them their power and give it to new people. This is because the human mind is a property that has always behaved like a divided kingdom. Furthermore, the greater the ability to reason and make choices, the more this property seem to be using the idea of good or evil to increase its happiness. If the more a person knows, the more human choices become motivated by the desire for happiness, this means that the more the rich nations delegate to technology the role the human body was programmed to sustain survival needs and earthly desires, the more the bottleneck that this strategy would be provoking would be making the social order dynamic. The longer the social order stays dynamic, the more the chances of the rich nations to be engulfed in a global war rise. If the rich nations become engulfed in a new global war, no one can predict how this new war would develop given that more than one nation possess nuclear bombs presently.

It looks as if the decision of the most powerful families/dynasties (victors of WW2) to let the rich nations let autocratic rulers govern in the different UN member states and to operate without regulation or corrective measures that would tend them in due time to begin to

cooperate in accordance with the principles stipulated in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights to be victimizing the most powerful families/dynasties including the rich nations much more than weakening those rulers and political who are serving them in those different UN member states.

I have no way of knowing if God is punishing the most powerful families/dynasties or the rich nations because they decided to turn their back on the work program that the founding fathers of the UN proposed in order to let the intergovernmental organization named United Nations who has no respect for neither God nor man to solidify their power. It looks as if the historical dynamic that has accompanied man since antiquity is a result of those who have plenty wanting more and so losing all they have for trying. Not to mention, when man rely on the support of a servant who is wicked and corrupt as the intergovernmental organization named United Nations has been conducting so far or pursuant to becoming an economic operator, then man cannot expect nothing that would be different than what awaited Adam and his wife after they listened to a snake.

Indeed, man has not stopped from trying to be the measure of all things throughout history. However, living in a world that is constantly, on its own, changing, and while humans are also undergoing the same transformation because themselves are part of the natural world has not made it easy so far. Surely, humans can continue to change things (i.e., material of terrestrial origin) to make them stop to look as per the way the natural system (God) programmed them to be looking like, or functioning like, including altering the way they were created as they actually are. But there would be a price of course. The Prophet Muhammad delivered a final sermon before his death. In this last sermon, the Prophet Muhammad (saws) said:

“By Allah, it is not poverty I fear for you, but I fear that the *dunyā*³⁶ (the world and its earthly concerns and possessions) will be presented to you, as it was presented to those before you, so you would compete for it just

³⁶ <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Dunya>

as they competed for it, and then it will destroy as it destroyed them.”^{37,38}

The prophet Muhammad (saws) then said: “O People, God, God is in prayer; God, God is in prayer.” (meaning make sure to not stop praying or acting in accordance with the teaching of the Quran).

Indeed, the fear that Muhammad manifested before his death remain with us to this day. It looks as if the most powerful families/dynasties and the rich nations are doing exactly what the followers of Muhammad started doing after his death. In other words, his followers did not take his counsel seriously, and started doing the opposite of what he suggested, leading to the state of despair that Islam exist in today.

Once again, I have no way of knowing if the most powerful families/dynasties and the rich nations would not be as misfortunate as the followers of Muhammad and manage to avoid becoming reverted to a simpler form as Islam (or Christianity) is on its way to becoming if the people who claim to adhere to this faith continue to use this religion to preoccupy themselves with the *dunyā* (increase their wealth) instead of the *al-ākhirah* (the afterlife). Then again, maybe there is a lesson for the most powerful families/dynasties and the rich nations from the misfortune that Islam (or Christianity) is knowing so the most powerful families/dynasties and the rich nations avoid happening to them as well.

Then again, I do not know how the most powerful families/dynasties and the rich nations can avoid becoming reverted to a simpler form in the course of time and things if they continue to be in favor of preoccupying themselves with the *dunyā* instead of preoccupying themselves with being faithful to what the founding fathers of the UN counselled them to obey, which is not any different than the one Muhammad, and before him Jesus, Moses, Confucius, Buddha, etc., also suggested.

Indeed, there must be a reason why every phenomenon that exist around man was made to follow a cycle and does not try to change what it was programmed to do, function, or serve. In other words, if we take the

³⁷ <https://twitter.com/MustafaThePoet/status/1113942825731862529>

³⁸ <https://dorar.net/fake-hadith?page=31>

water cycle, we find that water stays faithful to its course (condensation, precipitation, infiltration, runoff, and evapotranspiration). Simply put after the water droplet in the air condenses to become clouds, the clouds do not start to wander off, and attempt to go to another planet or to convert themselves into becoming earth, or plastic, or paper, etc. The clouds stay clouds, and the only transformation they change to is converting themselves from being clouds to being precipitation (rain).

If human imagination continues to be doing as this aptitude has been doing since antiquity pushing human ingenuity to create transformations that stops material of terrestrial origin from continuing to be doing what the natural world created such things to serve, and most importantly, entangling mankind in finding true happiness through only some of the rarest materials on earth (i.e., computers, mobile phones, space shuttles, etc.), this means that mankind would not be able to stop the historical dynamic that this specific specie has been knowing since antiquity.

May be the most powerful families/dynasties and the rich nations suppose that if they continue to be in favor of letting human imagination introduce changes into things to make something new out of them, and then take the new thing that human ingenuity made to produce something totally new out of it again, that such evolution could eventually lead to figuring out a way so man can live forever, and in this way they could rule over the world forever. I have no way of knowing if the idea of reengineering the physical world or competing with the natural world (God) is a smarter strategy to maintain their strength and stability as compared to focusing on learning how to build floatable cities here on earth instead of relocating people to another planet to resolve the shortage of social space (that is if they continue to be in favor of allowing that living and dead people can freeze social space and accumulate material things on a cumulative basis).

Yet again, if the most powerful families/dynasties continue to be in favor of wanting that technical progress does not go to waste, or let it (the technical progress) wait until they fix first the complex social order that the existing created things have already imperiled, then there seems to be only two scenarios ahead of them that they can depend on to regulate all the intolerance and disruptions that people are prompting to increase their happiness (i.e., if they want to remain in favor of letting

human imagination use human ingenuity to explore ways to outsmart the natural world - God).

The first choice is to increase death rates to stop all the back and forth jerking from continuing to destabilize their strength and stability. The second choice is to let the United States take the lead in transitioning mankind to implement the working program that the founding fathers of the UN programmed. This is because the United States is the only country that has experience in the idea of freedom. This also will entail resizing the United Nations so this international intergovernmental organization go back to fulfilling the role that the founding fathers of the UN programmed for this global council. Most importantly, ensuring that all government start to lead by example and not to act as the deputy of God on earth (i.e., exempt from obeying the rules).

Indeed, the option of increasing death rates including making people continuously live in a state of paranoia, as Andrew Grove, suggested is required for a company to be successful may not be a bad idea to make people develop friendly attitude toward one another. Throughout history, man seem to develop compassion in misery. However, if as I said that the mind works in the same way the created things that man produce works (i.e., they move from one complex state to another state that is more complex, and so forth), this means that opting for the option of increasing death rates is a solution that would complicate the social order even more.

For example, the state of paranoia that the people who subscribe to the Jewish faith live since 1945, is a good example to support how a society can become successful when it becomes tough and protect its members. The Jews managed in a matter of 70 years of turning themselves from being among the societies that was the most oppressed to being the most successful and rich. Then again, if pain gets rid of complacency. Complacency breed pain; this signify that the Jews are building for destruction if they continue to be unprepared to obey the principles stipulated in the Universal Declaration. In other words, if the Jews continue to be unprepared to be integrated, they would be building to relive or repeat the same history that their ancestors lived.

It looks as if the only safe way forward for the most powerful families/dynasties to avoid that their heirs be reverted to a simpler form after they permitted the rich nations granted right to the intergovernmental organization United Nations in the second half of the 20th century to be an economic operator so the Jews, the Muslims, the Christians, the Indians, the Chinese, etc. etc. stop being able to see eye to eye seventy years later, is to choose between what Muhammad, Jesus, Moses, Confucius, Buddha, etc. chose to do to live forever as compared to what their followers picked. For example, Muhammad said, on his death bed, that “he was a servant that God left him the free choice of picking between what this life has to offer and what he (God) offered, and he chose what God offered.”³⁹

Indeed, the offer of the founding fathers of the UN to the most powerful families/dynasties so their heirs do not encounter the same fate that the heirs of their predecessors dealt with will require that they prioritize between two values. The first one is the values that Muhammad, Jesus, Moses, Confucius, Buddha, and many others were teaching. The second one is the values that their predecessors picked.

I do not know which values between those afore two could solidify the power of the most powerful families/dynasties more, especially that one appears to be simple and the other is complex.

For example, Jesus said that with faith a person “can say to this mountain, ‘Go, throw yourself into the sea,’ and it will be done. If you believe, you will receive whatever you ask for in prayer.” [Matthew 21:21-22]

Once again, I do not know if the search for rare material or complex transformation can solidify the power of the most powerful families/dynasties. What I do know is that God complex (or narcissistic personality disorder) is “an unshakable belief characterized by consistently inflated feelings of personal ability, privilege, or infallibility. A person with a God complex may refuse to admit the possibility of their error or failure, even in the face of irrefutable evidence, intractable problems or difficult or impossible tasks. The

³⁹ <https://dorar.net/hadith/sharh/6518>

person is also highly dogmatic in their views, meaning the person speaks of their personal opinions as though they were unquestionably correct. Someone with a god complex may exhibit no regard for the conventions and demands of society and may request special consideration or privileges.”⁴⁰

I have no way of knowing if the most powerful families/dynasties are suffering from a God complex or a superiority complex.⁴¹ But it looks as if they are setting themselves up to face the same end that their predecessors faced if they continue to underestimate the power of the human brain. I will check to find out if this could be the case in the upcoming sections.

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

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

25

The mind and Newton's 2nd Law of Motion

The mind is a servant of misery and a servant of good deeds. The families/dynasties who won WW2 (the most powerful families/dynasties) could be considering that allowing the idea of peace (good) be serviced by the power of the mind (reason) could be a safe way to continue to get their way despite the resistance of others. Then again, it was not confirmed yet, to this date, if the mind builds for peace or destruction, or if the good or bad habits that newborns find existing people are trading with and are trying to preserve were programmed independent of the construct of the mind. If everything is not happening by accident, and the most powerful families/dynasties are assessing good and evil in an asymmetric manner, they could be confusing probability with logical processes, and therefore, taking decisions that involve lots of risk taking. In other words, enlisting good and evil, which are two ideas (values) that build but using two totally opposing approaches, may not be a strategy that could be helping the most powerful families/dynasties to get their way despite the resistance of others but to weaken it.

Simply put, governance cannot be administered in the same way a tug of war game is played. The pitting of people into teams on the basis of natural (color, sex, etc.) or manmade distinction (religion, nationality, etc.), and then having each team pull at opposite ends of a rope until one drags the other over a central line (i.e., strive to keep or obtain the same thing) is a probability based strategy and there is no logical framework whatsoever built into it to justify that it could help the most powerful families/dynasties or the rich nations who are protecting them at the long

run. This is because the people who are wrapping their hands around the values (the rope) that they want to pull toward their end are a variable (specie) whose nature is constantly changing, and therefore it is not possible for any team to win.

Said differently, people do not use the idea of government to benefit the truth but rather to benefit their self-interest. The idea of government is simply a means towards an end. Therefore, since the political system is being fed by the mind, and the preoccupation of the mind is with how to use this violence wielding apparatus (i.e., the government) to control violence for its own benefit and not necessarily the truth, this means that for as long as knowledge and devotion feed awareness and those two parameters are also the criteria which every person depend on to increase his happiness, then it is not possible to avoid that bias and lack of fairness to be the driving force in all political matter if competing agendas are what is at play or what motivates actions and reaction.

Actually, the decision of the most powerful families/dynasties and the rich nations who protect them to let the idea of good be about how to gain more on the aftermath of WW2, instead of how to strive to teach and educate newborns and existing people on how to implement progressive measures to secure the human development standards that the founding fathers of the UN laid out for them in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, has compelled a landscape that does not seem to be any different than the one that exists in standup combat sports. For example, boxing, kick boxing or martial arts, etc. are combat sports in which two people, usually wearing protective gloves (or without), throw punches and kicks at each other for a predetermined amount of time in a boxing ring. In other words, instead of two people who are rivaling each other sorting off their differences haphazardly, they agree to be doing it using a codified system.

I do not know if the political environment that emerged post 1945, illustrate the same practice that is used in stand-up combat sports. However, it appears as if all what changed in the world from before and post 1945 is that instead of societies continuing to ruthlessly overcoming hatred and rivalry through uncoded system of combats or warfare, the resolve of large and small societies to combine efforts to promote social progress facilitated a better codified system for the rich

societies to unleash their hatred and rivalry against poor societies instead of helping all people, rich and poor, to stop living in fear and want. Societies came together on the aftermath of WW2 to cooperate in the economic field (international security) to create a unified centralized democracy, and not to contend for power through relying on a better codified system to control violence for their own benefit (i.e., direct violence at everyone else).

Then again, irrespective of whether the most powerful families/dynasties and the rich nations who protect them are letting the idea of good become a contest game that rewards those who claim that they value their neighbor more than the self (i.e., politician, and judicial and law enforcement officers) with a better chance to widen their propensity instead of the truth, what such strategy has in common with combat sport is that they both produce the same outcome. In other words, combat sports are about punching and kicking, and this type of contact can “knock a person unconscious or even causing a concussion which can result in permanent brain damage, because there is no clear division between the force required to knock a person out and the force likely to kill a person.”⁴² Likewise, violence and wars produce physical destruction, but can equally result in death just as happens to athletes in combat sport.

I have no way of knowing if the decision of the most powerful families/dynasties to let the idea of good be a contest game that any person who wants to increase his propensity could use to get his way despite the resistance of others, but this culture carries lots of risks and can have overwhelming consequences. This is because if the political system that emerged post 1945, illustrates the same mindset that takes place in stand-up combat sports, then it is highly possible that the most powerful families/dynasties be reverted to a simple form in the course of time and things, because no athlete in combat sport has remained undefeated to date.

To put it differently, if the most powerful families/dynasties continue to let the rich and poor nations come up with new codified political and economic systems to punch and kick each other exactly as athletes who

⁴² https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Boxing#Health_concerns

fight in hand to hand combat sport do, it is highly possible that the perspectives and conceptions that governments are taking to turn them into victories may not produce the outcomes anticipated. This is because in hand to hand combat sport just as in the fight to determine which nation manages to let others consider its opinion before taking action of their own, outcomes are not just influenced by physical skill (military might), but also by mental skill. If till today no athlete in any type of sport managed to remain undefeated, this means that the most powerful families/dynasties and the rich nations who protect them, cannot guarantee that they could be continuing to transform the conditions and outcomes that matters to them forever. In other words, if no nation, kingdom, or empire managed to plan for every contingency to avoid its collapse, then it is very difficult to imagine how the most powerful families/dynasties and the rich nations who protect them can avoid becoming reverted to a simpler form and a new growing power would absorb them, if their eyes are firmly fixed on how to gain more instead of on how to implement progressive measures to secure the human development standards that the founding fathers of the UN laid out for them in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, to spare them from being defeated.

Humans do make decisions that depend on mere chance or based on predictions driven from previous experiences, but there are decisions that have a high ratio of probability with a higher likelihood towards odds that their outcome does not produce the favorable expectations that one usually plans for. If the most powerful families/dynasties and the rich nations who protect them believe that it is not necessary to strive to teach and educate newborns and existing people on how to implement progressive measures to secure the human development standards that the founding fathers of the UN laid out for them in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, this then means that one of two scenarios could be prompting this apathy toward letting the wider conflict between democracy and authoritarianism remain unresolved. The first is if the most powerful families/dynasties and the rich nations who protect them developed state of the art political and economic potential (in terms of manpower and technology) that can allow them to act quickly on direct threat including preventing that the power of rivaling nations grow and absorb them. The second is if the most powerful families/dynasties are taking a chance.

I do not know if the investments that the most powerful families/dynasties and the rich nations who protect them are making on operations and tools that allows them to act quickly on direct threat, instead of striving to win the wider conflict between democracy and authoritarianism as the founding fathers of the UN suggested, can prevent the political and economic power of rivaling nations from growing and absorbing them in the course of time and things. However, what I do know is that in boxing or any combat sport, a weight class “is a measurement weight range for boxers.”⁴³ The organizers of boxing events have a culture that require that a boxer fight within a fixed weight class. In addition, the trend for professional boxers is to move up to a higher class as they age (or gain weight).

If the global governance system is composed of nations that are divided according to weight (power) class similar to the one adopted in boxing sport, this means that all nations must be establishing relations not any different from the one that exist in the sport or boxing or as boxers do.

Currently, there are 17 weight classes in boxing.⁴⁴ Humans cannot naturally change their height or weight beyond a certain limit, and therefore the different weight classes allow boxers of all sizes and weight to compete in the best class category that fits their own condition.⁴⁵ Boxers gain money by fighting within respective weight class. Those boxers who are capable to change their weight can train and fight under a different (higher or lower) weight class. The heavyweight division is the best paid in professional boxing.⁴⁶

If the different weight class that boxers rival under illustrate the way nations are divided and are perhaps rivaling each other, then we can say

⁴³ [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Weight_class_\(boxing\)](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Weight_class_(boxing))

⁴⁴ <https://www.dazn.com/en-US/news/boxing/how-many-weight-classes-are-there-in-boxing-every-division-from-heavyweight-to-minimumweight-explained/1uscbt1epyohz11vek31ddrdsi>

⁴⁵ <https://www.dazn.com/en-US/news/boxing/how-many-weight-classes-are-there-in-boxing-every-division-from-heavyweight-to-minimumweight-explained/1uscbt1epyohz11vek31ddrdsi>

⁴⁶ <https://www.quora.com/What-are-the-most-well-paid-popular-weight-classes-in-boxing-Can-light-heavyweight-be-considered-popular>

that the same preoccupations that boxers are preoccupied to gain more illustrate what nations are also similarly preoccupied with.

All what boxers (or any athlete in any sport) care about during their career is to maintain their record on manmade scorecards (dashboards) unchanged, including how to increase their weight class (power) to advance to fight in a better paying division. Most importantly, boxers are interested in how to increase their wealth and improve their status.

If the most powerful families/dynasties want the political and economic environment between nations to be just as per the way boxers increase their wealth and status (through punching each other), this means that the rich nations who are protecting them must be devoted to preventing that the awareness of the poor nations grow above and beyond its actual status so as to prevent that the added knowledge entice those who would start to perceive that they deserve right to better standards of living challenging them. To put it differently, this means that the most powerful families/dynasties and the rich nations who protect them need to be devoted to using the codified governance system that they want all nations to legitimize or establish relations on its premise to deny with it right instead of to increase bonding.

I do not know if the most powerful families/dynasties and the rich nations who protect them can use the wisdom that exists in constitutions to deny with it rights instead of increasing bonding. Simply put, if the most powerful families and the rich nations can deny the North Korean, Iranians, and others right to develop nuclear weapons while their own stock is always on the rise. Likewise, if the most powerful families/dynasties and the rich nations can deny the Venezuelan, the Lebanese and others right to print money, while their printing presses are issuing any stock that they need. What I do know is that if the most powerful families/dynasties and the rich nations who protect them want to continue to get their ways despite the resistance of others, they would need to beat an invisible and weightless property (not physical). This property is the mind (human imagination and human ingenuity).

In other words, if the most powerful families/dynasties continue to be against governments relying on the power of constitutions to separate and distribute powers, it is not the physical body of the people who

would be rivaling them is what they need to knock out (as boxers do) to win and stay in power, but it is the human imagination and human ingenuity.

Put differently, in the sport of boxing it is possible to separate and distribute athlete into weight class and to have them punch and kick each other. What gets kicked and punched in combat sport is the physical body and not the human mind (behavior). What has been preventing since antiquity any authority to acquiesce people to obey the legitimized political order is not the human body but the human mind. Since the appearance of man till now, no force managed to triumph over the human mind (human imagination and human ingenuity) except the truth.

If no athlete was never undefeated and no authority who violated the constitution (norms) that it was preaching managed to prevent its collapse, can the most powerful families/dynasties and the rich nations that protect them prevent people (societies) from reverting them to a simpler form, if since 1945 they (the most powerful families/dynasties and the rich nations) remain against that mankind separate and distribute power in accordance with the principles set forth in the work program stipulated in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and wants nations to rival each other and maintain score cards as it is done in all sports?

I have no way of knowing what the most powerful families/dynasties and the rich nations that protect them are trying to accomplish by letting the political systems in most UN member states as of 1945 be flawed when it was already demonstrated that technology and automation are not a better vehicle for improving civility than the idea of government. However, what I do know is that in the sport of boxing many times a skilled boxer of a lighter weight can beat a heavy weight boxer. And so, if the most powerful families/dynasties and the rich nations that protect them believe that by letting nations have many agendas besides the agenda that is stipulated in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, this then means that it is possible for a small nation who does not project power on a global scale to beat a great power.

To put it differently, in boxing, the heavy weight fighters are the most well paid or popular among all boxing weight classes, because they are the one who possesses the most punching power. Then again, the sport of boxing is called “the Sweet Science,” because it is a sport that requires the pugilist combine “logic and science to be able to create an environment where it is all possible.”⁴⁷

If to harness for a powerful punch a boxer must be tough, forward thinking, tactical and taking into account precise scientific calculations to ensure that the fist that he is throwing possesses the most punching power, then if the most powerful families/dynasties and the rich nations that protect them want to avoid that no nation who does not project power on a global scale beat them and revert them to a simpler form, then they must exemplify “The Sweet Science” essence that is employed in the sport of boxing.

To put it differently, when measuring punching power, the mass plays a huge role in force. But in purely scientific terms, Newton’s Second Law of Motion, state that force is the product of mass and acceleration.⁴⁸ This means that mass is only half of the equation.

Simply put, if the most powerful families/dynasties and the rich nations that protect them do not want that a nation who does not project power on a global scale beat them and revert them to a simpler form, the size of their relative economic and military power is not enough to prevent them from being defeated, because it is only half of the equation when measuring punching power. To be invincible, the most powerful families/dynasties and the rich nations that protect them need to bring also speed to curb the ambitions, greed, and arrogance of the society (nations) who do not project power on a global scale.

To put it differently, inertia is the tendency of an object (nation) to resist changes in its state of motion (Newton’s first law)⁴⁹. The greater the

⁴⁷ <https://www.theboxingplanet.com/why-is-boxing-called-the-sweet-science/>

⁴⁸ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Newton%27s_laws_of_motion

⁴⁹ <https://courses.lumenlearning.com/physics/chapter/4-2-newtons-first-law-of-motion->

[inertia/#:~:text=Newton's%20first%20law%20of%20motion%20states%20that%20a%20body%20at,rest%20or%20remain%20in%20motion.](#)

mass (the nation), the greater the inertia. In other words, the bigger the bureaucracy of a nation (including area and population), the harder it is to change its policies, norms, ambitions, methods, processes, etc. Newton's Second Law tells us that when we have a net force applied on an object, then we are going to have a net acceleration going in that same direction, and that the force applied would be proportional to that of acceleration. Hence heavier objects (larger nations) will require the application of greater force (bureaucracy) in order to achieve the same acceleration as lighter objects (smaller nations), this mean that a nation who possesses twice the relative economic and military power of another nation, would not be solidifying its power better by interfering in the political status of a weaker nation, if the weaker nation is capable to show twice as fast that the political exploitation and imposition that the nation with greater power is purporting is not intended to strengthen righteousness and justice but to further the ends of despotism or anarchy.

I do not know how the most powerful families/dynasties and the rich nations that protect them plan to come up with the speed required to curb the cruel greed and arrogance of the mind when this aptitude is weightless, invisible and has the potential to exhibit double standards. Put differently, if the energy that travels in all the technological tools that the rich nations are using to snoop on people, and which travels at the speed of light, i.e., 299,792,458 m/s, all failed so far to help the rich nations to get their ways despite the resistance of others, could the most powerful families/dynasties protect their wealth and status when compromise breaks down and governments stops to be a vehicle to create truth but an apparatus to deny people right.

Once again, I do not know how the most powerful families/dynasties and the rich nations who are protecting them plan to use technology to make the mind surrender freedom to them when it is not possible to use anymore the idea of manifest destiny⁵⁰ to justify their civilization mission, nor they can rely on heathen as a motive to purport the need to exploit societies that are not modernized. In other words, I do not know how the rich nations plan to make general predictions about the future behavior of people (nations) when there is nothing sweet about watching

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

people use the idea of good to deny each other rights in the same way boxers throw at each other punches, and the more people's awareness rise, the more the added knowledge would be pushing people to make the policy debate about how to strengthen bias under the pretext of seeking the truth. Therefore, since for as long as the most powerful families/dynasties permit UN member states to relate contrary to what the principles set forth in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights stipulate, the harder it would be getting for the most powerful families/dynasties or the rich nations who are protecting them to determine the difference between people stated intention and actual behavior, then we can say that the longer the most powerful families/dynasties and the rich nations who are protecting them continue to be against using the idea of government as a vehicle to create truth, the more the inflated feelings of personal ability, privilege, or infallibility of people would be growing. Furthermore, the more people refuse to admit the possibility of their error or failure, even in the face of irrefutable evidence, the more the intractable problems, difficult and impossible tasks that people would be trying to resolve would be getting.

To give an example, the cold war was a period of geopolitical tension between the Soviet Union and the United States.⁵¹ This period is generally considered to span the 1947 Truman doctrine to the 1991 dissolution of the Soviet Union. Up until the dissolution of the Soviet Union, China was not regarded as a potential super power. Experts claim that China commenced a series of reforms that radically changed this country starting from 1975.⁵² Presently, China is regarded as a superpower.⁵³ If the rest of the UN member states continue to introduce reforms similar to the ones that China introduced, they could start to become more independent in the course of time and things. Presently, the relations between the United States and China is reaching a stalemate if the two countries continue to blame each other for their own structural problems. Could the most powerful families/dynasties or the rich nations manage to protect their interests if trust diminishes, the number of people (societies) who are becoming dogmatic is growing,

⁵¹ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Cold_War

⁵² <https://fas.org/nuke/guide/china/doctrine/0046.htm>

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

relationship is becoming fraught, distrust is masking cooperation, and every one consider the other his enemy?

The word “entice” is defined as an action that leads a person astray from one's true course.⁵⁴ If the most powerful families/dynasties continue to allow UN member states to close in on themselves, or seek to become independent, the aspirations of mankind to create a unified, centralized democracy will begin to die out. When nations stop to determine their future together, the unpredictable risks that such tactic encumber could subject mankind to indeterminable disastrous consequences.

In other words, all the nations who determined in 1945 to unite together to create the United Nations were all living in fear. If nations do not consider it essential to fight together to create a unified, centralized democracy, this means that all nations would be beginning to legitimize their own codified systems to justify how it is much better to create stability or justice than the international rule based postwar world order that all nations in 1945 affirmed faith in its potentials to create conditions of stability and well-beings. When nations start to teach citizens that their best interests are best served by keeping the affairs of other countries at a distance (i.e., isolationism), mankind could relive the same events that occurred in Europe during the 16th, 17th and early 18th centuries, which were known as the European wars of religion. The European wars of religion disrupted the religious and political order in the catholic countries of Europe.⁵⁵

Some historians have suggested that the revolts, ambitions, and Great Power Conflicts⁵⁶ that ensued during those wars served as a “creation myth” for the modern nation-state.^{57,58} If the most powerful families/dynasties want that the aspirations of UN member states to create a unified, centralized democracy fade away, and the doctrine of a

⁵⁴ <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/entice#other-words>

⁵⁵ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/European_wars_of_religion

⁵⁶ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/European_balance_of_power

⁵⁷ John Hearsey McMillan Salmon. "The Wars of Religion". Encyclopædia Britannica. Encyclopædia Britannica, Inc.

⁵⁸ Cavanaugh, William. *The Myth of Religious Violence*. Oxford University Press, 2009, pp. 142-180.

worldwide balance of power that all people have been fighting since 1945 to protect be replaced by a balance of power that each nation would independently establish as was the case before WW1 or WW2, this then means that the idea of nation-state as a congruent political unit would have to be scrapped.

Then again, if the UN member states begin to scramble to contend for power by forming alliances as was the case throughout the modern age, the question that would beg an answer, would be to know if the most powerful families/dynasties and their principal policemen the United States would be able to continue to maintain their strength and stability or if they would be reverted to a simpler form.

To put it differently, the European wars of religion posed a religious and political challenge to the Catholic Church, and in particular the papal authority, as a consequence of what was perceived to be errors, abuses and discrepancies by the Catholic Church. The European wars of religion prompted the reformation of the Catholic Church up to its split into Protestantism and what is now the Roman Catholic Church. If UN member states want to scrap the idea of creating a unified centralized democracy in favor of establishing a balance of power that UN member states would establish either independently or by band-wagoning as the western European powers were doing before 1945, it would be important to investigate if the most powerful families/dynasties and their principal policemen the United States would be able to continue to maintain their strength and stability, or if they would be reverted to a simpler form in the same way the Catholic church or the Papal authority yielded to or contended with.

It is important that readers keep in mind that during the European wars of religion, the societies who were challenging the errors, abuses and discrepancies of the Catholic Church or the higher nobility, were groups who felt that the laws that were being introduced were constantly declining their welfare and harming them financially. Those societies who were challenging the Holy Roman Empire did not possess any military technology or tactics, but their bravery came from legitimizing locally among each other that the meddling of religion in the social and political culture was constantly harming them. Presently, the reverse is going to happen. In other words, if the aspirations of UN member states

to create a unified, centralized democracy fade away, and nations continue to favor establishing balance of power either independently or through forming alliances, the nation who would manage to show that its natural and legal rights are aligned with religious guidelines would be the one who would be able to gain the most power. This is because it is the decline in religiosity (morality) what prompt the constant decline in peace and security.

To put it differently, if UN member states continue to be against creating a unified centralized democracy, then emotional slogans would no longer be enough to legitimize legal or natural rights (national and foreign policies). Accordingly, it would be important for the most powerful families/dynasties and their global policemen, the United States, to pick between having to lead by example, or to rely on predicting threats in order to prevent them or to mitigate them.

I have no way of knowing if the Holy Roman Empire or the British Empire lacked the right thinkers or planners to prevent their collapse. In other words, I have no way of knowing if the British Empire failed to maintain its hegemony, because its leaders failed to put pressure on the societies who this empire was administering (dominating) leading to WW1 or WW2, or if this collapse occurred because the societies that the British Empire was dominating recognized that the laws that this Empire was legitimizing was not increasing their welfare or righteousness in the world, but increasing the growing power of the people who were determining and enforcing the laws only. Simply put, the laws that the British Empire was enacting but without leading by example, bought the rulers of this empire time only instead of political legitimacy.

Said differently, the United States, Great Britain and the rest of their western European allies managed at the start of the 21st century to gather the support of all the nations to topple the political system in Afghanistan under the pretext that the hardline Islamist group that was ruling this country, the Taliban, was harboring a terrorist, Osama bin Laden, the mastermind of the September 11, 2001 attacks, a safe haven. The political system has not improved in Afghanistan as of 2020. The Taliban, are possessing more local legitimacy in 2020 in Afghanistan

than before the date the United States and its allies invaded this country.⁵⁹

I do not know if the United States, Great Britain and the rest of their western European allies consider that because they prevented al-Qaeda and its leader, Osama bin Laden (the terrorist who the United States and its allies overturned the Taliban government over to catch) from waging another terrorist attack in the United States in the last 20 years that such accomplishment has uplifted them and ensured that their natural security interests are implemented. Indeed, maintaining special operations or a security network around the world is one way to predict threats and to prevent them, but if this strategy is enough for every contingency, the Holy Roman Empire would have not collapsed, nor the British Empire or the Soviet Union. Therefore, hence the shift away from continuing to create a unified centralized democracy, could not be a course that could be helping the most powerful families/dynasties or the United States to continue to strengthen their power but to weaken it, because the failure of the work program that is stipulated in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights represent an opportunity to justify that the codified systems that nations would be on their own legitimizing would be more appropriate to advance righteousness (morality), this means that the more nations become independent and devoted to secure their best national interests instead of a unified interests, the more errors, abuses and discrepancies would grow. Furthermore, the more errors, abuses and discrepancies between nations grows, the more the chaos that this course would be creating would be arousing desire among nations to find out who would be the first to make the weaker consider the opinion of the strongest before taking actions of their own. The more nations become entangled in determining who merit be respected first, the more humans would be converting the world into a sport game just as it is done in boxing, but with the destruction not being limited to the two people who are fighting against one another to determine who would knock the other down first, but dragging along the entire human progress. This begs many questions.

⁵⁹ https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=sEtYN70okug&ab_channel=TheEconomist

The United States, Great Britain, and their allies toppled Saddam Hussein because those nations were fixed on the direct threats that Saddam Hussein was posing on their strength and stability instead of on being fixed on finding a common ground that would allow them to create a unified centralized democracy with him. The special security operations that the United States, Great Britain, and their allies developed succeeded at infiltrating into the Iraqi military forces to create an insurgency leading to the toppling of Saddam Hussein without a big resistance. However, humans are not like animals (dogs, horses, lions, etc.) capable to form a bond with new masters. When the money (or promises) that the United States, Great Britain, and their allies paid to the Iraqi soldiers (to the military general) to desert stopped coming to them (ran out), the same Iraqi soldiers who sold their country out, sold the United States, Great Britain, and their allies out in the same way. The United States, Great Britain, and their allies have a much bigger problem in their own hands to maintain their strength and stability today than the one Saddam Hussein posed before he was removed from power.

Could the security operations that the United States, Great Britain, and their allies developed manage to protect their wealth and status against the evil inclination that reside in the heart of man, if the servants (informants) who they need to depend on their loyalty (disloyalty) to continue to transform the outcomes and conditions that matters to them (prevent threats) are not making the world become safer for them, but rather making the world appear as if mankind is engulfed in a “forever war?” I will check to find out the likelihood in the upcoming sections.

26

The Character Assassination of the United States

Humans are normally enticed to do good by promise of added gain, and to do wrong by promise of the same outcome: pleasure or gain. Humans use lure to arouse a person astray from one's true course. For instance, during the cold war, the United States was promoting that communism represent core values that are devious, and the Soviet Union was promoting the same perception about capitalism. Most people would be easily inclined to support (in their mind) that communism is a better dogma than capitalism, because outcomes get to be distributed equally under communism instead of being filtered from the top down. However, the idea of communism collapsed in 1991 due to the avarice of man (political repression, restrictions of human rights, etc.).⁶⁰ In contrast, capitalism (or liberal interventionism) denies people right to equal outcomes, which makes people resort to wars to narrow the gap between the rich and the poor. The avarice of man is also the principal cause for the failure of the liberal interventionism (capitalism) philosophy to promote social justice. The exploitation of the poor and the encouragement of expansion and wars are regarded as some limitations which contribute to hampering the success of the liberal interventionism (capitalism) philosophy.⁶¹

Nonetheless, hence there are no other philosophies that man could use besides communism (the sharing of outcomes on equal rights) and

⁶⁰https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Criticism_of_communist_party_rule#:~:text=The%20actions%20by%20governments%20of,and%20cultural%20and%20artistic%20censorship.

⁶¹ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Criticism_of_capitalism

capitalism (the tricking of outcomes from the top down) to develop the necessary understanding of oneself to be able afterwards to build democratic institutions, people have been divided on the pros and cons of each idea to promote social justice since the appearance of man. In my case, I strongly believe that living under the shadow of capitalism is far better than living under the shadow of a communist regime. This is because in the former (capitalism) the soul is free, while in the latter (communism), a person cannot let his freewill legitimize his relationship with his natural right. Furthermore, a person is coerced into curtailing his aspirations involuntarily under the theory of communism. In fact, I also believe that there is no difference between the limitations that the idea of communism embroils to contain freedom or the idea of monarchy. Those two political systems (communism and monarchy) are two forms of authoritarianism (totalitarianism) that are the number one enemy to the idea of capitalism (liberal interventionism). The nations who stand to lose the most if the idea of freedom succeed in spreading democracy and the rule of law (i.e., the authoritarian regimes and monarchial regimes both constitutional or absolute), should also be the one who desire the least that the idea of capital or liberal interventionism succeed.

Then again, one would have expected that the peace and security situation in the world would have improved pursuant to the collapse of communism (i.e., end of the cold war). Unfortunately, the elimination of the communism idea did not improve peace and security in the world, but rather have made things become worse and more complex.

Surely, before the collapse of communism (i.e., the collapse of the Soviet Union), it was not possible to detect if it was the leaders of the Soviet Union who were against the invitation of the United States to use the liberal idea as a means of spreading democracy and the rule of law, or if this repulsion was a desire that all the people who lived in this bloc wished. Pursuant to the collapse of the Soviet Union (i.e., the collapse of communism), a new political reality seems to have unfolded in the world. All the UN member states (including the United States) appear to be indifferent about using the idea of capitalism (liberal interventionism) as a conduit to spread democracy or the rule of law.

Once again, it is not possible to know if this widespread intolerance that emerged in the world post the collapse of the Soviet Union is a phenomenon that the regimes who stand to lose the most if the idea of liberal interventionism be used as a means to promote democracy are fueling, or if this intolerance is being manifested precisely because people are not cooperating based on the principles stipulated in the work program that is laid out by the founding fathers of the UN in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Nonetheless, one thing is for sure. All members of the human family (the descendants of the people who were dominated before 1945 and were freed on the aftermath of WW2, and the ones who were already free before WW2 erupted) are not exercising tolerance so the idea of capitalism (liberal interventionism) that the founding fathers of the UN suggested be used as a path to create social democracy⁶² to succeed.

Evidently, the unpreparedness of all members of the human family to be patient so the social democracy polity (which is a philosophy that promote social justice within the framework of liberal-democratic polity and a capitalist oriented mixed economy) that the founding fathers of the UN (or the United States) invited everyone to use as a conduit to enable that in the course of time and things every individual would enjoy the freedom that the American people benefited from during the first half of the 20th century, signify that mankind is in front of two scenarios in as far as how the future could unfold. Mankind could continue to try to stabilize peace and security using the idea of liberal interventionism as a conduit (i.e., democracy). Alternatively, mankind could go back to relying on authoritarianism as a tool.

It is important to note that in theory the ideals that are in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights are not any different from the American ideals, ideals that are in communism, the ideals that are in the different religions, etc., Accordingly, when I said in the above paragraph that the founding fathers of the UN (or the United States) invited everyone to use the framework of liberal-democratic polity and a capitalist oriented mixed economy as a conduit to improve peace and stability, this suggestion refers to the use of the American ideals, hence those ideals managed to show that they can be a force for good from 1776 to 1945

⁶² https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Social_democracy

as compared to other ideals that were in use during this period in the history of the world.

It is also important to recall that the founding fathers of the UN (or the United States) did not propose that the different governments which would be enforcing the work program that was stipulated in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, consider themselves exempt from the appeal of obeying said work program. In other words, the founding fathers of the UN (or the United States) did not propose that the different governments which would be enforcing the work program that was stipulated in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, appoint themselves as the deputy of God on earth, and that their role would become to lead citizens into the promised land as Moses was tasked by God with doing according to the Bible.

The founding fathers of the UN (or the United States) proposed that the idea of government be used post WW2 as a ladder to create equality and egalitarianism. The founding fathers of the UN (or the United States) did not propose that the idea of political and economic democracy be used by governments post 1945 as a cover to create social hierarchy but as a mean to create social equality. Likewise, the United States did not propose that military regimes start to seize power under the pretext of being a “neutral” party to rescue their nation from the threat of dangerous ideologies. In other words, it would be anti-logic to suppose that the founding fathers of the UN (or the United States) proposed that all the people who were free before WW2 erupted or the ones who were dominated and were freed on the aftermath of WW2 start to advocate post 1945 economic and social interventions intended to promote social justice within a liberal democratic polity (or a capitalist oriented mixed economy framework) but without anyone being ready to observe the rule of law.

I do not know if the world would be more peaceful when the political environment would be divided between a faction who uses the idea of constitutional (or absolute) monarchy to portray itself as a neutral or non-partisan actor but while deepening social hierarchy as compared to living poor and free, or another faction who is doing the same but under the titular of military ruling to rescue people from the threat of

dangerous ideologies. What I do know is that the aspirations of man to be free has been a never ending goal. That is also to say that if our successors happen to regard freedom as we do, a sacred goal, or as our predecessors did, it would be necessary that those future heirs be ready to be tolerant and be ready to cooperate based on the principle of equality of opportunity even if fair rules lead to unequal outcomes, which is different than using fair rules to drive unequal outcomes. This will also require that the most powerful families/dynasties who control the international order or the money supply of the world pick (the victors of WW2) between continuing with allowing that the understanding that individuals in position of executive power gain of themselves translate into dividends that add more wickedness in the social order as they have been doing since 1945, or take the advice of the founding fathers of the UN (the United States) and to cooperate on the basis of the principles stipulated in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights to ensure lasting peace.

Hence the only fruit that individuals in position of executive power would reap when they use their added awareness to prioritize politics that add wickedness in the social order rather than social democracy (social justice) is nothing but outcomes that incorporate added emphasis by people on extreme nationalism, nativist or religious ideologies, including authoritarian tendencies, this signify that when such bias ideas rise, people self-fulfillment would stop to be possible.

Likewise, when people's hopes and ambitions (self-actualization) become restricted, the capacity of humans to carry to fruition one's deepest desires or one's worthiest capacities shrinks. Then again, mankind does not know if the self-fulfillment desires or aspirations that people manifest are simply beliefs that the mind comes up with or if they are programmed construct.

I have no way of knowing how the individuals in position of executive power could ensure that the self-fulfillment of people get in the way of their own expectations and/or in the way of the expectations of the force that programmed man.

For example, when our predecessors refused pursuant to WW1 to observe the work program that was stated in the covenants of the League

of Nations to maintain world peace, it was not possible for them to avoid that the Thucydides Trap⁶³ drag them into a new global war. The unpreparedness of those predecessors to accept to collectively work together to create a unified centralized democracy or settle their disputes through negotiation and arbitration, entangled them in a new global war that generated extreme violence, aggression, destruction and mortality that was worse than the one experienced during WW1.

If the rich nations continue to be against leading by example (thus giving the poor nations a reason to be unprepared to obey the international rule based postwar world order that was laid out at the end of WW2), it would not be possible to continue to build political and economic democracy, or use the principle of equal rights as a tool to cooperate and strengthen civil liberties. It is highly likely that Fascism and Nazism type ideologies which was common pre 1945 emerge and become the alternative option to protect against any encroaching threat. Furthermore, since it is not possible to make people cooperate without the existence of an authority that determine and enforce laws, this means that the more people cooperate based on ultranationalist or racist homophobic views, the more the stresses that would be ensuing would be forcing nations to dissipate threats in the same way the Athenian or the Spartans were resolving their own conflicts in antiquity (i.e., 431 - 404 BC), or the Western European societies were doing it more than two thousand year later (1914 – 1945).

The most powerful families/dynasties (the victors of WW2) can continue to be in favor of letting the UN member states extend this tradition of unrest, suppression or wars that our forefathers have relied on throughout history to divide and rule, including making people deprive each other from civil liberties or social justice. In other words, the most powerful families/dynasties could continue to be in favor of letting the rich nations use the idea of government as an apparatus to control violence for their own benefit instead of implementing the work program that the founding fathers of the UN counselled them to be faithful to its principles to continue to get their ways despite the resistance of others. Evidently, the course of the planets will not be altered if our successors continue this tradition of refusing to settle

⁶³ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Thucydides_Trap

dispute through negotiation and arbitration and engulf the world in a new global war to create a new balance or a new political or economic reset. Albert Einstein once said “I know not with what weapons World War III will be fought, but World War IV will be fought with sticks and stones.”⁶⁴ The worst case scenario if a new world war erupts is that mankind return to fighting with sticks and stones. This signifies that all what those who would be rivaling each other for power in the future need to be doing to avoid becoming reverted to a simpler form (or engulf the world in a new world war) is just to predict direct threat and hope that they are right about succeeding before they take action. In other words, all what those who would be rivaling each other for power and relying on oppression, violence, force assimilation, ethnic cleansing, or other asymmetric measures need to be doing to prevent that their wealth or status be stripped from them is to practice preventive wars and preemptive strikes.

Then again, the preventive wars and preemptive strikes that the United States, Great Britain and allies waged at the start of the 21st century against the threat of Saddam Hussein’s program of weapons of mass destruction in Iraq, or the Taliban in Afghanistan, have supported so far that preventive wars and preemptive strikes work only under certain conditions. This is very serious and worrisome.

In other words, if the more the rich nations remain against having the UN member states build a unified centralized democracy, the more the nations who are not powerful or protected by a powerful nation (such as Iraq or Afghanistan) have no choice but to compete (put up a fight) if they want to remain independent or against a powerful nation telling them what to do, this means that the usage of preventive wars and preemptive strikes to acquiesce any society carry large risks. The United States (with its web of allies) succeeded in defeating the Iraqi and the Afghani conventional forces, including occupying both countries, but the United States would have to pay a heavy price (lots of concessions) if it wants that those two countries become an ally in the near future.

⁶⁴ <https://www.goodreads.com/quotes/14977-i-know-not-with-what-weapons-world-war-iii-will>

If preventive wars and preemptive strikes, or traditional confrontational wars are risky endeavors (a game of chance) that only exact time and space determine their outcomes, this means that the most powerful families/dynasties could be setting themselves up to confront unpleasant outcomes if they build predictions using conceptions that are based on choice or prospective analysis.

That is also to say that hence it is not possible to hijack the self-fulfillment that people manifest, or to know if they get in the way because of self-imposed convictions or other-imposed prophecies (i.e., God), the reliance on non-confrontational strategies to acquiesce societies who refuse to abide by the natural and legal rights that the strongest legitimize could be a much safer way to achieve goals than waging on confrontational strategies that carries lots of risks.

For example, when the United States (and its allies) invaded Afghanistan, Mohammed Omar⁶⁵ (1060 – 2013), Supreme leader of Afghanistan commented about George Bush's (born 1947), 43rd President of the United States about threatening statements and speeches by answering with his famous statement: "Bush promised us defeat, and God promised us victory, and he will see which promise between the two is true."⁶⁶ This is very serious and worrisome. If after more than 18 years, the nation that regard itself as the greatest power the world has known (and with all its web of allies) cannot get "few" leaders in Afghanistan to surrender freedom to it, then if one thousand people, or one hundred thousand people, or one million people begin to perceive that the United States promised them defeat, and God promised them victory, mankind is doomed.

⁶⁵ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mullah_Omar

⁶⁶

<https://arabi21.com/story/1378865/%D9%86%D8%A7%D8%B4%D8%B7%D9%88%D9%86-%D9%8A%D8%B3%D8%AA%D8%B0%D9%83%D8%B1%D9%88%D9%86-%D8%AA%D8%B5%D8%B1%D9%8A%D8%AD%D8%A7%D8%AA-%D8%A8%D9%88%D8%B4-%D8%B9%D9%86-%D9%86%D9%87%D8%A7%D9%8A%D8%A9-%D8%B7%D8%A7%D9%84%D8%A8%D8%A7%D9%86-%D9%82%D8%A8%D9%84-20-%D8%B9%D8%A7%D9%85%D8%A7>

No one knows if the non-confrontational strategies that the United States and the Soviet Union were adopting during the cold war is what led to the collapse of communism. In addition, I have no way of knowing if the United States and the Soviet Union were imposing on each other embargoes, sanctions and blockades during the cold war, as the tapping into such measures became frequent post the collapse of communism. Then again, despite all the trade wars, sanctions, blockades, embargoes, social media, etc., that the United States or the European Union (the old powers) are employing so far against governments (or individuals) who refuse to carry out the obligations that are set forth in the UN charter, none are provoking the governments that were targeted to begin to behave differently.

In fact, a good number of the nations (or individuals) who the United States or the European Union (the old powers) are placing under sanctions, is prompting a large segment of the working class in those affected nations to prefer the inequity of their leaders over the ideas that the United States is proposing. Actually, the ineffectiveness of the sanctions that the United States or the European Union (the old powers) have imposed so far on some nations or individuals, gives the impression that such actions are an opportunity and not a threat. Put simply, the nations or the individuals that the United States is imposing on them sanctions seem to be using the idea of liberalism (or freedom) as a tool to justify how their own rules (norms and traditions) can rescue their dependents people from the threat of “dangerous ideologies.” In effect, assassination is a way to achieve gains or prevent a rival from posing a threat that humans rely on since ancient times as an alternative approach to negotiation.⁶⁷ Strangely, the acts of assassination that the rich nations are carrying out against targets who promote dangerous ideologies is not putting an end to the dangerous ideology following the murder of the person who is teaching his convictions, but rather the assassinated person is being replaced by a new person who is more complex. Likewise, a good number of the failed assassination attempts against individuals who promote dangerous ideologies seem to be drawing greater support for the person who was targeted or his cause, including showing how ruthless the assassin is. This is very serious and worrisome.

⁶⁷ <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Assassination>

To put it differently, the founding fathers of the UN did not propose to mankind to adopt principles on the aftermath of WW2 to ensure lasting peace that mankind had not tested with before to determine if they are capable to achieve practical results for the greater well-being of society or not. Before WW2 erupted, the United States was cooperating based on identical principles to the ones that are included in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. The norms that the United States was adopting managed to make the Americans develop understanding of themselves as compared to other societies who were much older.

If people around the world do not want to stand up for ideas that are known to have made the people who practiced them happier (the idea of liberal interventionism) and prefer instead that the practical results that they achieve be based on tribal distinction such as race, colour, sex, language, religion, political status, etc., exactly as the majority are doing, this means that it would not be possible to put an end to this historical dynamic that mankind has been knowing since antiquity. Most importantly, if people prefer unjust government confiscate their freedom over the idea of freedom that the United States is interfering in their political status to help them establish, then mankind may be confronting a much more serious problem than the idea of spreading democracy and the rule of law to ensure lasting peace.

Said differently, humans resort to violence, wars, assassinations, etc. to serve a cause, a political reason, or gain a payment. The cost or benefit of adopting such inhumane course is something that can be calculated or converted into tangible dividends. The policies of the successor determine if the choice of resorting to an immoral approach to settle dispute was right or wrong. If the people (societies) who the United States interfered in their political status post 1945, for example, do not want to stand up for the ideas that this country is preaching, but prefer to continue to practice ideological lines that are known to have produced throughout history complex relations, this means that either delusional aspirations are guiding people's worthiest capacities, or what is carrying to fruition people's deepest desires are predetermined imposed prophecies.

In other words, since we cannot say that the United States wanted to spread the ideologies stipulated in the UN charter to use them as a lure to transform the conditions and outcomes that matters to its strength and stability and not necessarily to build a just and peaceful world, because if this was the case, this country would have not been in favor of nations being granted independence to establish its hegemony; and likewise, since we cannot say that the United States began to forsake its commitment to make the world become a better place post 1945 because the political interferences that it is making in the political status of the nations who are not cooperating in accordance with the principles stipulated in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights are evidence of its commitments, this means that the unpreparedness of nations to cooperate based on the principle stipulated in the UN charter is not tangled in the caprice of the United States but rather in the conviction of UN member states that if they accept to surrender freedom to this ideology, that the United States would achieve hegemony over them (i.e., jealousy).

Then again, if humans are refusing to surrender freedom to each other irrespective of whether the ideology in question is formulated by another man or if it was a revelation as authors of biblical scriptures claim, then we cannot say that the dynamics that mankind knows is tangled in the non-existence of a framework that strengthen democracy or the rule of law. To the contrary, the dynamics that exist in the world has to be tangled in a rule that people refuse to get rid of and its consequence is making people refuse to relinquish control of regime to the voting public or to abolish social hierarchy.

I have no way of knowing what this rule that is preventing human ingenuity from effectively applying its programmed capability to distinguish between what is right or what is wrong on, but on everything else it does. However, if I have to pick a cause, I cannot think of a rule that man could be breaking than the one that the Quran state that God counselled Muhammad of not doing when he relates with people. In Verse 6, in Surat Ash-Shuraa in the Quran it is stated: "...Allah is [yet] Guardian over them, and you, [O Muhammad], are not over them a manager."⁶⁸ In other words, God counselled Muhammad that his sole

⁶⁸ <https://quran.com/42/6>

responsibility when he relate with people is only to impart the Divine Message. If people believe in God and tread the path of guidance or if people veer off the path of obduracy and fall into the abyss of error, this choice is one that every individual would make. It is not called upon on Muhammed to interfere in how people decide to conduct their lives.

In theory, all the obligations that are included in the UN charter to build a just and peaceful world are not very different from the one that are included in the Quran or biblical scriptures. If we compare between what Allah supposedly instructed Muhammad to be doing and that is to impart the divine message only, or whether people act according to the scriptures or not, it is up to them; we find that the founding fathers of the UN also imparted a similar message. The founding fathers of the UN counselled the most powerful families/dynasties to let each UN member states determine its own political status and pursue its own political and economic solution.⁶⁹ The founding fathers of the UN did not counsel the most powerful families/dynasties to create UN agencies that would be dedicated to promoting the same identical programs that governments offer so instead of mankind worrying about how to stop the people who use the idea of government to deepen their propensity as was the case before WW2, we now have to be concerned with stopping the people who are also working for the UN on top. Most importantly, the founding fathers of the UN did not counsel the most powerful families/dynasties to start being against people who are content with their status (or way in which their life is going), to task the UN with creating UN agencies that would be devoted to teaching people why they should no longer accept to surrender freedom to their leaders if the latter does not start to share outcomes with them on equal rights.

Indeed, if we take the council that the Quran state God asked Muhammad to abstain from violating (i.e., meddling in people's lives), and the opposite way the victors of WW2 (the most powerful families/dynasties) started doing on the aftermath of WW2, we find that the most powerful families chose to go about continuing to solidifying their power by adopting a tactic that is contrary to what Allah counselled Muhammad to avoid, which is also what the founding fathers of the UN counselled them to be doing as well.

⁶⁹ <https://www.hawaii-nation.org/1514.html>

Most importantly, it looks as if the decision of the most powerful families/dynasties to defy what God counselled Muhammad to not disobey or what their own thinkers (the founding fathers of the UN) also later suggested, has narrowed the choices that they have to make to avoid that their heirs do not live the insecurity that they are knowing, and perhaps lose the wealth and status that they are going to be inheriting. The most powerful families/dynasties can continue to refuse to admit the possibility of their error of tasking the intergovernmental organization named United Nations to interfere in the social order in order to teach people why they need to stop to be content in the hope that such strategy would allow them to solidify their power better. Alternatively, they (the most powerful families/dynasties) can go back to implementing the work program that Muhammad and the founding fathers of the UN counseled them to remain faithful to its principles to continue to transform the outcomes and conditions that matters to them and not be reverted to a simpler form in the course of time and things. This will require that the United Nations be resized and stopped from interfering in the political, economic and social status of nations. This will also require that all the UN member states (rich and poor nations) begin to relate in the same way the founding fathers of the UN suggested in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

Once again, I have no way of knowing if the most powerful families/dynasties would be solidifying their power using anyone of the afore mentioned choices, and/or if they would choose to do it through engulfing the world in a new global war to reduce desires through increasing death rates instead, or another type of reset. What I do know is that till today no one knows if it was the hand of God who arranged so all people come together to build a unified centralized democracy on the aftermath of WW2, or if it was the perceptual biases or disregard that our different leaders exhibited before WW2 and the consequent violence that they lived during WW2 is what deeply distressed them, and got them to the point of making commitment to work together to save succeeding generations from the scourge of another global war. Furthermore, since no ruler who played the deputy of God role and who disobeyed the biblical scriptures managed to avoid becoming reverted to a simpler form either before he died, or his heirs paid this ultimate price, then we cannot say that the most powerful families/dynasties

could expect a different fate if the principles that are included in the religious scriptures on how to conduct, and the ones that are included in the work program of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights are one and the same.

To put it differently, if God left it up to each individual to make up his own mind on whether to believe in his message or not, but post 1945 instead of the families/dynasties who won WW2 doing the same, i.e., letting nations determine their own political status, they want instead everyone to be rich, and own an airplane, and a boat, and a palace like the one that exist in Buckingham palace in Great Britain, then either the most powerful families/dynasties believe that they are invincible or they are suffering from God complex. Simply put, if all the biblical scriptures suggest that it is God who grant riches and abundance to whoever he wills, [Surah ash Shuraa 42:15] and the most powerful families/dynasties want the UN to create organizations to go fish the people who God desired perhaps they live poorly or may be it is their own wish to remain poor, and to start teaching them about democracy and equal rights before figuring out how to control the expectations of the people who the UN already awakened does not support that those people who are playing the role of Moses presently know what they are doing.

I do not know what bearing the decision of the most powerful families/dynasties to change the number of nations from fifty-three (53) as was the case in 1945 to one hundred and ninety-three (193) as of 2015 while everyone is using the idea of freedom as a tool to secure his best interests instead of the common interests would have on their strength and stability. Likewise, I do not know what impact would the decision of the most powerful families/dynasties to change the terms of reference of the United Nations so this organization does not fulfil the responsibility that the founding fathers of the UN envisaged for this council only but to incorporate becoming an economic operator have on their strength and stability as well. It is important to mention here the ongoing efforts that the most powerful families/dynasties approved in connection with tasking the UN with ending poverty and injustice in the world in all its forms by 2030 date, which is the new programmed

deadline to attain this goal,⁷⁰ that would definitely be postponed to a new date. What I do know is that if the most powerful families/dynasties want to continue to transform the conditions and outcomes that matters to them without the division that would ensue between people reverting them to a simpler form, they are going to need to prevent the wrath that the Quran says happens to any society who allows that knowledge tears through its social fabric.

Verse 14 of Surat al Shuraa in the Quran state “And they did not become divided until after knowledge had come to them - out of jealous animosity between themselves. And if not for a word that preceded from your Lord [postponing the penalty] until a specified time, it would have been concluded between them. And indeed, those who were granted inheritance of the Scripture after them are, concerning it, in disquieting doubt.”⁷¹

If the more knowledge come unto people, the more people (nations) would be divided until it would be very difficult to maintain solidarity, this then signify that the more people awareness rise, the more envy, wrong doing and greed rise. The more envy, wrong doing and greed rise, the more peoples need to resort to war to create a new balance rise.

The United States did not start to build a real military till the start of the 20th century (i.e., realized that it was going to be sooner or later either attacked or waging wars). This means that it is possible to say that that the United States did not know that “as more knowledge come unto people,” envy, wrong doing, and greed would rise. However, it would be naïve to suppose that Great Britain or the rest of the old powers did not know that fact.

In the book *Is the United States being used as an instrument to further the ends of Despotism and Anarchy?*⁷² I try to support how the United States could have been acquiesced to play the role of global policemen by the old powers on the aftermath of WW2 on purpose. This strategy shifts all the disenchantment that societies would be knowing for being denied freedom to change their economic status, or do whatever serves

⁷⁰ <https://www.un.org/development/desa/disabilities/envision2030.html>

⁷¹ <https://quran.com/42/14>

⁷² <http://www.centermpa.com/>

their best interests better, away from the old powers as was the case like before WW2 erupted, and puts all the blame on the United States as has been the case since 1945.

As I said in the afore mentioned book, I cannot think of a reason that could have prompted the victors of WW2 (Great Britain and the old powers) to deem that it was not necessary anymore for them to continue to play the global policemen role on the aftermath of WW2 as they were doing throughout the second millennium, thus the United States could start to play this role on their behalf, then to attribute this motive to their conviction that it was no longer necessary for them to perform this control or monitoring themselves anymore. Mankind has been delegating to technology (automation) the role that the human body was programed to play to sustain the survival needs or to satiate the earthly desires of this mass starting from 1945.

I have no way of knowing if the most powerful families/dynasties and the victors of WW2 (Great Britain and the old powers) appointed the United States as global policemen and restored to people their national lives at the end of WW2, because they have deemed that technology (automation) can protect them against the division that the Quran state that people's increased knowledge perpetrate. Indeed, people are divided about the utility of technology (automation) with some suggesting that technological growth would become uncontrollable and irreversible at a point in time in the future which would result in unforeseeable changes in human civilization (technological singularity), while others have disputed this plausibility.

I have no way of knowing if the decision of human imagination to delegate to machine the role that the human body was programed to serve will end the actual civilization or not. What I do know is that until either one of those two afore outcomes that investigators who make predictions about the impact of machines on the continuity of mankind on earth occurs, the most powerful families/dynasties and the victors of WW2 (Great Britain and the old powers) need to resolve two challenges no matter if computer-generated robots take over our world and bring unforeseeable changes in human civilization or not.

The first challenge concerns how to stop the UN system (NGOs, Charities, etc.) and the governments of the different UN member states from relying on two opposing tools to solidify their powers. The UN system uses the idea of good as a tool to get its way in UN member states despite the resistance of others, and governments strengthening democracy and the rule of law using as a tool the idea of evil (i.e., abuse or disobey the UN charter and Universal Declaration of Human Rights on moral grounds).

The second challenge concerns picking between wanting the UN system or UN member states prepare people (societies) to legitimize the natural and legal rights that the most powerful families/dynasties determine.

I believe that after the most powerful families allowed the intergovernmental organization named United Nations to become an economic operator, they breached the system of checks and balances that could exist between this organization and governments. By making the intergovernmental organization named United Nations become another economic operators who is like governments using the social and the political order to serve its best interests and not the best interests of the international rule based postwar world order that was laid on the aftermath of WW2 by the victors of WW2, this signify we now have two apparatuses who are rivaling each other in every UN member states to determine who would get ultimately in control of the idea of good (the idea of evil), which is a violence-wielding apparatus in its own way.

If neither one of those two apparatuses (the UN system or government) resize each other, the odds of the most powerful families/dynasties managing to get either apparatus to transform the conditions and outcomes that matters to them (the most powerful families/dynasties) may be slim. This is because UN offices are staffed mostly by national staff and not by expatriates. If it is not possible to control the “knowledge” that would be coming into any person, and the people who exercise executive power within a UN member state and the staffs of the UN are all working to benefit their best interest and the interest of their own country and not the best interest of the international rule based postwar world order, then it is highly likely that the most powerful families/dynasties could be chasing wind.

To put it differently, since the international rule based postwar world order serve the best interests of the most powerful families/dynasties, and not the best interests of the people (societies) who are altering their behavior accordingly, if UN staffs and government officials are working in UN member states to benefit their best interest and the interest of their own country, then it is not possible for those afore players to not perceive the most powerful families/dynasties as a threat who is undermining their rights for the extension of their power. This also means that it would not be possible for the most powerful families/dynasties to stop those players who they are depending in reality on them to continue to solidify their power from perceiving them as a threat to their own survival and specific national identity. This is very serious and worrisome.

In other words, if the UN, the international aid organizations, NGOs, Charities and all the governments, etc. are using the idea of good (or evil) as a tool to resize each other, then their actions should be threading more division in the social order than unification. In addition, if the more knowledge come unto people, the more such phenomenon divides people, then the more people become divided, the more they become aware that the norms that are being legitimized is not programmed to increase their best interests but rather to benefit of the individuals involved. The more people perceive that the social contract that they are being asked to surrender freedom to its rules is programmed to benefit the individuals involved, and not necessarily the common interests, then the more peoples' preparedness to withdraw their obligation to obey rise. When people withdraw their obligation to obey, it is not possible to stop people from being bound by their personal power and conscience. When people begin to abide by their personal power and conscience, it would not be possible for people to voluntarily consent or to easily give up their natural freedom to obtain the benefits of the political order. In the absence of political order and law, it becomes very difficult for the most powerful families/dynasties to continue to transform the conditions and outcomes that matter to them. This is because the most powerful families/dynasties secure the continuity of their wealth or status in periods of peace and not in periods of wars.

Many people have envisioned that the unpreparedness of the victors of WW2 (the most powerful families/dynasties) and the rich nations who

are protecting them to be faithful to the international rule based postwar world order that they laid out at the end of this global war would eventually lead to their collapse and reversal to a simpler form.

Indeed, the collective solutions that the United Nations (organization), international aid organizations and governments of UN member states are spearheading to neutralize the social and economic inequalities that has engulfed the world since 1945, does not support that the efforts employed are creating a dent in the multiple crises that piled up so far.

Evidently, the choices ahead of the most powerful families/dynasties are clear if they do not want the predictions that futurists make about their eventual disintegration or eventual rise of a new power that would absorb them occurs, which by large appear to be coming true.

The most powerful families/dynasties can continue to create clubs, bodies, institutions, unions, coalitions, agreements, contracts, etc. in the hope that the time that those political and civil structures are buying would aid to come up with a comprehensive solution that would put an end to the social and economic inequalities that has engulfed the world. Alternatively, the most powerful families/dynasties can increase death rates by engulfing the world in a new global war to create a new balance or reset.

I have no way of knowing if the idea of allowing more clubs, bodies, institutions, unions, coalitions, agreements, contracts, etc. maintain relationship with the international rule based postwar world order serve the best interests of the most powerful families/dynasties, when it was the decision of allowing the intergovernmental organization named United Nations to create agencies, bodies, institutions, etc. so those structure maintain relationship with this global council what created the social and economic inequalities that has engulfed and impoverished mankind.

To put it differently, no one predicated in 1979 when the Iranian Revolution⁷³ overthrew Mohammad Reza Pahlavi⁷⁴ (1919 – 1980), that forty years later the Iranian government (and others) would be claiming

⁷³ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Iranian_Revolution

⁷⁴ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mohammad_Reza_Pahlavi

rights to generate energy through nuclear power including the right to possess nuclear weapon, which this country (and others) have total right to possess in a world that its inhabitants refuse to disarm and brag about how powerful their nuclear weapon arsenal is like. But, as we are all witness, when the United States (the global policemen of the world) requested from the political leaders in Iran to relinquish control of the regime to the voting public, the faction who has been controlling this country since 1980, refused to adhere to such obligations as contained in the United Nations Charter which all country members pledged to carry out. To put it differently, there is no connection between the Iranian people claiming right to possessing weapons of mass destruction, and the refusal of the leadership in Iran to relinquish control of the regime to the voting public to possess right to cooperate based on the liberal ideas that are included in the work program stipulated in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Simply put, the Iranian people could be practicing the work program stipulated in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and claiming their rights to possessing weapons of mass destruction. The two dossiers are separate from one another.

However, because all the UN member states (including the United States as country) are violating the work program stipulated in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, then it is not in the best interests of governments that the ideas that the United States (as a global policemen) is preaching to let liberal interventionism succeed in strengthening democracy and the rule of law. This is because if the idea of liberal interventionism succeeds, all the individuals who maintain their power by ensuring that the military stays in control to rescue people from the threat of dangerous ideologies, or the ones who maintain a one party political system to achieve the same, or claim that the country is a monarchy because it is the wish of the people would no longer be able to continue to rely on such ideas to get their ways despite the resistance of others, and would be obliged to start to cooperate based on the principles stipulated in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. It is not in the best interests of any nation who does not subscribe to the philosophical idea that penne that “all men are created equal,” to cooperate based on the principles stipulated in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, because this concept gets rid of social hierarchy.

Humans cannot get rid of social hierarchy even if they want to achieve this goal voluntarily (i.e., get rid of jealousy from their heart or share outcome on equal rights). This means that the more the United States acquiesce to the invitation of UN member states to play the global policemen role to get the world from fear through searching for responses that limits the growth of the factors that have been causing the social and economic problems in the first place, the more the collective solutions or paradigm and systems shifts that the United States would be acquiescing into should be weakening its capacity to defend its best interests, until eventually reverting its potential to a simpler form in the course of time and things.

To put it differently, if every time the United States puts pressure on the Iranian government to relinquish control of the regime to the voting public or to abandon the pursuit of developing nuclear weapons, the Iranian regime rushes to threaten with moving ahead with their plans to resume uranium enrichment to produce a nuclear bomb to protect their right to defend their sovereignty and/or their right to self-determination, this signify that the profound concern for the long-term future of humanity that the United States or the Iranian government are each pursuing is distinct. If the leaders who control the United States continue to rely on diplomatic solutions to resolve the US-Iran nuclear standoff instead of force as they have been doing since 1980, they would be continuing to rely on the character assassination that each country is subjecting the other to yield to in the hope that its effect would generate the expectations that each country has.

On the other hand, because the heart of the gridlock that exists between the United States and the Iranian is not tangled in preventing or allowing the Iranians to develop a nuclear bomb, but rather in determining who would be considering the opinion of the other before taking actions of his own, and all the UN member are supporting the United States commitment to preventing the Iranian from possessing a nuclear weapon because this obstruction would prevent Iran from imposing itself on everyone else and not necessarily because of their concern to accelerate the attainment of the goals set forth in the UN charter, this means that the United States is building for its destruction when this country rely on diplomatic solutions to protect its best interests instead of reliance on the use of force.

In other words, if the United States is abstaining from sending an ultimatum to the Iranian (as well as to the Brits, French, Chinese, Russian, North Korean, etc.) to ask them to stop all their nuclear program as this country did during WW2 when its leaders sent the Japanese an ultimatum asking them to surrender or risk being forced to do it, this means that either the United States is protecting the Iranian government, or the United States thinks that the challenges that has imperiled individuals, nations, kingdoms, since the appearance of man on earth would be predicaments that this country could resolve.

This predicament involves undermining that the soul is ever inclined to evil, except those shown mercy by God [Surah Yusuf 12:53]. And that as knowledge continue to come unto people, those who God does not show mercy on them [Surah Yusuf 12:52], they would certainly die [Genesis 2:17].

If the predicament that the United States must resolve to maintain its strength and power including achieving its own goal for humanity is not tied to the failure of mankind to use the traditional institutions and policies that bring awareness (knowledge) from assassinating or reversing back to a simpler form the aspirations of every posterity, but rather the jealousy that reside in the heart of man, this means that the biggest obstacle that the United States must overcome to secure its goal would be to overcome how to ensure that its principal rich and poor allies (Great Britain, France, Italy, the Scandinavian nations, Egypt, Saudi Arabia, Japan, Israel, etc.) would not plot its demise as the Bible narrate in the book of Genesis the “brothers” of Joseph acted like when they were angered by Joseph’s supremacy.

In other words, if all the people who claim that they are committed to finding solutions to the multiple crises facing humanity are only interested in securing them on conditions that they would be exempt from observing the principles that would be appealed to reach them, this means that all the love of money, pleasure, power, status, etc., that people are prioritizing could crisscross or create a bottleneck for the United States in the near future.

For example, the government of Egypt signed two contracts with the Russian Government for the construction and financing of the El Dabaa Nuclear Power Plant (NPP) in November 2015. The commissioning of the El Dabaa NPP is expected to begin in 2026. If in 2026, the United States tries to put pressure on the Egyptian regime to be faithful to the democratic process that this country pledged to respect upon becoming a UN member states, then it is highly likely that, if human nature remains the same till this date, the United States is not going to have to start to figure out how to stop the Iranians and others only from enriching uranium, but the Egyptians on top.

Moreover, since the only way the Egyptian military could stay in power is if the state of emergency that this country has been under since this nation obtained independence in the early 1950s continue to go on and off, this means that the longer Egypt continue to be a military state, the harder it would be for the United States to make this institution be ready to relinquish control of the regime to the voting public so the Egyptians begin to cooperate based on the obligations contained in the UN charter. Two scenarios could emerge if the military institution refuses to relinquish control of the regime to the voting public so the Egyptians begin to cooperate based on the obligations contained in the UN charter. The first is to recreate the same course of events that the United States is having with the Iranians since this country began to use the idea of self-determination as a tool to justify why it has right to enrich uranium, but with every round of negotiation etching a step closer to developing a nuclear bomb as the Iranian are doing. The second is to be always on alert against a preemptive attack or the reliance on a deterrence strategy.

If the different UN member states decide to block the United States from continuing to using its strength to bullying them into accepting the obligations contained in the UN charter, and they decide to align in an adversarial power to end its hegemony, I do not think that any UN member state would consider waging a preemptive attack against the United States because this could lead to an all-out-war if the attack does not result in a destruction that is less than total.

I believe that if the different UN member states decide to block the United States from continuing to using its strength to bullying them into accepting the obligations contained in the UN charter, the way they are

going to achieve their goal is by relying on a deterrence strategy. The goal of this strategy would be to let the fragmentation or breakdown of the US occur in the same way the Soviet Union crumbled. In other words, hence the United States has a stock of nuclear warheads spread all over the country, it would be necessary that this country be partitioned as happened to the Soviet Union in order to transport and stock pile in one state all weapons of mass destruction as happened during the dissolution of the Soviet Union.⁷⁵ It should be noted that if the United States did not possess weapon of mass destruction, it would not be necessary to partition this country, since what it is being assassinated is the idea of freedom which this country depend on to gets its way and not the people who live in this country.

Evidently, this will require that the UN member states bandwagon against the United States. Of course, the UN member states would be divided between allies and foes. The foes would be plotting against the United States in the same way Joseph's brothers conspired against their brother's supremacy. In as far, as the nations that the United States would be counting on them to stand up to it (its allies), their true nature would not be any different than the one Judas Iscariot exhibited when he betrayed Jesus.

Then again, when we compare how the fate of Joseph or Jesus culminated, we find that Joseph was saved and made the Vizier of Egypt (the highest official to serve the Pharaoh), but Jesus was not as lucky; he was crucified.

Indeed, the unfortunate circumstances that Joseph and Jesus confronted produced two outcomes that are totally contrary to each other. I have no way of knowing if the different individuals (families/dynasties) who are controlling the governments of UN member states would consider the repeated calls or sanctions made by the United States to them to consider its opinion before taking actions of their own as an act of coercion and intimidation thus prompting them to plot to subject this country (the US) to the same fate that Joseph or Jesus confronted or not. What I do know is that there is an ancient Arabic proverb that could be very useful to recall now, because it describes what every leader or

⁷⁵ <https://www.atomicheritage.org/history/soviet-closed-cities>

nation should abstain from doing to not be exposed to threats or tests. This proverb state that “it is the leading bull who prompt the crooked furrow in the field.” What this proverb is trying to bring to the attention of a leader or a bigger force is that when the big bull stops to plow straight; the small bulls have no choice but to follow. This is also intended to say that it is not possible to build durable security when two forces are acting in opposite directions and neither one is cancelling the other.

In other words, it is not possible to expect that the individuals (families/dynasties) who control UN member states start to voluntarily consider the opinion of the United States (as an idea) before taking actions of their own or be loyal to the ideas that are promulgated in the UN charter, which call on people to cooperate based on the principles of equal rights, when the United States (as a government) is not doing it. This is because if the leading bull is not plowing straight (i.e., leading by example), asking the small bulls to plow straight (i.e. to lead by example) would still produce two forces that would be acting in opposite directions. In addition, asking the small bulls (the individuals or families who control UN member states) to plow straight when the big bull is plowing crookedly (i.e., not leading by example), achieves nothing other than to take the power that would be in the hands of the faction who is controlling the government to give it to another faction who would begin to direct its violence at the faction who was just replaced.

Simply put, it looks as if we cannot blame the individuals (families) who control Lebanon (a stateless country) or Egypt (a military state) for refusing to relinquish control to the voting public of their regimes if the five nations (the United States, Great Britain, China, Russia and France) who the families/dynasties who won WW2 tasked their governments to prepare people to cooperate based on the principle of equal rights refuse to lead by example. In fact, the individuals (families/dynasties) who control China or Russia refuse that any opposing political faction operate in those two sovereign nations.

Indeed, the decision of the most powerful families/dynasties to let the leaders of the United States, Great Britain, and the Soviet Union (i.e., Russia) not stay faithful to the pledge made in 1945 to allow that only them (those three countries) possess any weapons more powerful than a

rifle and all others to be disarmed⁷⁶ is not the only major obstacles that those three countries created for the most powerful families/dynasties so far. If we add the decision that those three countries (i.e., the United States, Great Britain, and the Soviet Union / Russia) took to task the intergovernmental organization named United Nations to be an economic operator just as the leaders of the Catholic church did in the first millennium instead of being faithful to the principles of Catholicism only, I think the United States, Great Britain, and the Soviet Union (i.e., Russia) tangled the most powerful families/dynasties and mankind in circumstances that could not be any different than the one the families/dynasties who controlled the Roman Empire and our predecessors lived.

In other words, if the answer to any query I raise to understand what could be preventing people from coming together pursuant to the political, economic and social reset that occurred in 1945 to cooperate based on the goals set forth in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, I find to be tangled in people's attachment to two divergent ideologies, whereby one promotes that all men are created equal and on that basis any political or economic programming should be done, and another which promotes that men do not have rights but live at the mercy of the state (i.e., the mercy of the people who are in power), this means that for as long as the proponent of each idea tries to bunker under the benefit of his preferred philosophy to resize the other, mankind could be creating a standoff that is not any different than the one that exist between the idea of good or the idea of evil, or the one that Jesus or Muhammad confronted when those two began their ministry.

Simply put, when Jesus or Muhammad began their ministry, those two were rejected. Afterwards, one of them was crucified (Jesus), and the other lived until he died naturally (Muhammad).

If the predicament that is preventing people from coming together pursuant to the political, economic and social reset that occurred in 1945 to cooperate based on the goals set forth in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights to reduce fear and want is tangled in the existence of two

⁷⁶ Gaddis, John Lewis (1972). *The United States and the Origins of the Cold War, 1941–1947*. Columbia University Press. ISBN 978-0-231-12239-9.

factions, whereby one relies on the idea of freedom (and of all people being equal) to get its way despite the resistance of others (the United States), and the other, who does not consider that all people are equal, and have rights to only live at the mercy of the faction who control the government or the state, then we can say that the United States is promoting a philosophy that is theoretically not any different from the one that Jesus or Mohammad were preaching.

Said differently, if man accepts to observe to cooperate based on the work program that was formulated by the founding fathers of the United Nations in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, there would not be any difference between what Jesus or Muhammad were teaching people to observe, and what man would be observing. The democratic principles and the rule of law that Jesus and Muhammad were teaching, and the one the founding fathers of the US or the UN proposed are one and the same.

If we are to consider that the philosophy that the United States is promoting is not any different from the one Jesus or Muhammad was teaching, then the United States must cross (navigate) through the same circumstances that those two prophets stumbled or confronted until the philosophy they were preaching was admitted

To put it differently, the process leading to the acceptance of the ministry of Jesus or Muhammad passed through stages. It was first rejected and then accepted. During the rejection phase, people were divided between those who were in favor of the new philosophy, and those who were not. In the case of Jesus, he was not as fortunate, and he was crucified before his ministry was accepted. In the case of Muhammad, he died naturally.

Most importantly, we can note that in the case of Muhammad, his philosophy was accepted in a way that was different than the one Jesus's philosophy endured. In the case of Muhammad, the rulers who were rejecting his philosophy surrendered freedom to it before his death, and the adherents to this new philosophy (religion) did not have to displace, resize or absorb the rulers who were in power as happened with the way Christianity progressed. In the case of Christianity, the proclaimer of the new philosophy (religion) was obliterated (Jesus) and even the rulers

who were in power. The rulers (the Roman Empire) were reverted to a simpler form and were absorbed by the adherents or proponents of the new religion.

If we take all the past events that occurred in the world from 1945 to now, we find that people are divided as was the case when Jesus or Muhammad were preaching their philosophy. Furthermore, if the analogy that is being made between the way Christianity and Islam evolved and the way the people are divided over the idea of freedom as of 1945 are one and the same, then we can say that way forward could consist of two scenarios.

The first scenario would be obliteration of the United States just as Jesus had to yield to. This would be followed by the disintegration of all those who would have conspired against the United States as happened to the Roman Empire.

The second scenario is that all the UN governments who are refusing to cooperate based on the principles that are stipulated in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights would begin to do so thus mankind would enjoy the same success that Islam knew when local leaders agreed to cooperate based on the principles of this faith.

I have no way of knowing if the circumstances that transpired in the world until Christianity or Islam were accepted are being played out as of 1945. However, since there is no other ideology that man can practice to build a just and peaceful besides the one that was proclaimed in 1945 (i.e., based on the principle of equal rights), and man reached this progressive ideological idea already in 1945, the standoff that exist between the United States and all the UN member states who are refusing to date to go along with its counsel to relinquish control of the regime to the voting public and to cooperate based on the principles stipulated in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights is serious and complex. Of course, the implication of this standoff is not one that the poor would bear, but the families/dynasties who control the rich nations in particular.

To put it differently, the conflict between good and evil is a battle between individuals or ideologies, with one side held up as Good, while

the other is portrayed as Evil.⁷⁷ Aristotle claimed that Oedipus Rex exemplify this form of battle, hence it describe “the tragic operations of fate than with a thematized conflict between good and evil.”⁷⁸ In other words, all the conflicts between good and evil evolve around a sacrifice.

If the standoff that exist between the United States and all the UN member states who are refusing to date to go along with its counsel to relinquish control of the regime to the voting public and to cooperate based on the principles stipulated in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights is one that in theory could be said to be identical to the conflict between good and evil, which is also regarded as a universal condition of the human nature, then the families (dynasties) who are refusing to plow straight (i.e., to lead by example) would have to “sacrifice”.

For example, in the Christian ritual “a priest by the breaking of bread and the pouring of wine symbolically reenacts the breaking of Christ's body and the shedding of his blood.”⁷⁹ In narrative and mind, the priest is commemorating the sacrifice of one man who died so his idea may live. Since 2000 years now, different priests put on vestments and move in a preordained ritual, and together with the people who are watching them commemorate such a sacrifice. However, only a handful of Christian practice the teaching included in the lord's prayer,⁸⁰ which Jesus said is what a person must be doing to gain eternal life.

Indeed, the sacrifice Jesus made since 2000 years now so all mankind gain wisdom and be delivered from evil here on earth and in heaven did not attract lots of people, otherwise the world would be much safer now. On the other hand, Jesus did not have nothing to lose if people accept to cooperate based on his teaching or not, because he was poor. That is to say, that we cannot say that if the people (families/dynasties) who control the different nations continue to be divided between a faction that promote that all men are equal to resize the faction that promote

⁷⁷ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Conflict_between_good_and_evil

⁷⁸

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Conflict_between_good_and_evil#Classical_tragedy

⁷⁹ <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=TonLOAk10Y>

⁸⁰ [https://www.biblegateway.com/passage/?search=Matthew+6%3A9-](https://www.biblegateway.com/passage/?search=Matthew+6%3A9-13&version=NIV)

[13&version=NIV](https://www.biblegateway.com/passage/?search=Matthew+6%3A9-13&version=NIV)

that men do not have rights but live at the mercy of the state (i.e., at the mercy of a small group), or the other way around, that those who would be reverted to a simpler form or absorbed by another growing power would be making the same sacrifice that Jesus had to yield to, because Jesus was poor and when he died he was still single. The sacrifices that the rich families/dynasties would be doing would be similar to the ones that the rulers of the Roman Empire and others confronted.

I have no way of knowing what the rulers of the Roman Empire did wrong to lead people into believing that they were not an authority that could be trusted. However, if we can correlate the distrust that many people around the world are developing about the United States being truly a force for good, this could be exactly what the rulers of the Roman Empire confronted before their collapse. This is very serious and worrisome.

In other words, if the character assassination that the United States is knowing continue to threaten public confidence around the world, then it would not be possible for the United States to avoid becoming distrusted if wherever the US sets foot, the only resulting reality is turbulence, division, broken families, destruction and deaths. If people around the world stop to see the United States as a force for good, then it would not be possible for this country anymore to use the idea of good as a tool to get its way despite the resistance of others. When people around the world stop to interpret the meddling of the United States in their political status as an opportunity, but a threat, there is a good chance that in the same way the British colonists who were living in America (the patriots) united against the British Crown and sought to be separated to form a new country that people (societies) around the world would do the same.

Then again, if UN member states continue to convince their citizens that the United States is not a force for good and/or it is a country that can be trusted, thus prompting most governments that have close cooperation with this country to distance themselves from it including plotting to see it becoming resized, we know that all those people who would be falling victim to this character assassination plot, the damage that they would be effecting would be killing the idea of liberal interventionism as a tool to be used under its auspices to organize

distinct societies, but not the usage of the idea of democracy and the rule of law as a tool to enable every person of the human family to continue to realize one's deepest desires and capacities.

In other words, if the United States credibility continues to shrink, and the extreme negative and unethical perception that people would be developing lead to the disintegration of this country as happened to the Soviet Union (i.e., the idea of Communism), the western European monarchs are going to continue to cultivate that those countries are not republic because it is the people who want to live under such political system. In like manner, the Chinese would be cultivating that the Marxists beliefs promise a harmonious living, the French that socialism is the right tenets, the Iranians about Islam, the Egyptians about the military ruling, and so forth.

Furthermore, because it would not be in the best interests of any nation to emphasize absolute authority thus prompting all the weaker nations that would be obeying to perceive that they are being denied freedom, which constitute a serious threat to world peace, it would be essential to continue to rely on intergovernmental organizations to regulate interactions between states.

For example, when the Roman Empire collapsed, it was absorbed by the Catholic Church. However, before the Roman Empire became absorbed by the Catholic Church, the power that the Catholic Church possessed grew as a result of the extremely negative and unethical perception that the disciples of Jesus began to spread.

In other words, if the UN member states manage to assassinate the character of the United States, and fail to agree on letting a single power emphasize absolute authority, it would not be possible for them to regulate interactions between states except through accepting that non-state actors and international institutions play role in the international rule based order that would be emphasized.

However, since there is no any other ideology that man can practice to build a just and peaceful world besides the one that was proclaimed in 1945 (i.e., based on the principle of equal rights), and man reached this progressive ideological idea already in 1945, this means that all the UN

member states would have no choice but to build on top on what they have already built at this global council thus using it as a new starting point.

If the UN member states manage to conspire against the United States thus prompting the collapse of this bloc of nations as happened to the Soviet Union, but then fail to agree on letting a single power emphasize absolute authority rule over all of the ones that would be in existence and favor having once again non-state actors and international institutions play role in regulating interactions between states, then we can say that the role that those UN organizations would be playing would not be any different than the one that the existing UN organizations that were created already and granted right to maintain relationship with the United Nations are doing, except that the world would be pursuing the aspirations set forth in the UN charter without the United States as a country forming part of this aspiration.

Then again, if we compare between the date when the Christian movement emerged (i.e., 33 AD) and when the Roman Empire collapsed (i.e., 476 AD), we find that during this time interval, the turbulences, divisions, wars that the Roman Empire was knowing were not any different than the ones we are knowing since 1945. However, during all this time that the Roman Empire power was diminishing, the power of the Christian movement which started out being made up of few disciples in 33 AD had grown into becoming a large political movement during those four centuries.

Evidently, what prompted the collapse of the Roman Empire is the failure of the rulers of this authority to deliver on the promises they were making. In other words, the more the rulers of the Roman Empire were delivering empty promises, the more they were prompted into making compromises. For example, in 313 AD, the rulers of the Roman Empire had no choice but to accept and to legalize Christianity.⁸¹ And so, if in theory it does not matter if the power of the United States is curtailed or this country resized and reverted to a simpler form, because if the world continue to be divided between a faction that promote that all men are created equal and deserve right to wealth, prestige and power, and

⁸¹ <https://www.pbs.org/empires/romans/empire/christians.html>

another who promote that men do not have rights but live at the mercy of the state (i.e., at the mercy of a small group), then the historical dynamic that exists in the world is not going anywhere. This then also means, that if the historical dynamic that exists in the world stays, then it is highly possible that if the UN agencies continue to grow that their power would subject the heirs of the most powerful families/dynasties to the same fate that the rulers of the Roman Empire were dealing with on the hands of the Catholic Church in 476 AD or right before this empire collapsed.

In other words, if in 1776 what helped the people who were in favor of separating from the crown to grow leading into becoming a superpower in 1945 (i.e., not remain poor, disorganized and struggling as the people of South Sudan are like since they split from Sudan in 2011) is their decision to treat each other as equal, then if the intergovernmental organization named United Nations continue to use the idea of equality as a tool to grow, it would not be possible to avoid that this organization become as powerful as the Catholic Church had become after the death of Jesus. Simply put, if Christianity grew because the adherents of this faith were doing exactly what the people who split from the British Crown in 1776 in North America were doing, and that is to preach that everyone in the United States is equal, while everyone in Europe was preaching that it is only the Crown who is the main actor in regulating interactions, then it is highly possible that if the different UN agencies continue to preach the same idea that the families/dynasties who were controlling the catholic Church were doing in antiquity so Christianity grows, that the heirs of the most powerful families/dynasties today would confront the same fate that happened to the heirs of the Roman Empire.

Actually, the downfall that the rulers of the Roman Empire confronted, which I am suggesting could confront the heirs of the most powerful families/dynasties if the ones who are executing executive power today continue to undermine the wickedness of man, is exactly what the United States is confronting today around the globe or since the start of the 21st century. In 1776, the families/dynasties who controlled the United States relied on the idea of freedom to get their ways despite the resistance of others. The United States managed to be a superpower by 1945, because the rulers of this country (despite all internal problems)

cultivated an all-round moral society. Instead of letting this perception that the entire world had developed about this country (the US) continue to forge forward on the aftermath of WW2, its new leaders began to increasingly adopt double standards. The consequence of this cumulative irresponsible behavior that the leaders of this country (the US) thought would be forgotten (i.e., consigned to history's dustbin) is eating away from the conviction that people had developed about this country (the US) being a force for good. As people's distrust with the true intentions of the United States grows, the only choice that this country (the US) has to reverse this trend would be to make compromises or lead by example. The more the United States makes compromises or lead by example, the more its power would be diminishing, if understandably the nations who are depending on their special relations with the United States for protection are not cooperating based on the principles stipulated in the Universal Declaration of Human rights and/or would be in favor of the United States solidifying its power and their own diminishing. This also means that as people disenchantment with their government grows, the more this situation would reflect negatively on the credibility of the United States. This is because citizens would be perceiving that it is the United States who is denying their governments right to look for alternative solutions as the Lebanese people perceive today. We should not forget that all the nations agreed to cooperate together on the aftermath of WW2 on conditions that happiness would be distributed equally among nations and not trickled top-down.

Indeed, the gridlock that that United States and the most powerful families/dynasties are confronting is not any different from the ones that Moses and the leaders of the tribes who he brought into the promised land confronted. For example, Moses brought people from Egypt into the promised land and then instead of the people who Moses helped to have a new life acting based on the rules he suggested to them they wandered in all direction, and till today the people who claim that they are descendants of those people have remained lost.

In 1776, the founding fathers of the United States managed to bring all the wandering people who were living in North America to come together to head toward a promised land (make the idea of freedom and the United States ideals a great power). In 1945, the successors of those

founding fathers managed to bring all the people of the world to live on this promised land with them as well (to work collectively to reduce fear and want). Instead of the leaders of the United States ruling post 1945 contrary to what the successors of Moses did in the promised land (Jerusalem) to avoid being disintegrated and reverted to a simpler form as happened to those predecessors, they appear to be repeating the same mistake.

I have no way of knowing if the insecurity that the world is knowing post 1945 is analogous to the one our ancestors lived in antiquity. What I do know is that man was not programmed with power to determine if the actions that his body prompt in nature are right (good) or wrong (evil). Man was counselled in the Bible in the story of the creation to make every effort to not distinguish between good and evil, for when man does so he would certainly die.⁸² Indeed, man has been relying as counter measure to ease the impact of his inaptitude to distinguish between what is right from what is wrong by establishing balance between the two. God continuously chipped a hand and sent prophets when man's complex relations created gridlocks that required specific political and social reset to unblock.

May be if peace and security continues to become difficult to unblock, God may decide to interfere and send a new prophet to lend a hand as he was doing in antiquity. At the same time, it is difficult to imagine what the Terms of Reference of this prophet would consist of, if the moral principles that the founding fathers of the UN secured for us on the aftermath of WW2 to create a balance between good and evil are the final norms that mankind could depend on "for the development of a full and complete structure of a world order under law"⁸³ as Cordell Hull also deemed in one of his letters.

Indeed, the Bible does not mention if when Moses and the people who left to go live with him in a new promised land that they had with them computers to help them develop algorithms on what they need to be doing to prevent their collapse or conquer. May be the most powerful families/dynasties are counting on the power of science or technology

⁸² <https://www.biblegateway.com/passage/?search=Genesis+2%3A17&version=NIV>

⁸³ <https://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/documents/letter-resignation-from-secretary-state-cordell-hull>

to prevent their collapse. Then again, if despite all the exploration that has been done through science and technology to control the actions of the human body, all the attempts used so far have shown that such strategy has made people become less tolerant rather than patient, then it may be necessary to resort to an all-out war to increase first death rates and then program anew political and economic reset as happened on the aftermath of WW2 if people continue to be unprepared to surrender freedom voluntarily.

Throughout history backstabbing, violence, wars, etc. have been a very practical tool to reset social and ideological gridlock. Actually, those who plot to backstab, wage violence or wars, etc., have always managed to hide their purposes. For example, when Julius Caesar (100 BC – 44 BC), Roman General, was assassinated by a group of rebellious senators, those traitors were communicating with their eyes before the attack. Likewise, wars are very useful tools to increase death rates and reset the political, economic and social order. However, the only challenge wars pose is that it is not possible to determine who would be the true winner when two belligerent forces split into two opposing camps and begin to throw all their economic, industrial and scientific capabilities to find out who would be the first to surrender to the other. Only when a complete cleansing or annihilation of any trace of the side that was defeated (human, material and culturally), is effected can the faction who won claim victory.

For example, because the Babylonians did not annihilate all the Jews (books, monuments, etc.) during the conquest of Jerusalem in 587 BC, this city has never known a moment of peace since the last 2500 years. Likewise, when the Jews managed to conquest Jerusalem again in 1948, their decision to not annihilate all the Palestinian (Muslims) who were living in this city and in this entire region including burning all their books, monuments, or any trace to them, etc., has left mankind once again unable to have peace in this social space of the world since the last 70 years.

As the above example shows, the reliance on wars to create political, economic and social reset is not sufficient if the violence that would be employed does not also reset the power of the will or history. In other words, we cannot prevent today that a person decides to revenge the

killing of Jesus by going ahead and killing a Jew if the Catholic Church insists on keeping the history written the way it has it described in the New Testament. In other words, even if the Jews provoked the killing of Jesus, planting in the head of newborns that their God was crucified by a racial faction that they also compete against is nothing but evidence to support why the Catholic Church is enticing violence in the world instead of peace.

Most importantly, the danger of wars is that it is not possible to know while the fighting is on-going who would be the final victor. In other words, it is just as the case is like in horse racing, the race doesn't always go to the swift. One must wait to the end to know who would be the final victor.

For example, during the Vietnam War, the Tet Offensive is regarded as the largest military campaign of the Vietnam War.⁸⁴ This offensive was fought in three phases with each phase lasting between 1 to 2 months. The United States and its allies won this offensive that the North Vietnamese People's Army launched, but for the American to make this offensive tilt on their side, it was required that 200,000 more American soldiers and activation of the reserve during this very short time interval.

Military analysts claim that the Americans re-evaluated if indeed they would like to continue to push to defeat the North Vietnamese People's Army after this victory that was very costly, and some even claim that the US sought negotiations to end the war afterwards.

Two lessons can be drawn from the Tet Offensive. The first is the price that a person (or a nation) wants to pay to achieve goals that no one knows if they are right or wrong. In other words, no one can tell if the Vietnam war was not fought, if this country would have been better off if it remained communist or switched into becoming democratic. What we do know is that in 1990 Communism collapsed. This means that if the unitary government which control Vietnam (i.e., Marxist-Leninist) presently agrees to relinquish control of the regime to the voting public, the people in this country would be inclined to be a federalist because this form of government is more close to being democratic. The second,

⁸⁴ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Tet_Offensive

and the most important lesson that we can draw, is that before the Tet military offensive that the North Vietnamese People's Army launched, the military leaders in the United States and the US political leaders were assuring the American public that the North Vietnamese were incapable to launch military operations of this magnitude.

In the bible, the book of Ecclesiastes explores that in life no person can control anything. If it is not possible to control anything, then it would be of no benefit to the most powerful families/dynasties to wage on the potential of increasing death rates (wars) to create a political, social and economic reset, if this tactic is not taking to the point of obliterating genetically and historically the trace of any human race that would be rivaling. Actually, the conflict that exists between the Israeli and the Palestinian since 1948 serve as a small scale theater of the larger bigger social problem that needs to be resolved. That is also to say that if the most powerful families/dynasties do not know how to resolve the Israeli Palestinian conflict, they would not be able to resolve any political or economic problem that challenges the international order.

Then again, I strongly believe that the most powerful families/dynasties would not be able to prevent wars if the intergovernmental organization named United Nations is not resized (reset) as happened to the League of Nations, and returned to function as per the coordination role that the founding fathers of the UN programmed that this global council be created to serve while governments are developing the necessary understanding of themselves, thus enabling them to better translate the knowledge that they would be gaining into politics that would operate neither as a tyranny nor a democracy.

Put simply, the founding fathers of the UN did not recommend to the families/dynasties who won WW2 that the international intergovernmental organization named United Nations begin to provide political, economic and social solutions to prepare nations to attain the UN goals faster, but to let governments be the one doing it and at their own pace. In other words, the founding fathers of the UN proposed that governments develop their own curriculum and train themselves on how to cooperate based on the principles proclaimed in the UN charter, and then in passing the understanding of themselves that they gained to their

successors. In other words, do as the American people did in the United States from 1776 to 1945.

However, for one reason or another, the families/dynasties who won WW2 (the victors of WW2) decided to supersede this recommendation that the founding fathers of the UN suggested to them on what they must do to continue to solidify their powers and attain the ends stipulated in the UN Charter. The families/dynasties who won WW2 granted rights to the United Nations (international organization) to interfere in the political, economic and social status of nations, that was not very different from the one that they granted to the five permanent members of the United Nations Security Council. The families/dynasties who won WW2 tasked the United Nations (international organization) to create new agencies and to embed them in the social order to provide to all the governments and common people in all UN member states political, economic and social solutions to speed the preparedness of both (i.e., government, and people) to attain the ends stipulated in the UN charter. The UN system is now composed of hundreds of organizations and hundreds of thousands of employees who are all interfering in the political, economic and social system of nations at all levels. The majority of those UN organizations are self-financed. In other words, they compete for money just as private companies do it on the outside of the UN fence. The only difference is that all the UN agencies are granted privileges and immunities. In other words, those UN agencies are perfect tools to launder money in the name of good, and an ideal tool to achieve political corruption because they are an economic operator who operate just like the Vatican under no political jurisdiction, and while running its own political courts.

The families/dynasties who won WW2 did not want to stop at letting the United Nations (international organization) interfere in the political, economic and social status of nations only, but they added tasking the United Nations (international organization) with ending injustice and poverty in all its form on earth. In other words, the families/dynasties who won WW2 tasked the United Nations (international organization) to promote programs that its planned activities should be oriented toward reaching that humans begin to cooperate based on the equality of outcomes and not the equality of opportunity. The new date that keep on getting postponed to end poverty and injustice on earth by the UN

system is set for 2030. In other words, the families/dynasties who won WW2 tasked on our behalf the United Nations (international organization) to see that by 2030 (i) all humans achieve the ends stipulated in the UN Charter, and (ii) all humans have access to material things or justice on equal basis!

As the above shows, there is no correlation between what the founding fathers of the UN asked the families/dynasties who won WW2 to have governments and the United Nations (international organization) oversee and what the families/dynasties who won WW2 tasked the United Nations (international organization) to start doing. In other words, we have no way of knowing how this switch in the job description of the United Nations (international organization) from being a coordinating agent to being the lead pilot in the attainment of the old and new UN goals is affecting the evolution of the international postwar order.

It would be naïve to assume that all the officials who are employed at the UN have been all drawn by the idea of seeing that good triumph over evil. This means that a good number of those employees are working at the UN because it is a way to get them out of their deprivation. Likewise, this also means that there are a good number of employees who are promoting the idea of good at this international organization not necessarily so the world become a safer place but rather to transform the conditions and outcomes that matters to them only.

Furthermore, hence it would be also naïve to assume that the families/dynasties who are refusing to relinquish control to the voting public of their regime in the different UN member states that such action is not programmed so their heirs become the first benefactor of their wealth, power, or status, this means that those heirs would not be able to get their way easily if the UN system is preaching ideas that seek to end poverty in all its form or reduce the gap between the rich and the poor at the same time. If we consider that there are lots of UN employees who are working at this international organization not necessarily because they care if good triumph over evil or the other way around, this means that there is a good chance that the heirs of the families/dynasties who won WW2 be resized by the UN employee (and their supporters) in the same way the followers of Christ managed to

resize the Roman Empire when this authority allowed Christianity to thrive in Rome.

Therefore, since the challenges that are confronting mankind are not only about how to prevent that the United States collapse, or about how to get the families/dynasties who refuse to relinquish control to the voting public of their regime to start doing it, but most importantly, how to ensure that the intergovernmental organization named United Nations does not use the idea of good as a tool to resize everyone as the Catholic Church did during the Roman Empire, and then began to direct its violence at everyone else, it becomes very important that the most powerful families/dynasties and the United States do not be resized. This is because the understanding that those people (the victors of WW2) gained of themselves to accept that the idea of liberal interventionism and self-determination be used as a mean to establish democracy and the rule of law is the final norm that mankind could depend on “for the development of a full and complete structure of a world order under law.”

Moreover, since the families/dynasties who won WW2, tasked the United Nations (international organization) with seeing that in 2030 (i) all humans achieve the ends stipulated in the UN charter, and (ii) all poverty and injustice eradicated in all its form, and we know that theoretically those two goals cannot be accomplished at the same time, because it would be useless to ask people to share outcomes on equal rights before developing friendly relations first, this new work program that the families/dynasties who won WW2 tasked the United Nations (international organization) with pursuing could be building to provoke a class struggle which could escalate into a world revolution.

Man is known to be specie that is able to give up on pursuing goals that brings no benefit, but then again, man has been since its appearance on earth working to reengineer (redesign) the universe. However, hence the ideas that the book of Ecclesiastes in the bible explores cannot be taken lightly, and on top of that, we have no way of knowing, or of verifying if the solutions that the United Nations (international organization) is providing and is reporting on them are really transforming the world to the better as this international organization claims is really what is happening in the world, it becomes important to check if this is really

the case. This is because if the other way around was the case, the most powerful families/dynasties could not be wagering on their strength and stability becoming reverted to a simpler form (i.e., becoming absorbed by the United Nations (international organization) as the Catholic Church absorbed the Roman Empire), but on something that is more precious than that. This is the destruction of this present civilization. This is because when the Catholic Church was using the ideas of Christ to solidify its power leading to the collapse of the Roman Empire, the families/dynasties who were controlling this religion were not asking people to stop to be tolerant if their government does not increase their happiness, but they were asking people to be doing the opposite.

In the social sciences, unintended consequences are defined as outcomes that are not the ones always foreseen, or intended by an action.⁸⁵ I have no way of knowing why the families/dynasties who won WW2 (the most powerful families/dynasties) embarked on pursuing aspirations that aims to end poverty and injustice in all its forms, which are goals that achieves nothing but energizes an individual to achieve the opposite (rival because two people cannot fill the same void space).

“The Magic Turns on the Magician” is an old Arabic expression that literally means that sometimes plans and actions backfires. I have no way of knowing if the decision of the families/dynasties who won WW2 (the victors of WW2) to embark on pursuing aspirations that achieves nothing but energizes an individual to achieve the opposite is part of a plot conceived to divide and conquer, or if the complex political reality that emerged in the world is a result of unintended consequences.

Then again, the families/dynasties who won WW2 (the most powerful families) do not take risks on matters that can destabilize their strength and stability. In other words, the most powerful families/dynasties know that no king or ruler in the history of the world pursued aspirations that are equivalent to the one that they granted right to the United Nations (international organization) as of 1945. Likewise, the most powerful families know that all attempts that were tried to end poverty or injustice

⁸⁵[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Unintended_consequences#:~:text=In%20the%20social%20sciences%2C%20unintended,are%20not%20intended%20or%20foreseen.&text=Perverse%20result%3A%20A%20perverse%20effect,solution%20makes%20a%20problem%20worse\).](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Unintended_consequences#:~:text=In%20the%20social%20sciences%2C%20unintended,are%20not%20intended%20or%20foreseen.&text=Perverse%20result%3A%20A%20perverse%20effect,solution%20makes%20a%20problem%20worse).)

on a small-scale failed. Simply put, no king or ruler in the history of the world tasked his chiefs to legitimize programs that are intended to end poverty and injustice in all its form in the realm when it is the natural and legal rights that the king and his chiefs are imposing is what causes the fear that dependents know in the first place.

Given the strong ambiguity between how kings and rulers ruled or maintained their strength and security before WW2 erupted, and how the present kings and rulers are going about achieving the same goal post 1945, I plan to check if the ambitions that the most powerful families/dynasties are pursuing are driven by convictions or if they are ideas strategies that are well thought. This will help me to understand better if all the insecurity that emerged in the world post 1945 is due to the most powerful families/dynasties testing with a new social order that its outcome could end this historical dynamic that mankind has known, or if it would provoke a class struggle which could escalate into a world revolution if it is not stopped. This should also help me to understand if the most powerful families/dynasties would be able to avoid embroiling mankind in a new global war to create a new balance. Most importantly, this analysis will help me to understand if letting peace and security continue to deteriorate as the case has been like since 1945 is aiding the most powerful families/dynasties to solidify their power, or if it is accelerating their demise.