

# **The Cost of Blind Policy**

**Will the short-sighted policies of the  
United Nations compel the poor  
to trample the victors of WW2  
under their feet?**

**Salim Maloof, Ph.D.**

Copyright 2022 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 Cost of Blind Policy, 2022

This is a work of non-fiction.

Salim Maloof  
The Cost of Blind Policy

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

*In memory of Josephine Nehme Maalouf*

# 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  
Definitions

## PREFACE

### **The Cost of Blind Policy**

1. Analysis

22

# **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 the United Nations) in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC). He expressed reservations against UNOPS approving a project in the DRC, which UNOPS negotiated directly with the Prime Minister.

The government of the Democratic Republic of the Congo was going to finance the general organization named the 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 that received the money becomes accountable to the United Nations. And since each UN agency runs its own legal and auditing house, it is easy to fix the paperwork to make everything legally clean. The project involved opening 2000 km 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, his supervisors told him 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 he succeeds in growing the Sudan Office in Sudan, the organization will help him 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 for Sudan.

However, a 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 to the decision of the Department for International Development (Dfid) [now called the Foreign Commonwealth & Development Office] of the British government to finance a project in Darfur worth 10 million euros, 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 fees after Dfid (the British) made it clear that it was not going to finance this project unless the conditions it was asking for were 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 staff.

While on administrative leave and before UNOPS told this US national what charges were 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 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 had cancelled the investigation. The United Nations did not tell the US national what charges were 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 and health insurance, including offering him a new two-year 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 requires any staff member 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 and denied him the right to any claim because he did not question within 60 days the decision of the organization named United Nations placing him on administrative leave and waited until his supervisors informed him that they had cancelled the investigation to put into question his rights. 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 cost him his right to any claim! 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 wants people to stop being tolerant to have any rights and wants them to be intolerant!

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

In the year 2022, the corruption ring of those UN managers who were using the UN as a cover to do their evil work in the name of truth and good and who ganged on this UN staff member because he refused to trade his self-interests for the values included in the UN Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights was exposed and

dismantled. Instead of UN member states requesting that those UN managers be imprisoned with the UN Judges who were protecting them, they were fine with the UN ending the contract of those UN managers while keeping all their wealth, health insurance and UN pensions. Likewise, instead of UN member states requesting that the United Nations Secretary General reopen the case of this UN staff member so he could be remunerated for all the pain that they put this UN staff member through because he refused to take part in their wicked plots, the UN member states believe that if they let this intergovernmental organization keep this case in the garbage basket of history, the United Nations would be preserving their power, wealth, and status.

Throughout history, people with considerable power have been denying the weak right, and so the way the intergovernmental organization named the 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 personalities 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 at 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 signifies 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 that control the United States (the custodians of the idea of freedom) and the families/dynasties that won WW2 (the custodians of the

Anglosphere) could continue to transform the conditions and outcomes that matter to them while the administrators of the United Nations (the 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 aforementioned powerful families/dynasties should amend the UN Charter thus granting any person whom the general organization named the United Nations victimized the right to have his case heard in civil courts, and in this way avoiding that the United Nations (organization) continue to disintegrate their power until a new authority absorbs them and starts 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 II.

This work was not prepared to criticize the social order that ensued in the aftermath of WW2, or any government that came to power in the aftermath of this global war. This work is also not intended to provide any UN member states with ideas on what their leaders, thinkers, or populace should be doing or not be doing to prevent conflicts or strengthen peace. Likewise, the purpose of this work is not to share a view on how to social engineer the world to give the best results, nor was it 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 that control the international order or the money supply of the world) granted rights to the international intergovernmental organization named the 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 the United Nations could revert to a simpler form as 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 staff 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 the 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) is 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, which 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 forms by 2030 (or at any later date in the future), and most importantly, letting this authority be in charge of such a dossier on the maintenance of the security and power of the families/dynasties that won WW2 are 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 are the intentions of the author to criticize the performance of any UN member state, regime, government, or ideology, including who governments decide should live or die or whether mankind should go back to adopting 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 world is composed of 193 UN member states. This means there are today 193 different political (and economic) systems whose architecture does not resemble each other. In principle, all the UN member states are supposed to be strengthening democracy and the

rule of law using 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). 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. It is very important that readers who originate from countries mentioned in this work, such as Lebanon and others, know 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.

The author's 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 that control the international order or the money supply of the world) to prevent wars between, nations including failure to make people surrender their 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), which the different UN member states created in 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 are 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.

While reading this book, one should bear in mind that the author recognizes that many UN staff 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 contributions to deepening peace and security in the world. The progress the United Nations (hereinafter the organization) has made to contribute to human development is impressive. The purpose of the author is not to discredit the efforts or achievements of the UN staff 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 staff also know that after the victors of WW2 (the families/dynasties that control the international order or the money supply of the world) approved that the United Nations (the organization) become an economic operator, 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 livelihoods, just as Ferdinand II, King of Aragon, and his wife Queen Isabella I of Castile were doing in the late 15<sup>th</sup> century / early 16<sup>th</sup> century in western Europe. Those bad apples at the UN (supervisors) are not able to balance their interests against the interests of the common good because they are not working in their roles to satisfy the best interests of society only but to deepen their own. The disregard and contempt that UN supervisors and UN judges are prompting could compel people to lose faith in this institution, thus deepening fear and want and 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 that 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 already mentioned in religious scriptures.

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 say 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 prioritize the idea of good and then thinking that the idea of good could be used to solidify one's 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 in the aftermath of World War II in order to let technology (machinery) do the lion's 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 that 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 way despite the resistance of others.

While reading this book, one should 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 put 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 analyzed were solely used because I felt they contained ideas that could aid me in comprehending better if the decision of the victors of World War II (i.e., the families/dynasties that control the international order or the money supply of the world) to act contrary to what those chosen scriptures counseled 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.

# 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 exercises their power by 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 control 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 did not connect to this wire to have light. In theory, the members of this club can only be the families/dynasties that 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., the idea of God) as a tool to solidify their power. The elites (the families/dynasties control the international order or the money supply of the world) preserve their power 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 that provide legal functionality for the architecture that the elite families/dynasties that won WW2 want every member of the human family to respect. In other words, those five nations are the countries that legitimize the social contract (natural and legal rights) that the victors of WW2 want all people to respect. In principle, those five countries are a group of rich and poor nations that the families/dynasties that won WW2 want other societies to consider their opinions before taking action of their own. The families/dynasties that control the five permanent nations of the UN Security Council are not necessarily the families/dynasties that control the international order and the money supply of the world.

*Rich nations (rich countries):* This word shall refer to the countries that provide financial functionality for the architecture that the elite families/dynasties that won WW2 want every member of the human family to respect. In other words, they are the countries that 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 that won WW2 used to make those countries their home bases. The principal job of the government in those rich nations is to induce the atmosphere that will determine which 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 that determine which nation has power or wealth and which one is engulfed in instability.

*Nations that won WW2:* This word shall refer to the western European monarchs and republics. It was the Old Powers (the western European monarchs and republics) who fought during WW1 and WW2 and they were the ones who won those two global wars. In real life, no society, kingdom, or nation that waged a war and won gave its spoils to another society or kingdom. In addition, the western European monarchs and kingdoms started working to build wealth, power, and status at the start of the 2<sup>nd</sup> millennium and did not start to build military before WW1 or WW2 erupted. The global policeman of the world role that the United States started playing in 1945 is regarded in this work as a functional role that was delegated to this country by the families/dynasties that control the monarchs and republics in western Europe. In other words, the United States is fronting on behalf of the families/dynasties that control the western European monarchies and republics, just as law enforcement agents front for the families/dynasties that control governments in any country.

*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 determines and enforces 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 acquires gets determined by the families/dynasties that won WW2 through the rich nations. In other words, the families/dynasties that won WW2 decide which country to inject money into to increase its productivity, might, etc., 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 as a 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 that won WW2. The United States is viewed as a satellite state that the rich countries and the powerful families/dynasties control. In the aftermath of WW2, the families/dynasties that won this global war took on the global policeman responsibility that Great Britain was playing until 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 that won WW2 wanted to install or extend in the different UN member states in 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, the Germans, the British, the Americans, the Chinese, the French, the 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, would make fewer people live in fear and want. This shall mean that industrialized nations give the nations whose 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 a 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 them of their power.

*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 the United States; and (ii) the territory located in North America, which is known as United States, and whose 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 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. If the American culture is endangered, later generations could not prosper. Any criticism or compliment expressed shall not mean the need to have this country promote nationalistic ideas intended to deepen the hegemony of this country over the international order, but rather to avoid losing the understanding that the American people have gained of themselves as compared to other societies around the world. This is because it is this understanding (awareness) that led them to be in favor of the idea that the WW2 war aims be to secure that all people live free from fear and want, instead of being in favor of extending domination.

# PREFACE

This book tries to support that it is not the victors of WW2 or the rich who decide where the buck stops but the common people. Accordingly, the work tries to highlight how the policies that non-state actors such as the international organization named the United Nations have been legitimizing and enforcing since 1945 are disenchanting people and pushing them to withdraw their obligation to obey the rich. Most importantly, the work tries to support how the decision of the victors of WW2 to let their critical thinkers and servants (governments and international institutions) break the rules that they are legitimizing and enforcing will prompt citizens to trod them under their feet in the same way rulers and kings were trodden under the feet of their citizens when they permitted their critical thinkers and servants to regard themselves exempt from observing the policies that they were legitimizing.

# 1

## Analysis

---

In 2011, the nations with great power granted the right to NATO to interfere in the Libyan crisis to protect civilians. This quest for a more just and equitable international order by the nations with great power escalated into a hunt that saw the leader of Libya and his family suffering a brutal death. In addition, Libya has remained in a state of total chaos since 2011.

“The buck stops here” is a phrase that was “popularized by US President Harry S. Truman, who kept a sign with this phrase on his desk in the Oval Office.” It would be erroneous to say that the “buck stops” with the rulers (leaders) who had granted the right to NATO at the United Nations Security Council to interfere in the Libyan crisis, because public officials get elected into their positions after they express a desire to be interested in serving all other living beings. That is to say, the people who help candidates be elected into positions of leadership have a greater say over the way hierarchy is embedded than the individuals holding an actual position of power. The failure of the United States and NATO (the world's biggest military) to get their ways in the nations in which they resorted to force to improve democratic movements and institutions in the last 70 years, or even to improve their own power in them, shows that “the buck” does not stop with whoever possesses military might or wealth only, but “the buck” stops when “the poor” decide or say it should stop also. The insurgents who fought the United States and NATO in Afghanistan, Iraq, Libya, Syria, etc., or the ones who are now fighting Saudi Arabia and its allies in Yemen are not using military gear or relying on military equipment (drones, F15, F150, F500, S400 or S1400). Those fighters are wearing “slippers” or sandals, and their only weapon is their conviction.

Therefore, since “The buck” appears to stop where “The wealthy” or where “The poor” says it should “stop”, and not with the individuals who “The wealthy” or “The poor” appoint to legitimize and enforce parameters for everyday behavior, we can say that only those two principal categories of social dimensions wield limitless power. They are the ones who decide who should control the money supply of the world and who should control the international order. For this reason, each side or mass dreads and fears the other. In other words, each side decides who is to be put to death, be spared, be promoted, or be humbled, just as King Nebuchadnezzar was in antiquity, doing according to the Book of Daniel.

In addition, we can also say that those two social dimensions (the wealthy and the poor) are both working to control the patrons (the numerous governments, bodies, institutions, unions, and coalitions) for the benefit of the other. Those two forces (i.e., those two social dimensions) are essentially two forms of personhood. That is to say, they do not conduct any affairs, but they are constantly in the public eye.

All human choices appear to be motivated by the desire to increase happiness (wealth, status, or power). This means that it is not the poor who stand to lose the most if their happiness shrinks but the wealthy.

Let the word “victors of WW2” refer to the families/dynasties who won WW2. Let the word “the families/dynasties who won WW2” refer to the families/dynasties who control the international order or the money supply of the world. In other words, the families/dynasties who control the international order or the money supply of the world are the ones who stand to lose the most if their wealth, status, or power shrinks and their authority is absorbed by another growing power.

Let the word “units of authorities” refer to the different legal entities such as governments or human development organizations such as the UN system, NATO, EU, the World Bank, the IMF, Development Banks, NGO, charities, Foundations, etc. etc., who the victors of WW2 (the families/dynasties who won WW2) depend on to solidify their power or to continue to control the international order or the money supply of the world.

In addition, let the word “patrons” refer to the rulers and political class, judges and law enforcement officers, thinkers and writers, soldiers, politicians, administrators, or spokespersons who the victors of WW2 (the families/dynasties who won WW2) depend on at the different “units of authorities” to transform the conditions and outcomes that matter to them, including reducing fear and want to ensure lasting peace. In other words, those patrons are the “agents of change.”

People were not granted the right to predict the future. This means that we cannot say that the victors of WW2 can predict the future. If no person could have predicted the way the Libyan leader and his family were going to be dehumanized by the Libyans, NATO, and the United Nations (the people), this means that no person including the families/dynasties who won WW2, knows if they could face the same fate. However, what we do know is that, if the Libyan leader and his “patrons” were leading by example, their actions would not have compelled the Libyans, NATO, and the United Nations (the people) to trample them under their feet as they trodded the Iraqi leader in 2003.

It is important to keep in mind that the above-mentioned paragraph should not be construed to mean that other leaders rule by example. Only children and monks do not use wealth, power, and status to increase their happiness and to deny others access to water, food, mates, and created things. The Libyan leader widened or broadened his spheres without deepening his military might at the same time. He, therefore, had lots of enemies inside Libya and in neighboring countries. His powerlessness to be able to defend all the disregard that he was compelling made him become vulnerable.

I have no way of knowing if this abnormal rise in contempt and disregard that appears to have swept the world as of 1945 is due to people's persistent disillusionment with the way the patrons of the families/dynasties who won WW2 are going about securing that the power, wealth, and status of those powerful families/dynasties does not shrink, including increasing the happiness of all other living beings. However, one thing is for sure; if all the units of authorities or patrons who the families/dynasties who won WW2 are depending on

their wisdom to continue to transform the conditions and outcomes that matter to them are not giving order to chaos, then this moral degradation that appears to have swept the world would not have occurred.

Furthermore, since this moral degradation that appear to have swept the world in recent years would have not occurred if it was not for all the mediocre and short-sighted policies and ambitions of those agents of change (patrons) who the families/dynasties who won WW2 are depending on to solidify their powers (minus the role the United States is playing in this exercise for reasons which I justify later in this work); we can say, that if the civilizing mission which the families/dynasties who won WW2 are adopting continue to decay the social order, that its drawbacks harbor outcomes that would not be any different than the one the Libyan and the Iraqi leader confronted on the hands of their dependents, NATO and the United Nations (people with the UN system, EU, World Bank, IMF, Development Banks, NGO, charities, Foundations, etc. etc.).

That is to say, instead of the agents of change (patrons) or units of authorities who the victors of WW2 are depending on their wisdom to help them to continue to get their way despite the resistance of others (i.e., lead them to the promised land), the families/dynasties who won WW2 could be permitting those patrons and units of authorities (minus the role the United States is playing in this exercise for reasons that I justify later in this work) to lead them with mankind to start to wander as happened to the Israelites until they agreed to give order to wisdom instead of chaos.

According to the Bible, Moses did not live to enter the promised land, but Joshua, who was in Moses's service, led the Israelites until reaching their final destination. That is to say, the heirs of Moses (his two children) did not inherit Moses's power, status, or wealth after his death. Hence all the disarray that has engulfed the world in recent years can only be due to people scrambling to determine who could have a greater say in governance to trickle afterwards his power, status and wealth to designated individuals, and not necessarily to get to the promised land (reduce fear and want); I plan in this work to understand if this existential anxiety agenda which the families/dynasties who

won WW2 decided to give order to its tenets in the aftermath of WW2 is helping their heirs to inherit their power, wealth and status, or if their patrons (i.e., rulers and political class, judges and law enforcement officers, UN system, NATO, EU, World Bank, IMF, Development Banks, NGO, charities, Foundations, etc. etc.). are preparing the ground so their heirs face the same fate that the rulers of the Roman Empire endured in antiquity (when the ideas of Jesus were exploited) or the Libyan leader and the Iraqi leader in modern history.

“Survival of the fittest” is a term that appeared in the work of British naturalist Charles Darwin in 1869. Humans began to rely on this concept to make the weakest consider the opinion of the strongest long before Charles Darwin popularized it.

People persuade each other to obey through relying on tools or through the intermediary of the human body (reason or dexterity).

Initially, in the early days of human history, the fittest relied on dexterity to make the weakest consider their opinion. However, as people were getting civilized, the strong and the weak began to rely on new methods such as religion (reason) and science (tools) to determine who can subjugate (dominate) the other faster.

The efforts that the fittest or the weak have exhausted to make the meeker surrender freedom to the cleverest through the use of science (tools) or religion (reason) have been elusive so far.

There is a reason for the failure of the fittest to make the weak consider the opinion of the strongest before taking action. This reason cannot be due to arguments related to change, over confidence, uncertainty, risks, lack of collective reality, etc., because Heraclitus, an ancient pre-Socratic philosopher, told us more than 2500 years ago that “No man ever steps in the same river twice, for it's not the same river and he's not the same man.” Likewise, the reason cannot be due to the world being filled with injustice, greed, etc. The book of Ecclesiastes in the Bible told us that nothing has been ultimately reliable since 450 BC already.

That is to say, the history of the world did not start in the aftermath of WW2 (i.e., when the victors of WW2 decided to make the WW2 war aims about how to improve social justice to reduce fear and want) or with our own cohort, so we pretend that we do not know what is uncertainty (flood, earthquake), or evil (greed and injustice), and the like. The Bible is the oldest written document that exists. The story of the flood (i.e., uncertainty) is the first drastic story in the Bible after the story of the creation of the world. Likewise, the story of Cain and Abel (i.e., greed) is another account that comes immediately before the story of the flood.

Hence, in theory, we cannot attribute or blame this abnormal rise in senselessness that swept the world in recent years to uncertainty, greed, or frailty of certainty, because everyone seems to know that we live in a non-linear world for the exception of the victors of WW2 (the families/dynasties who won WW2), and the patrons of the different units of authorities who the families/dynasties who won WW2 depend on or invited to help them to get their ways despite the resistance of others in the aftermath of WW2 faster; we can say that all the questions of values, moral behavior, and right conduct that people are still questioning to this day are nothing but an extension of the same insecurity that existed before WW2 erupted. In other words, all the intolerance that people are exhibiting is a result of the mistakes and short-sighted policies and ambitions of the families/dynasties who won WW2.

Furthermore, since we cannot say that the disregard and contempt that has swept the world since 1945 is due to the victors of WW2 lacking a work program to preserve world peace (i.e., exercise a minimum level of control), we can say that all the brutality, demonstrations, marches, civil disobedience, civil resistance, political censorship, political regression, police brutality, etc., etc., that every member of the human family is obliged to put up with to improve accountability or democratic legitimacy in recent years signify that the victors of WW2 (and only the victors of WW2) are giving order to chaos instead of giving order to wisdom. In other words, the families/dynasties who won WW2 (i.e., the families/dynasties who control the international order and the money supply of the world) refuse to be patient or grateful.

In fact, the decision of the victors of WW2 to let the poor (the weak) in recent years have a say in how the wars they wage to deny specifically each other or the poor (the weak) the right to improve their lives or increase their happiness is evidence to support that we should never underestimate human stupidity on matters of governance. Indeed, this increased indifference to the danger of letting propaganda play a role in influencing the poor by the families/dynasties of WW2 on matters of governance in recent years, knowing that law and political order are not natural but human creations, clearly shows that the powerful families/dynasties are shooting from the hip as of 1945.

Actually, to show how the families/dynasties of WW2 are inviting the poor to strip them from their power, wealth, and status, including even putting the fate of the entire humanity under a great threat, let us consider this example. The founding fathers of the UN did not counsel the victors of WW2 to create new units of authorities in the aftermath of WW2 that have supranational power to harmonize the actions of nations in parallel to the intergovernmental organization named the United Nations. The European Commission is a new unit of authority that the victors of WW2 approved to be created in the aftermath of WW2 to act independently toward the best interest of UN member states based in Europe.

The primary tasks of the European Commission are to propose new laws, including negotiation of international treaties. In 1945, “The People” of the world agreed to combine efforts to strengthen collective peace and security. “The People” did not agree in 1945 to have the Africans, Europeans, Asians, Arabs, etc., posteriorly create new commissions so their patrons start to formulate and enforce policies specific for the people of Africa, Europe, Asia, the Arabs, etc.

Most importantly, “The People” in 1945 did not grant the victors of WW2 (i.e., the families/dynasties who control the international order and the money supply of the world) the right to approve arbitrarily (unilaterally) ideas that have the potential to threaten mankind or the human progress. That is to say, “The People” did not grant the victors of WW2 the right to approve on their behalf that the Europeans work

to label nuclear energy, as green energy as they started doing at the European Commission at the start of 2022.

Since the dawn of time, the fittest have managed to find legal solutions to business and trade issues. The likelihood of the fittest at the European Commission arriving to classify nuclear energy as being environmentally sustainable should not be a very difficult task to do. Everyone knows that the rich work for their self-interests and super profits. In other words, many people know that the European Commission can easily channel tax money to legitimize a way for private investors to fund the construction of new nuclear plants or for shareholders in companies that produce equipment used in the nuclear industry to expand.

Surely, the victors of WW2 and their patrons have vast wealth, power, and status and therefore can maintain their elusive dominance by any means possible. At the same time, one cannot stop his own curiosity from pushing him into wanting to comprehend the logic around certain decisions that the families/dynasties who won WW2 have been taking since 1945, especially when one tries to scrutinize them to understand how they were distilled and always reaches the conclusion that they are irresponsible judgements or short-sighted policies. In other words, they do not conduce to the families/dynasties who won WW2 (or their heirs) continuing to get their way despite the resistance of others.

To put it differently, the families/dynasties who won WW2 and their thinkers and writers, soldiers, politicians, administrators, or spokespersons have no way of knowing if everything is ordered in time or not. In other words, we have no way of knowing if the reason why the rich or the poor refuse to be patient or to be thankful is because everything is ordered in time (i.e., programmed by a creator) or not. Let us suppose that there is no creator to this world who subjects us and everything around us to time. That is to say, subject us to all the hatred and malice that nest in the hearts of people.

The Fukushima Daiichi nuclear plant in Japan was commissioned in 1971. The families/dynasties who control Japan knew the threat nuclear energy posed before approving construction of the Fukushima Daiichi nuclear plant. Nonetheless, the families/dynasties who control

Japan listened to their thinkers and writers, soldiers, politicians, administrators, or spokespersons and went ahead with construction. We all read in the news about the lives that were lost (people displaced, dreams wiped out) during the 2011 tsunami in Japan. According to reporters, a good number of people died from radiation when the gigantic wave flooded the nuclear reactors at the plant, and a large area around the Fukushima nuclear power plant will be uninhabitable for at least 100 years. Let us not concern ourselves in this work with asking to find out about who was made to answer for the lives lost or the thousands of people who were displaced from their homes in Japan, and focus on answering another question.

The old powers (western European nations) fought among one another during World War Two to determine who could make the weakest consider the opinion of the fittest. The old powers are based in Europe. Many questions beg answers. Hydrologists and seismologists tell us that the 500-year, 1000-year, or 10,000-year earthquake or flood is a real probability. Common sense dictates that the families/dynasties who control Europe should be busy dismantling the nuclear plants that are already in operation in Europe to avoid converting this populated territory into becoming like Chernobyl today, a deserted social space (from radioactivity released) in case of a disaster. Strangely, the families/dynasties who control Europe are not dismantling the nuclear plants that are already in operation in Europe but are permitting the European Commission to approve that new nuclear plants be built in Europe so the natural world has a greater say in how their power, wealth, or status would be dealt with in the future.

As the aforementioned example shows, we cannot say that if a natural disaster were to strike Europe today and a vast area of land around one of the nuclear power plants that are in operation would become affected (leak radioactivity) and would become uninhabitable for at least the next 100 years, that such an outcome was a result of a rare event or that the families/dynasties who won WW2 did not know that it could occur to plan for it or know about its consequence; but we could say that if such an unfortunate event were to happen in the future, its occurrence would have happened only because the families/dynasties who won WW2 waged on human creativity

(science) and human imagination instead of on wisdom. This is very serious and worrisome.

To put it differently, if we are living in a system (world) in which neither the poor or the rich are prepared to be patient or thankful in it; and the heart of everyone in the system is filled with hatred and malice; and all what the people in the system do is produce ideas or create change to deny each other rights, yet the families/dynasties who won WW2 refuse to recognize that every time they clear an idea which they think that it could be good for the maintenance of their strength and stability (or humanity), what in theory the families/dynasties who won WW2 are also doing is inviting a threat which would be dwelling but in disguise, this means that the more mindful the families/dynasties who won WW2 become about piling up ideas that they believe could be maximizing their power, the more they would be increasing their own fragility simultaneously.

Simply put, there is no difference between the British preventing the Iranians or the Syrians from producing a nuclear weapon and them owning one and having it stored on the island of Great Britain. This is because the British cannot tell if the risk that the Iranians or the Syrians would be posing to their strength or stability if they were to own a nuclear weapon is greater than or less than the risks that an earthquake, flood, or human error poses. Only an event that cannot possibly happen has a probability of zero. Therefore, when the British government agrees to store a nuclear weapon (i.e., build a nuclear plant) in the island of Great Britain, the probability becomes 1 or 50/50. This does not mean that because an earthquake or flood did not strike the island of Great Britain till today, or human error led to a disaster, that this outcome is not going to happen in the future. We just have no way of knowing when it would happen. For example, the families/dynasties who rule Japan learned the hard way when the tsunami struck their island.

If only an event that cannot possibly happen has a probability of zero, then common sense dictates that the families/dynasties who won WW2 be in favor of having nuclear plants built and operated in poor nations so when a disaster strikes, it could not affect their wealth, power, or status. Most importantly, they (the families/dynasties who won WW2)

would be controlling the ideas that have the potential to affect their leadership or authority role as well.

That is to say, if the families/dynasties who won WW2 permitted the European Commission to legitimize nuclear energy as green energy, we know that in doing so, they would be inviting the natural world to also have a greater say in how their wealth, power, and status would be evolving. But, at the same time, we know that the 500-year, 1000-year, or 10,000-year earthquake or flood is an event that occurs only once every 500-year, 1000-year, or 10,000-year usually. In other words, the devastation that the 500-year storm or earthquake encumbers produces this upheaval only once within any 500-year time interval usually.

On the other hand, what is very difficult to comprehend is how the families/dynasties who won WW2 reached that when they allow that 193 nations (with rulers, political class, judges and law enforcement officers) and millions of units of authorities between UN system, NATO, EU, World Bank, IMF, Development Banks, NGO, charities, Foundations, etc. etc., all maintain relationships with them on what they need to be doing to maximize their power in the aftermath of WW2, that such a strategy would not revert them to a simpler form. This is because the ideas (threat) that all those legal entities are posing on their (the families/dynasties who won WW2) strength and stability are not happening only once every 500-years, 1000-years, or 10,000-years, but every day continually - day in and day out.

Hence, we cannot say that the deteriorated state of peace and security in the world is principally due to uncertainty, greed, overpopulation, environmental degradation, etc., etc., as the different patrons of the families/dynasties who won WW2 at the different units of authorities tell us the unpreparedness of people to obey the political and economic order is due to them; we can say that if the families/dynasties who won WW2 were not undermining the limits of human power, the mistakes and short-sighted policies and ambitions that those afore legal entities have been compelling since 1945 would not have occurred. Many questions beg answers. For one, can the families/dynasties who won WW2 prevent their wealth, power, and status, from being absorbed by the people (patrons) who are working at those different units of authorities, supposedly to solidify it, including to reduce fear and

want, if it is no longer them (the families/dynasties who won WW2) who are determining how their wealth, power, and status should progress (evolve) but there are millions of people who are having a greater say in it? Said differently, how are the families/dynasties who won WW2 reaching the conclusion that the people who are supposedly helping them to solidify their power at the different units of authorities, or the common people who are surrendering freedom, are going to be giving order to wisdom and not to chaos if those same units of authorities - who supposedly should be restless to ensure that the poor do not become bound by their personal power and conscience - are teaching the poor to not distrust the rich? In fact, all those units of authorities (i.e., UN system, NATO, EU, World Bank, IMF, Development Banks, NGO, charities, Foundations, etc.) are as of 2015 working to end poverty and injustice in all UN member states by 2030.

If, in theory, only when a person remains changeless in front of change could a person solidify his power, yet the families/dynasties who won WW2 believe that they could continue to get their way despite the resistance of others, while different units of authorities are teaching people to stop coping unless outcomes are shared on equal rights, then one of two scenarios could be true. The first is if the powerful families/dynasties believe they are invincible. The second is if the powerful families/dynasties decided to topple the wealth, power, and status that took their fathers centuries to assemble for them.

To put it differently, when the Christian church was persuading people to change, this movement was not teaching the poor to take but to give. If the families/dynasties who won WW2 believe they can mobilize the entire world to stop tolerating the social injustice that the legal and natural rights which the rich are legitimizing are its principal cause and still expect that people would voluntarily surrender freedom to them, then either those powerful families/dynasties are naïve, or they have no challenge and, therefore, want to take great risks on account of walking out unharmed.

I have no way of knowing which scenario between the aforementioned two could be compelling the families/dynasties who won WW2 to perceive that they could maximize their power while the patrons of different units of authorities are preaching to people about the

importance of participating in the democratic process, but then when people express their dissatisfaction with the performance or effectiveness of rulers or a given unit of authority, they risk becoming depersonalized and perhaps dismembered. What I do know is that a person can only solidify his power either through being a good shepherd or through relying on divide and rule. In addition, humans do not use the idea of good to improve democracy, freedom, rights, etc., but as a tool to dominate each other. Moses told our rulers and political class (judges and law enforcement officers) more than 2500 years ago what they need to be prioritizing to reduce fear and want. That is to say, all that our rulers and political class (judges and law enforcement officers) have been doing since Moses passed away is rewriting what Moses said 2500 years ago differently instead of leading by example so people do not find themselves having to be bound by their personal power and conscience to increase their happiness. Evidently, the biggest challenge to reducing disregard and contempt has been the unpreparedness of leaders and political class to admit that awareness and knowledge are not reversible but irreversible. In other words, the fittest (the rich) refuse to admit that people cannot rewind their cumulative awareness and knowledge in time or purge it. In fact, I strongly believe that only a few leaders managed to take advantage of the awareness and knowledge of their people to increase their own happiness and the happiness of their dependents. For example, Moses (and later Joshua) managed to free people from continuing to live under domination and to reach the promised land, the Rashidun Caliph (from 632 to 661) managed to build a great empire with social justice, and the rulers of the United States (from 1776 to 1945) managed to make citizens prioritize common interests over self-interests, thus becoming the happiest people the world has known despite their internal problems.

On the other hand, what is perplexing about the way peace and security have been evolving in the aftermath of WW2 is that the families/dynasties who ruled the world throughout the second millennium (the past 1000 years) are the same families/dynasties who won WW2, and therefore, by default, they are the ones who continued to rule the world after WW2 was regarded to have ended. The families/dynasties who won WW2 should know better about adopting irresponsible and short-sighted policies (political and economic) in the

aftermath of WW2, especially since the majority of those power houses are weaved or molded together with religious dogma, which has also existed for a long time as well.

To give an example, up until 1945, the western European nations (the fittest) made the weak nations consider their opinion before taking action of their own by keeping a tight control on awareness and education in the countries they were dominating through a system of loyalty built over the years with alliances, nepotism, and money. The rulers or political class in weak nations who refused to obey the old powers (i.e., the western European nations) were either assassinated or crushed militarily. Most importantly, throughout the time that the old powers (i.e., the western European nations) were ruling the world (almost 1000 years), historians do not mention in the literature that the French, British, Dutch, Belgian, Spaniards, etc. created units of authorities such as UN system, NATO, EU, World Bank, IMF, Development Banks, NGO, charities, Foundations, etc. etc., and dispersed the agents of those legal entities into the different societies to teach people about social justice, democracy, freedom, rights, etc. in the hope of this strategy helping them to continue to maximize their power. In addition, as if that was not bad enough, the families/dynasties who won WW2 (i.e., the western European nations) proposed that all those new units of authorities that they created in the aftermath of WW2 to help them to maximize their power and to ensure lasting peace be granted the right to become economic operators and to enjoy privileges and immunities just like them. In other words, the families/dynasties who won WW2 want the officials of the different legal entities who are preaching to the poor about freedom, human rights, social justice, and democracy to be doing it while the agents of those units of authorities (the patrons) are pursuing the full realization of their personality at the same time.

To put it differently, the families/dynasties who started to exploit the teaching of Jesus in the first millennium to solidify their power had the goal of resizing the families/dynasties who were controlling the Roman Empire. As of 1945 we do not have this scenario. As I just said, the families/dynasties who ruled the world throughout the second millennium (the past 1000 years) are the same families/dynasties who won WW2. Therefore, when the families/dynasties who won WW2

grant rights to the officials of the different legal entities that they created themselves and dispersed into the different societies to teach people about social justice, democracy, freedom, rights, etc., what those powerful families/dynasties are doing is inviting those agents to resize them. This is because the agents of those units of authorities are not preaching about freedom, human rights, social justice, democracy, etc., while abandoning the mainstream society, but they are doing it while pursuing the full realization of their personality at the same time. In other words, the agents of those units of authorities are accepting bribes, smuggling, extorting, and trafficking drugs while enjoying privileges and immunities and while operating their own judicial systems!

It looks as if only two solutions can help the families/dynasties who won WW2 to reverse the complex political and economic circumstances they created in the world after they allowed rulers and political class including human development organizations in UN member states, to provide parameters for everyday life while hardly anyone is obeying the work program set forth in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. The first is to engulf the world in a new world war to create a new reset. The second is to be a good shepherd.

On the other hand, if the families/dynasties who won WW2 have been since 1945 acting indifferently toward allowing rulers and political class including human development organizations, to disband the social fabric (i.e., not practicing what they are preaching), this means that the families/dynasties who won WW2 are not regarding the entropy (disregard, contempt, chaos, intolerance, injustice) that people are exhibiting as harboring any threat that could affect their strength and stability, because if this was the case, they would not be giving order to chaos.

In the gospel of Matthew, Jesus warned rulers and political class of letting “salt lose its saltiness,” to avoid that it becomes “good for nothing except to be cast out and trodden under the feet.” Salt is one of the most extremely stable chemicals, and therefore, it is extremely difficult to make it lose its stability. Is the power, wealth, and status of the families/dynasties who won WW2 stable as salt is chemically structured? And thus, they are not afraid if people lose faith in the

international rule-based postwar world order they instituted in the aftermath of WW2 or in being cast out and trodden under the feet?

On the flip side, I cannot think of a tactic that the families/dynasties who won WW2 could be waging on its potential to avoid that people “would cast them out and trodden them under their feet” subsequent to their decision to allow the idea of good (social justice, democracy, rights, etc.) to be exploited for profit, except to suppose that those powerful families/dynasties are counting on the tools that shepherds depend on and use to put flocks on the right path whenever the herd wanders. To keep herds on the right path and not wandering, the shepherd applies goads and pricks.

If the different patrons and units of authorities that the families/dynasties who won WW2 have created in the aftermath of WW2 and depend on to sustain their wealth, status, and power can be regarded as analogous to the instruments that shepherds use to keep herds from wandering and on the right path, then we can say that this abnormal insecurity (injustice, greed, intolerance) that appears to have swept the world recently is the result of one of two outcomes. The first is if the families/dynasties who won WW2 are lacking wisdom. The second is if the patrons of the different units of authorities, which the families/dynasties who won WW2 created and are depending on their wisdom to keep the flock (people) from wandering, are the ones who are lacking this aptitude (i.e., wisdom).

We cannot say that the families/dynasties who won WW2 (i.e., the rightful owners of the international rule-based postwar world order that we all began to cooperate in the aftermath of this global war to secure) are the ones who do not know what is good for humanity, because if this was the case, those families/dynasties would not have made the WW2 war aims to be about how to reduce fear and want.

In other words, since the families/dynasties who won WW2 made the WW2 war aims to be about improving democracy, human rights, and justice through the intermediary of the liberal intervention and the self-determination ideology, we cannot say that those powerful families/dynasties who won WW2 do not know what is good for humanity, because the liberal intervention and self-determination

ideology is the end of the line. That is to say, if people fail to cooperate in the economic and political field based on the liberal intervention and self-determination ideology, mankind needs to go back to practicing pre-1945 dogmas (domination and subjugation). This is because there is no better dogma than the liberal intervention and self-determination ideology to improve democracy, human rights, and justice that mankind knows about.

If the families/dynasties who won WW2 cannot be the ones who do not know what is good for humanity, then the patrons and the different units of authorities who the families/dynasties who won WW2 are depending on their wisdom to solidify their power and ensure lasting peace must be the ones who do not know what is good for humanity.

The world is divided into 193 UN member states. The United States was the only country that, before WW2 erupted, was working on improving democracy, human rights, and justice through the liberal intervention and self-determination ideology, and its citizens were the happiest before WW2 erupted. We cannot say that the rulers and political class in the United States do not know what is good for humanity (i.e., despite all the abuse they are compelling or failure they are stumbling upon since 1945), because all 192 UN member states are cooperating in the economic and political solution to develop the understanding the Americans had reached in 1945.

If we cannot say that the rulers and political class in the United States do not know what is good for humanity despite all the abuse they are compelling or failure they have stumbled upon since 1945 (because the people who live in this country are the happiest even from 1945 till today), we can then say that the world derailed from securing the goals set forth in the UN charter or the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (i.e., reaching the happiness that the Americans knew in 1945) only because rulers and political class (including judges and law enforcement officers) in all the remaining 192 UN member states do not know what is good for humanity (i.e., have no wisdom).

Furthermore, hence all the new units of authorities (UN system, NATO, EU, World Bank, IMF, Development Banks, NGO, charities, Foundations, etc. etc.) who are providing next to governments,

political, social and economic solutions are nationals of those 192 UN member states who I just said appear to lack wisdom, we can say that the families/dynasties who won WW2 decided to preserve their wealth, power, and status, or the ideology that they began to depend on to solidify their power (i.e., the liberal intervention and self-determination ideology) using goads and pricks (i.e., patrons) who possess a shape but not weight. In other words, those agents (patrons) lack understanding of themselves.

In addition, given how in real life, everyday one (1) Shepherd while carrying one (1) goad or one (1) prick takes flock out from the sheep pens and bring them back safely to it at the end of the day, and the families/dynasties who won WW2 (the Shepherd) decided to have millions of goads and pricks between UN member state (193) and human development organization such as UN system, NATO, EU, World Bank, IMF, Development Banks, NGO, charities, Foundations (10 million minimum) doing it, but without any one of those patrons who all think they know what is good for humanity practicing what they are preaching on this journey (for the exception of the United States); we can say that the type of self-help which the families/dynasties who won WW2 are relying on to ensure that their own wealth, status and power does not get reverted to a simpler form is non-classical. In other words, the offensive and defensive tenets that the families/dynasties who won WW2 are relying on to solidify their power post 1945 are not ones that incorporate assumptions considered central in the three most prominent political schools of thought (i.e., realism, liberalism, and constructivism) on how relations produce gains or losses. This is because in none of those three schools of thought are the causal and the constitutive properties one and the same.

Since this abnormal wave of insecurity that swept the world does not appear to be part of reformism which could produce a qualitative social system, because human choices seem to be motivated for the desire for happiness, and people legitimize natural and legal rights specifically to deny each other access to happiness, we can say that as more and more people continue to distrust the international rule based postwar world order which the families/dynasties laid out at the end of WW2, the more people's preoccupation would shift toward relying on the different legal entities which they create and depend on to get their

ways despite the resistance of others to improve their self-interests and not the common interests.

If the longer the families/dynasties who won WW2 tolerate this upheaval that engulfed the world after they allowed rulers and political class (including judges and law enforcement officers), and human development organizations such as UN system, NATO, EU, World Bank, IMF, Development Banks, NGO, charities, Foundations, etc. etc., consider themselves exempt from the appeal which the founding fathers of the UN suggested they obey to reduce fear and want, the more the gradual changes that would be ensuing in the social order would be weakening the wealth, status and power of the families/dynasties who won WW2 rather than to maximize it; then the powerful families who won WW2 could be subjecting their power, wealth and status to unquantifiable uncertainty by favoring giving order to chaos instead of wisdom.

To put it differently, pruning in horticulture is “the removal or reduction of parts of a plant, tree, or vine that are not requisite to growth or production, are no longer visually pleasing, or are injurious to the health or development of the plant.” This signifies that if the families/dynasties who won WW2 continue to permit rulers and political class (including judges and law enforcement officers), and human development organizations continue to adopt injurious strategies to the health or development of the people, thus compelling people to give order to chaos, the families/dynasties who won WW2 could stumble on the problem that Jesus says happens when seeds fall among thorns. In the parable of the Sower, Jesus tells us that when seed (i.e., the families/dynasties who won WW2) falls among thorns (rulers and political class, judges and law enforcement officers, and human development organizations), and the thorns grow up, there is a good chance that the thorns choke the seed, and it will yield no grain.

I have no way of knowing if the intolerance (corruption, deceit, betrayal) that has swept the world in recent years is because the thorns that are growing are starting to choke the families/dynasties who won WW2 and the liberal intervention and self-determination ideology, which the powerful families/dynasties depend on to solidify their power. What I do know is that all the patrons and different units of

authorities stand to gain if the families/dynasties who won WW2 are resized or if the United States is reverted to a simpler form. And so, if Jesus's claim in the parable of the Sower is true, then the upheaval or turmoil that has engulfed the world in recent years cannot be indicative of the families/dynasties who won WW2 maximizing their power but rather a sign that their power is shrinking. In other words, in the same way heat can break the stability of salt, the decision of the families/dynasties who won WW2 to deviate away from the work program which the founding fathers of the UN counselled them to remain faithful to its principles to maintain their strength and stability (i.e., this was to have governments provide political and economic solutions in UN member states only) and to begin to give birth to new nations, and new units of authorities (UN system, NATO, EU, World Bank, IMF, Development Banks, NGO, charities, Foundations, etc., etc.) to provide the parameters for everyday behavior but without anyone giving order to value or obeying the work program set forth in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, could be creating heat (violence) that could break their stability and revert them to a simpler form.

Hence, the families/dynasties who won WW2 want governments and national and international human development institutions to maintain relationships with them while considering themselves exempt from the appeal set forth in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, this means that the families/dynasties who won WW2 do not mind that government officials and staff of national and international human development institutions appoint themselves the deputy of God on earth, just like them.

In the remaining segments of this work, I plan to formulate an idea on whether or not the decision of the families/dynasties who won WW2 to let patrons of units of authorities maintain relationships with them (but while no one is practicing what he is preaching) would maximize their (the families/dynasties who won WW2) power or lead to all the people (patrons and the poor) casting them out and to trodden them under their feet. This analysis should also help to develop an idea on whether or not the frameworks that the different governments and national and international human development institutions would devise in the future could help to stabilize the international order or

imperil it even more (i.e., add more fuel to the fire). Perhaps, I should mention that only the work program that the founding fathers of the UN proposed is capable of solidifying the power of the families/dynasties who won WW2 and ensuring lasting peace. This work program stipulates that governments and only governments provide political and economic solutions, and without national and international human development institutions building the capacity of governments or providing human rights solutions (reducing poverty, improving justice, democracy, etc.) in the social order. This will require returning the United Nations to be structured and to function as per the way the founding fathers of the UN designed.

Let us divide the history of the world into two timelines. Let the first timeline refer to the period before WW2 erupted, and the second interval to the period after WW2 erupted.

People persuade each other to obey either through relying on tools or on the human body (reason or dexterity).

All the people who relied on religion (God, afterlife) during the first time interval (i.e., the period before WW2 erupted) failed to make the weak (the poor) surrender freedom to the values that those spiritual agents were spreading and depending on to solidify their own power. In other words, the people who were relying on religion or philosophy to get their way despite the resistance of others failed to improve morality or to make it very difficult for the people who rely on science to not rival them. The weak (the poor) did not want to wait for the afterlife to have access to what the people who were relying on religion to make the weak surrender freedom to them were promising.

Likewise, the people who relied on science or tools (knives, swords, guns, dynamite) to frighten the weak with such instruments failed to make the weak (poor) be prepared to surrender freedom to the political order being legitimized during the first time interval as well (i.e., the period before WW2 erupted).

History is cumulative, meaning that it is possible for a person today to delve into the events of the past to draw lessons.

The constant failure of the fittest to draw the right lesson(s) from all the failures that their predecessors were stumbling upon in their search to make the weakest consider their opinion during this first interval (i.e., the period before WW2 erupted) is what has kept the world insecure. The constant discord between the families/dynasties who were rivaling to determine who could control the international order or the money supply of the world was continually validating the prophecy that is mentioned in the Quran in Verse 140 of Surah Al-Imran: We alternate these days “of victory and defeat” among people so that Allah may reveal the 'true' believers, and choose martyrs from among you—and Allah does not like the wrongdoers—

One could suppose that the families/dynasties who won WW2 (i.e., the second time interval) would be wise enough, preferring to remain faithful to the unmatched good values they legitimized in the aftermath of WW2 in the UN Charter or the Universal declaration of Human Rights thus making it very difficult for the families/dynasties who are rivaling them to have any take on them or to motivate the common people to distrust them. However, for one reason or another, the families/dynasties who won WW2 decided to deviate away from the work program which the founding fathers of the UN counselled them to remain faithful to its principles to maintain their strength and stability and ensure lasting peace, preferring instead to extend this revolving cycle of continuous sifting, which is mentioned in the Quran. In fact, the dynamism or the type of social problems that has swept the world since 1945 gives the impression that instead of the families/dynasties who won WW2 being vigilant to disprove this perceived truth mentioned in this verse of the Quran about how power, wealth, and status are a wheel that will shift amongst people when wrongdoers (people in positions of power) refuse to prioritize values, they (the families/dynasties who won WW2) seem to be in favor of wanting it to stay disproven. In other words, the families/dynasties who won WW2 and their thinkers and writers, soldiers, politicians, administrators or spokesperson appear as if they are not just working toward validating this perceived truth but even to accelerate its occurrence.

To put it differently, one could suppose that the families/dynasties who won WW2 would be with their patrons (thinkers), drawing lessons

from history, thus regarding the perspective that such a field gives on the problems of the present as an opportunity. Unfortunately, for one reason or another, the actions that the powerful families/dynasties are taking or legitimizing as of 1945 do not seem to support how they are factoring past events into their thinking or paying attention to the fact that people are programmed with a capability to recollect for a reason.

For example, during the French Revolutionary War, the fittest in France (i.e., the wealthiest families/dynasties) were relying on whips, swords, bows, and arrows, etc. (tools) to make the weakest consider their opinion. Over time, instead of the fittest in France focusing on the patterns of cause and effect to make the people who they want to surrender freedom to them be prepared to voluntarily do it, they began to use the exploration that people are continuously doing and the practical results that such investigation generates to help them get their way despite the resistance of others better. That is to say, the fittest in France swapped relying on whips to make the weak surrender freedom to them with a police baton. They also swapped using bows and arrows or swords with guns and dynamite.

Indeed, the new tools that the fittest in France (i.e., the wealthiest families/dynasties) began developing and using from the date when the French Revolutionary War ended to when WW2 was regarded to have started failed to make the weak consider their opinion in this country. All those old tools (i.e., whips, swords, bows and arrows, police batons, guns, dynamite, etc.) that the fittest were relying on in France to make the weak consider the opinion of the strongest before taking action, or the new ones that were introduced in the aftermath of WW2, proved to be ineffective in this country and anywhere else so far.

In fact, the interval of time between the date when the French Revolutionary War was regarded to have started and when WW2 was regarded to have ended is close to 200 years. One could suppose that the families/dynasties who won WW2 would be drawing lessons with their patrons (thinkers) from the failure of the fittest in France (or elsewhere) during those 200 years to make the weakest in this country be ready to consider the opinion of the strongest through the intermediary of tools, and thus try to not rely on such a strategy to

continue to get their way despite the resistance of others in the aftermath of WW2, but unfortunately, this was not the case.

That is to say, instead of the families/dynasties who won WW2 and their patrons (rulers and thinkers) doing as per what the families/dynasties who were depending on religion before WW2 erupted to solidify their power and that is to minimize people's dependence on human creativity to get their ways despite the resistance of others, or adopt the same strategies which the families/dynasties who controlled the United States relied on to get their ways from 1776 to 1945 to solidify their power, and that is to prioritize value over human creativity, the families/dynasties who won WW2 and their patrons chose to rely explicitly on human creativity to transform the conditions and outcomes that matters to them. In other words, the families/dynasties who won WW2 did exactly what their predecessors (i.e., the families/dynasties who were the fittest) were doing throughout history to get their way despite the resistance of others. This was relying on human creativity to solidify their power, knowing that this strategy accelerated the reversal to a simpler form of the families/dynasties who relied on such tactics to get their way despite the resistance of others. This tactic permitted the families/dynasties who were challenging the families/dynasties who were in positions of leadership to absorb their power, wealth, and status faster.

To give an example, in the aftermath of the Lebanese Civil War (1990), Prime Minister Rafic Hariri ordered that the words “if it lasted to someone else before, it would have not reached you” be engraved on a stone placard and placed at the main entrance to the Government Palace building when it was being rehabilitated following the damages it sustained during the conflict. The Government Palace is a historic building, which also serves as the headquarters of the Prime Minister of Lebanon.

Rafic Hariri was assassinated in 2005. From 2005 till today, all the government cabinet members (i.e., the warlords and new power brokers such as the son of Hariri) passed under the placard every day when they were entering and exiting this building. Apparently, no one was paying attention or reading what this old proverb that was

engraved on this placard was calling their attention to be doing. If the case was any different (i.e., the government cabinet members were reading the placard), Lebanon would not have been in the state of irreparable chaos that it is in today, which only a reset (i.e., a new civil war, financial bailout, or recolonization) or an austerity plan (including leading by example) could resolve.

Therefore, since we cannot say that the rulers and political class or the staffs of the different international human development organization who the families/dynasties who won WW2 are shuttling to Lebanon are paying attention to what this proverb that is installed at the entrance to the government building in Lebanon is saying when they are entering to meet with the government cabinet members from the 1990s onward as well; we can say that the challenges that the families/dynasties who won WW2 are confronting to keep their power, wealth and status intact from 1945 onward are not any different from the ones which the families/dynasties who control Lebanon (i.e., mainly warlords) are confronting as of 2005 (or as of the date when Hariri was assassinated) except that they are on a larger scale.

If the political and economic challenges that are confronting the families/dynasties who control Lebanon (i.e., mainly warlords) as of 2005 on a small scale can be said to parallel the political and economic challenges that are confronting the families/dynasties who won WW2 and their different units of authorities and patrons but on a larger scale, then we can say that the solutions that I just said are only available ahead of the Lebanese to put the country back on the right track are also the solutions that the families/dynasties who won WW2 have ahead of them to prevent their power, wealth, and status from disintegrating.

If the choices that the families/dynasties who control Lebanon and the choices that the families/dynasties who won WW2 (i.e., the families/dynasties who control the international order or the money supply of the world) have to take to maintain their power, wealth and status are one and the same (i.e., via a reset such as a war, financial bailout, or recolonization, or an austerity plan that includes leading by example), then we can say that the likelihood of the families/dynasties who won WW2 managing to avert their power, wealth, or status from

shrinking is highly unlikely if they continue to behave in the same way the rulers and political class in Lebanon are doing till today.

That is to say, if the families/dynasties who control Lebanon (i.e., mainly warlords) choose to engulf this country in a war to continue to solidify their power, they have no guarantee that their power, wealth, or status would not shrink. Likewise, if the families/dynasties who control Lebanon (i.e., mainly warlords) spare this country from a civil war, they know very well that during the upcoming elections, a big chunk of their power, wealth, or status is going to be stripped from them.

Hence there is nothing that the families/dynasties who control Lebanon (i.e., mainly warlords) could do to prevent that their power, wealth or status does not shrink, except to engulf the country in a civil war which could be a threat to weak and the strong warlords (because the strong warlords do not know with which foreign allies the weak warlords are associated), or delay the election (unless the strong and the weak warlords are sure they would be voted back into power), this means that the families/dynasties who won WW2 must be entangled in the same paradox that the families/dynasties who control Lebanon (i.e., mainly warlords) are dealing with today.

That is to say, if the warlords in Lebanon had continued the Lebanese civil war and had not stop it, they would have continued to eliminate each other, thus letting the method of elimination create hierarchy. However, because the warlords in Lebanon stopped the civil war and switched over toward giving the idea of liberalism and self-determination a chance to keep them in power, but not to achieve the results that this dogma promises, they have gotten themselves into a much bigger problem today. The warlords did not only fail to settle their disputes throughout this time or to rebuild the country, but now they have the entire population holding them accountable for their disenchantment and demanding they either increase their happiness or be ousted from power.

The challenges and scenarios that the families/dynasties who control Lebanon (i.e., mainly warlords) appear to be dealing with today seem to be very analogous to the challenges and scenarios that the

families/dynasties who won WW2 were confronting as of 1945. The families/dynasties who won WW2 stopped WW2 and switched over to give the idea of liberalism and self-determination a chance to keep them in power, but not to achieve the results that this dogma promised. They have gotten themselves into a much bigger problem today. The families/dynasties who won WW2 did not only fail to settle their disputes throughout this time or reduce fear and want, but now they have the entire world holding them accountable for their disenchantment and demanding they either increase their happiness or be ousted from power.

If the aforementioned correlation between the challenges and scenarios that are confronting the families/dynasties who control Lebanon (i.e., mainly warlords) and the challenges and scenarios that are confronting the families/dynasties who won WW2 contains any elements of truth, this means that the choices ahead of the families/dynasties who won WW2 to continue to solidify their power may boil ultimately to three. The first is to engulf the world in a global war (civil wars) to create reset(s). The second is to reverse position or stand on the idea of liberalism and self-determination as a means to solidify power (i.e., prioritize authoritarianism). The third is to return to adapting the work program that the founding fathers of the UN proposed.

I have no way of knowing which scenario between the aforementioned three the families/dynasties who won WW2 will ultimately pick. The families/dynasties who won WW2 did not implement the work program which the founding fathers of the UN proposed. The work program which the founding fathers of the UN proposed cannot be a threat to the families/dynasties who won WW2, because this framework gives order to vertical hierarchy instead of horizontal hierarchy, and therefore, can only be an opportunity. In other words, this work program makes it possible to quantify the problem and to adopt a Training of Trainers model to secure the goals set forth in the UN charter, instead of continuing on doing as the case is right now, where every member in society is considering himself a trainer. That is to say, the UN goal can only be achieved when the people who control the government develop the understanding of themselves and not when the poor (the weak) develop understanding of themselves while the

rich (the fittest), who control the government, refuse to relinquish control.

Insofar as the other two choices, I believe it would not matter if the families/dynasties who won WW2 choose to solidify their power through continuing to allow that people engulf the world in wars or to reverse their position on the idea of liberalism and self-determination as a means to solidify their power (i.e., prioritize authoritarianism).

The families/dynasties who won WW2 know that all pre 1945 political dogmas collapsed and that if they adopt any pre 1945 political order, it would not be possible for them to prevent the world from becoming engulfed in a new global war or stay dynamic. Nonetheless, the advantage of prioritizing pre 1945 political dogmas (i.e., authoritarianism) centers around enabling governments to reduce the number of people who depend on the idea of democracy, equal rights, rights, freedom as a tool to get their way despite the resistance of others. When people are slowed down (i.e., repressed politically), rulers and political class in UN member states would be capable of circumventing civil disobedience, civil resistance, etc., before it occurs. On the other hand, if the families/dynasties who won WW2 choose to keep on letting people engulf the world in wars (i.e., prioritize liberalism and self-determination but without anyone practicing what is being preached), this strategy accelerates divide and rule. The risks the divide and rule strategy pose are that it can get out of control, thus compelling the families/dynasties who won WW2 and the entire world to deal with lots of perilous unforeseen conditions.

Earlier I said that awareness and knowledge are irreversible. If it is not possible to easily exploit people when awareness and knowledge rise, then the families/dynasties who won WW2 cannot be sure that people around the world would be ready to surrender freedom to any political order beside the liberal and self-determination interventionism.

For example, the families/dynasties who control France oriented the population in this country, in the aftermath of WW2, to be preoccupied with depending on human creativity to sustain survival needs instead of orienting people to be tolerant as the church teaches. In other words, the families/dynasties who control France wanted citizens to become

modernized and to delegate to technology the role the human body could have been programmed by the natural world or God to serve, thus letting this mass develop a virtual relation with the natural world instead of continuing to develop a direct relationship, as was the case before WW2 erupted.

As of the start of the 21st century, France's political challenge seems to revolve around how to control the internal tribal challenges that have nested in the country as a result of the awareness and knowledge that people gained. In other words, the free time that the poor gained after technology started to secure survival needs on their behalf enabled them to recognize that rulers and political class (including judges and law enforcement officers) are at the center of the challenges that are preventing them from increasing their happiness. This means that the arsenal of weapons and police equipment or tools which the families/dynasties who control France oriented the population to produce as of 1945 is principally purposeless. This is because the political and economic challenges are internal. That is to say, the political and economic disputes or disagreements confronting France are internal and are not altercations that a neighboring society (country) is provoking. If rulers and political class in France use the arsenal of weapons and police equipment against the population in France, people's preparedness to obey reduces instead of improving. This is very serious and worrisome.

Said differently, before WW2 erupted, the families/dynasties who controlled France were preoccupying citizens with increasing their happiness by dominating poor nations. This strategy enabled the families/dynasties who control France to make citizens look outward instead of onward. In the aftermath of WW2, the families/dynasties who control France began to compensate for the inhumane treatment, which they were directing citizens to depend on to increase their happiness through dominating poor nations, by making citizens prioritize human creation instead of orienting the human body to continue to develop relations with the natural world, as I just said. In addition, the more the families/dynasties who controlled France were persuading citizens to delegate to technology the role the human body could have been programmed by the natural world or God to serve, thus gaining more free time, the more this process was making citizens

start to look inward more, especially since other societies were doing the same, since all the societies pledged to not seek territorial gain in the aftermath of WW2. The families/dynasties who control France cannot make citizens start to look inward and avoid being devoted to improving social justice or prioritizing division. This means that if the families/dynasties who control France do not prioritize ruling by example or adopt the same strategies that their predecessors were adopting before WW2 erupted, it would not be possible for them to continue to solidify their power.

Hence, the families/dynasties who control France would not be able to orient the population to dominate other societies as easily as this country was doing before WW2; this means that the families/dynasties who control France need to be relying on law and order (authoritarianism) more. Already France is like any European nation: a police state in disguise. If the families/dynasties who control France fail to make citizens surrender freedom to them, they would have no other choice but to continue to rely on force as they are doing. This is very serious and worrisome. This is because if the rulers and political class (including judges and law enforcement officers) in France continue to rely on force to get their way despite the resistance of others as they have been doing since 1945, this signifies that France will continue to evolve as per the way its evolution has been since the end of WW2 - regressive and not progressive. Furthermore, since the aching that a baton inflicts on the human body is much more lethal than a whip, this also means that the evolution of the French from a social and psychological perspective is happening inversely rather than growing forwardly.

In addition, if we consider that France is one of the principal countries who made classical contributions (both scientific and philosophical) to the actual modernity that exists in the world, yet the more its rulers and political class (including judges and law enforcement officers) are becoming modernized the more their ability to distinguish between what is right from what is wrong is getting impaired, this then means that unless rulers and political class in France accept that modernization (technology) would not appease or tame the population ultimately but only leading by example would do it, then It would not be possible for those people who are in position of power in the

country to speak the same language with the common people. This is because the rulers and political class in France believe that technology can help them to make the population obey the political order (i.e., help them to get their way despite the resistance of others) much more than if they were to be leading by example. And so, if the people in positions of power in France continue to assume that the flaws and complexities of human nature are what drive people to be unprepared to obey, and not the distancing of people from fulfilling the role which the natural world (or God) programmed the human body to serve, then mankind is doomed. This is because this means that the more the people in positions of power in France and elsewhere orient people to be devoted to using the free time that the human body is gaining to snoop on what the neighbor is doing, while preaching to it about democracy and freedom at the same time, the more this strategy would not be making a person be ready to voluntarily surrender freedom but to be convinced that anarchy is inherent in human relations and is the driving force for the defensive and offensive positions that people take.

Simply put, if the above conjecture on what could be increasing internal tribal challenges in France (and around the world) is true, then the families/dynasties who won WW2 could be creating a bottleneck between UN member states that its impact could ultimately cost them their wealth, power and status easily. That is to say, if when the Egyptians, Moroccans or Algerians finish with becoming modernized, their choice is going to be picking between becoming a super authoritarian regime, as is the case today in France or Great Britain, or a super chaotic regime as is the case in Libya or Lebanon, and we know already which choice they are going to pick, then the families/dynasties who won WW2 could be wagering on their emotions more than on wisdom if they think that they can preserve their leadership when distrust continues to rise in the world. This is because neither scenario (authoritarianism or chaos) could equalize the odds against the families/dynasties who won WW2 or inhibit the exertion of soft or hard balancing of the rich or the poor to resize them.

In conclusion, since it does not matter if the families/dynasties who won WW2 continue to let rulers and political class (including judges and law enforcement officers) in UN member states create state of

emergencies to double down on balancing behaviors through the overarching law enforcing tool which the founding fathers of the UN laid out in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights; or blame human nature for the flaws and complexities that exists; or attribute challenges to questions of uncertainty, greed, overpopulation, environmental degradation, tribal challenges, etc., etc., as the thinkers and writers, soldiers, politicians, administrators or spokesperson of the new units of authority which the families/dynasties who won WW2 created in the aftermath of WW2 try to postulate; and only if ideas and explorations (science) are halted (i.e., to halt awareness and knowledge) or rulers and political class (including judges and law enforcement officers) start to rule by example could the families/dynasties who won WW2 prevent their resizing, this means that the choices ahead for the families/dynasties who won WW2 are clear.

Simply put, since it is not possible to stop ideas and explorations (science), the families/dynasties who won WW2 have two choices. They can continue to refuse to prioritize the work program which the founding fathers counselled them to obey to solidify their power and ensure lasting peace and continue to rely on modernity and the idea of good (democracy, freedom, rights) to dominate (i.e., make the weak consider the opinion of the strongest). In other words, extend this ongoing trend, which the nations with great power are adopting, through overthrowing regimes which they do not like while turning a blind eye on the ones they profit from remaining authoritarian. Alternatively, they can take a backward step and go back and start to implement the work program which the founding fathers of the UN counselled them to prioritize to solidify their power and ensure lasting peace.

Evidently, if the families/dynasties who won WW2 choose to continue to show that their interests and motives are not programmed to establish balancing behaviors among people but to further their power and capability only, it would be necessary that they become capable of exercising power over people's emotions and wisdom.

I have no way of knowing if the families/dynasties who won WW2 are waging on the power of modernity to further their power and

capability or if they are waging on the power of wisdom. What I do know is that people started to show evidence of being incapable of exercising power over their emotions since the dawn of time (i.e., refer to the story of Cain and Abel in the Bible).

To put it differently, I have no way of knowing how people are looking at the way the victors of WW2 (i.e., the families/dynasties who won WW2) are handling the stability of the international order as of 1945. In other words, I have no way of knowing if people are accepting the way the families/dynasties who won WW2 are letting peace and security evolve in the world, or if they are disenchanted as Cain was increasingly becoming of his brother Abel. What I do know is that if humans in antiquity were not running around and killing for pleasure, then Cain would have had no reason to kill his brother Abel. That is to say, if Abel was doing things that Cain was considering right, Cain would not have attacked him and killed him.

On the other hand, since we know already that if Cain or Abel had stayed working the land and they had not started to make offerings to the Lord (so he would not have gotten in between them as ideas and science are getting in between people today), they would have stayed on good terms with one another, and Cain would have had no reason to perceive that God was looking with favor on Abel and his offering more than on his, then we can say that had Cain and Abel not begun to believe in something that is not true, the differences or jealousy that existed between them would not have occurred.

Furthermore, since we do know that the division of labor makes it impossible for two people to fill the same void space, this means that only if the person who is occupying a given social space relies on ideas that are not true could he manage to prevent those who would be rivaling him to occupy his space from succeeding.

At the same time, we do know that the idea of law and political order is not natural but a human creation, and the rich (i.e., the families/dynasties who won WW2) use the political order as a means towards an end (i.e., to increase their wealth, power and status). In other words, we do know that the rich have no other choice to be able to continue to solidify their power except to protect the weak from

things which are not true. That is to say, we do know that if the rich were fulfilling their part of the agreement and obeying the political order (the legal and natural right they legitimize), the poor would not be distrusting rulers and political class and, therefore, refusing to obey.

In my opinion, there is one variable that we do not know. This variable is how did the families/dynasties who won WW2 conclude that if they deviate away from the work program which the founding fathers of the UN counselled them to obey to solidify their power and ensure lasting peace, and to go on a tangent and to start to create new nations and new units of authorities (i.e., UN system, NATO, EU, World Bank, IMF, Development Banks, NGO, charities, Foundations, etc. etc.) and to task those legal entities with spreading things that are not true (ending poverty or injustice while their staffs are devoted to realizing the full development of their personality at the same time), that the truth would not come out and that people would not distrust them and cast them out and trodden them under their feet.

I have no way of knowing if the insecurity that has engulfed the world in recent years is due to the families/dynasties who won WW2 and their patrons persuading people to develop the same rage that Cain developed toward his brother Abel to the point of choosing to kill him. What I do know is that Jesus said that sooner or later, the truth would come out, and when the truth comes out, those who do not have would be given more, and those who have (i.e., power, wealth, and status) would have it taken from them.

If despite what Moses, Jesus, Muhammad, Confucius, Buddha, etc., already counselled the families/dynasties who won WW2, to not disobey so what they have (i.e., power, wealth, and status) is not taken away from them and given to others, the families/dynasties who won WW2 think that they can sail through the eye of the storm and survive, then one of two scenarios is true. The first is if the families/dynasties who won WW2 and their patrons are naïve. The second is if the families/dynasties who won WW2 believe they are invincible.

I have no way of knowing which scenario between the two is true. What I do know is that the founding fathers of the UN counselled the families/dynasties who won WW2 to reject that there would be any

territorial gains by any nation in the aftermath of WW2 and to permit that people allow territorial adjustments among them or based on the wishes of the peoples concerned.

When the founding fathers of the UN laid out those two axioms for the families/dynasties who won WW2, they were considering that their successors (i.e., rulers and political class, judges and law enforcement officers) would be cooperating based on the principle set forth in the UN charter or the work program set forth in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and not on continuing on doing what they were doing before 1945 erupted.

Unfortunately, instead of the families/dynasties who won WW2 prioritizing how to make rulers and political class (including judges, and law enforcement officers) prioritize the work program set forth in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, they started dividing the world into distinct societies. Today, the UN member states total 193. In other words, we have today 193 societies (UN member states) whose members are rivaling each other, and not one os cooperating based on the principle set forth in the UN charter.

Furthermore, since none of the 193 societies can rival each other except through using the idea of good, human rights, freedom, justice, etc. as a tool, because this is the only narratives which has the potential to prevent that discord undermine public trust in rulers and political class, this means that the idea of good, human rights, freedom, justice, self-determination, etc., has become a weapon just as a gun, dynamite, or any explosive can be used to help one person solidify his power. This is very serious and worrisome.

To put it differently, none of the UN member states is using the idea of good, human rights, freedom, democracy, justice, self-determination, etc., to increase good, human rights, freedom, justice, democracy in the world, but to arrive at making the weakest consider the opinion of the fittest with such concepts. In other words, nations expect the weakest society (nation) to cooperate within its own territory or among its own members based on the political order of the fittest, but not to cooperate with the fittest based on direct democracy. That is to say, it would be naïve to suppose that the United States (the west) would be

prepared to voluntarily let the Iraqi dinar (Indian rupee or the Chinese yuan) displace the US dollar to become the most widely used currency in international transactions or the world's primary reserve currency. Besides, if, for example, the United States, the British, the Germans, the Norwegians, etc., agree to cooperate with the Chinese or the Indians based on direct democracy, those two highly populated countries would swallow the wealth and power of the United States and others as easily as whenever a big fish is seen swallowing a small fish.

In addition, hence within societies (nations), rulers and political class are not using the idea of good, human rights, freedom, democracy, justice, self-determination, etc., to increase good, human rights, freedom, justice, democracy in the world, but to arrive at making the weakest consider the opinion of the fittest with such concepts, this situation poses another challenge.

For example, it was not the Japanese population who surrendered to the United States during WW2 but the families/dynasties who were controlling Japan. In other words, the families/dynasties who were controlling Japan during WW2 did not make a referendum to ask the Japanese if they wanted to surrender to the United States or not after the US exploded two nuclear bombs over Japan. Therefore, since the Japanese could have chosen to die if they would have been asked to participate in a referendum just to deny the United States the pleasure of claiming indeterminately afterwards that they defeated them, we can say that what pushed the families/dynasties who were controlling Japan during WW2 to surrender to the Americans was fear of losing their wealth, power, and status more than courage. The families who had a father, a mother, a brother, sister, child killed in Japan during WW2 may have been in favor of continuing to fight the Americans to take revenge.

Furthermore, since the families/dynasties who won WW2 have no way of knowing whether they could stumble in the future on societies who possess courage and who refuse to surrender, as the Taliban have demonstrated since 2001, the Yemeni since 2014, and now the Ukrainian since 2022, this signifies that if the families/dynasties who won WW2 continue to let people give order to chaos instead of

tolerance, they will have no other choice but to start to practice the strategy that Joshua was adopting when he was leading the Israelites to the promised land or the one the Pharaoh used to make people surrender freedom to them.

If the families/dynasties who won WW2 are not programming to reduce the world population or convert the world into becoming organized as was the case during the Pharaoh days, whereby there is a fit man standing next to a weak man with a whip to force him to obey, or adopt the same strategy that the western Europeans followed during the Opium Wars to make the Chinese become confused, then the only tactic for them to continue to get their way despite the resistance of others would be to rely on philosophical weapons instead of real weapons, as they started doing as of 1945. That is to say, bunker under the idea of good (i.e., human rights, freedom, democracy, justice, self-determination, etc.), so such philosophical weapons can do the fighting on their behalf.

I have no idea how the families/dynasties who won WW2 are programming to continue to solidify their power when everyone knows that there is no magic that would make people be ready to voluntarily obey except when their happiness is increased or they perceive that law and order are above all. What I do know is that the rulers in Egypt started to convert this country into becoming a modern Pharaoh state as of 1952, and the way they are managing to get their way despite the resistance of others shows they are not doing that bad so far. Likewise, the Chinese have wised up, and therefore, it is going to be very difficult to drug them as the western Europeans were doing during the middle of the 19th century. That is to say, the days of the old powers looking at the Egyptians or the Chinese as subordinates are shrinking.

Indeed, the idea of good (i.e., human rights, freedom, democracy, justice, self-determination, etc.), which the families/dynasties who won WW2 are using to solidify their power as of 1945, was used in antiquity when the Christian church was making people disavow the authorities of the rulers and political class to prioritize similar principles. This tactic was very successful initially hence it managed to

resize the rulers and political class of the time, but then in the course of time and things, it failed, and the church was resized.

What is very different this time is that it is the families/dynasties who won WW2 who are using the strategy that the poor used to resize the rich through the idea of good (i.e., human rights, freedom, democracy, justice, self-determination, etc.).

I have no way of knowing how the families/dynasties who won WW2 reached the conclusion that they can make the poor be prepared to obey them when in real life a small force has never managed to influence a change on a larger force except when God intervened, and knowing that humans may have been programmed with eyelids to weaken them (i.e., be obliged to sleep).

To put it differently, I have no way of knowing if God is helping the families/dynasties who won WW2 to get their way despite the resistance of others, as he was doing when he was helping his chosen people (the Israelites) to get to the promised land (i.e., a small force always defeating established kingdoms), or if the patrons and units of authorities who the families/dynasties who won WW2 invited to help them in the aftermath of WW2 to get their way despite the resistance better have figured out a way to make people become continually passive or wakeful, protecting them. If God has not privileged the families/dynasties who won WW2 as he privileged the Israelites, or if the patrons who the families/dynasties who won WW2 are depending on their wisdom to help them to continue to get their way despite the resistance of others and ensure lasting peace have not figured out a way to make it possible for humans to be sleepless as most fish and animals stay to prevent attacks from predators, then the families/dynasties who won WW2 must be wagering on the power of science (technology) to protect them. This is because machines are the only creatures who stay sleepless.

Once again, I have no way of knowing if science (technology) would be able to control people in the same way whales, for example, have complete control over their breathing. For example, whales can distribute their oxygen to the right organ in their body based on the energy that each organ is exhausting. That is to say, have technology

control who stays poor and who stays rich, who has status and who stays with no prestige, who has power and who stays powerless, etc. Strangely, despite this great controlling power that God (or the natural force) that created the world has granted whales, this force still humbled the whales and made sure they continually emerge to the surface to fill their lungs with air. In addition, despite their massive size, researchers say that whales are “too timid and immediately swim away at the slightest hint of danger.”

Finally, I have no way of knowing if researchers managed to control people’s behavior so that all the human rights, freedom, democracy, justice, self-determination etc. teaching which the families/dynasties who won WW2 are permitting patrons and units of authorities to preach in UN member states but without anyone practicing what is being preached is helping those powerful families/dynasties to detect the slightest hint of danger so the political corruption, political repression, and accepting bribes, smuggling, extorting, drug trafficking that those agents of change are compelling does not stifle them in the same way fish suffocate. What I do know is that when civil disobedience, civil resistance rise, and the “goads and pricks” (i.e., the rulers and political class and staffs of human development organizations) who the families/dynasties who won WW2 are depending on their wisdom to solidify their power and ensure lasting peace are simultaneously increasing political corruption, political repression, and accepting bribes, smuggling, extorting, drug trafficking while enjoying privileges and immunities and while operating their own judicial systems at the same time, the world could become divided between those who would be in favor of freedom and those who would be for oppression.

I have no way of knowing how the families/dynasties who won WW2 plan to solidify their power when the world would become divided between those who would be in favor of freedom and those who would be for oppression. What I do know is that when disregard and contempt rise, the families/dynasties who won WW2 would have no choice but to continue to appoint themselves with the thinkers and writers, soldiers, politicians, administrators or spokesperson who are protecting them as the sole authority on what is true and what is false

and to begin to punish those who undermine or disagree with their policies.

I have no way of knowing if people will be civilized in the future to the point of being ready to accept that the families/dynasties who won WW2 (i.e., their heirs) appoint themselves as permanent deputy of God on earth when awareness of knowledge rises, or if the people will be expecting that the heirs of those powerful families/dynasties practice what they would be preaching and would not exempt them from this responsibility. What I do know is that if the families/dynasties who won WW2 fail to make the poor be ready to drop their legal entitlement to the freedom, justice, equal rights, self-determination which they enlisted many units of authorities in the aftermath of WW2 to preach to them but without any member of those legal entities cooperating based on the principles set forth in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, then the impasse the powerful families/dynasties would be knowing could push the poor to trample them under their feet as they did to the leaders of Iraq and Libya in modern history, or revert them to a simpler form as happened to the families/dynasties who controlled the Roman Empire in antiquity.

I have no way of knowing which scenario between the aforementioned two the poor could pick if the families/dynasties who won WW2 continue to make mistakes and to adopt short sighted policies and ambitions that demoralize them. What I do know is that what caused the Roman Empire to collapse was not the weakness of the rulers and political who were controlling this empire, but the decision of the families/dynasties who were controlling the Roman Empire to listen to their thinkers and writers, soldiers, politicians, administrators or spokesperson instead of listening to the advice of their own fathers. Are the families/dynasties who won WW2 listening to the advice of their fathers (i.e., the founding fathers of the UN)? Only time will tell!