

Unchecked Power

**Will mankind's unpreparedness to limit
the arrogance of the United Nations keep
the world dynamic forever?**

Salim Maloof, Ph.D.

Copyright 2023 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., Unchecked Power, 2024

This is a work of non-fiction.

Salim Maloof
Unchecked Power

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

In memory of Nicholas Aziz 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

Unchecked Power

1. Analysis 23

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 on the aftermath of WW2 and tasked with coordinating the work included in the UN Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

This work is a treatise. In this present work, the author is trying to understand if the United Nations (as an idea and a class action) or the United Nations (as a legal entity or an organization) are threatening the capacity of the victors of WW2 (the families/dynasties who control the international order or the money supply of the world) and 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 15th century / early 16th century in western Europe. Those bad apples at the UN (supervisors) are not able to balance their interests against the interests of the common good because they are not working in their roles to satisfy the best interests of society only but to deepen their own. The disregard and contempt that UN supervisors and UN judges are prompting could compel people to lose faith in this institution, thus deepening fear and want 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 2nd 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 show that the families/dynasties that control the international order and the money supply of the world (the principal victors of WW2) are not elevating themselves to the height that religious or philosophical books suggest kings of kings should rise above. The book shows that it may not be possible for existing people to stop walking like dogs, as the Quran likened how some people were walking during the days of Moses, if the principal victors of WW2 continue to financialize the world and do not mind that their critical thinkers and servants educate newborns (new people) to embrace art and truth instead of letting parents be in charge of this task as most animals do. This also means that the principal victors of WW2 would not be able to stop the barbarous acts that have swept the world since 1948 from resizing them if the decline in the mental abilities that people are increasingly demonstrating continued to persuade them to become increasingly devoted to sniffing the earth and running after material things, thus keeping the international order as a court to solve people's issues and pleadings instead of a battle field (a project) to reach the "promised land" (or the UN goals). The book uses the dichotomy paradox that Zeno of Elea, a pre-Socratic philosopher, developed and which is a principal axiom in the field of calculus to support how newborns (new people) may not be able to rise and take the human posture for as long as the fittest refuse Jesus's suggestion to focus on the past instead of worrying about tomorrow, thus continuing on "adding to the troubles each day brings".

1

Analysis

The Quran is “the central religious text of Islam, believed by Muslims to be a revelation from God.” Muslims believe that God revealed (dictated) the Quran to Muhammad orally. Muslims believe that Muhammad was a prophet. Surah Al-Araf is the seventh chapter of the Quran. The meaning of the word “Al-Araf” is “The Heights”. The primary focus of this Surah is to invite people to give up “wrong” and embrace “right” in order to rise to higher levels of humanity. Muhammad is not the only prophet, philosopher, leader, teacher, father, etc. who invited people to form their will and to rise above the self. Moses, Confucius, Buddha, Jesus, and many other philosophers and scholars invited people before Muhammad to do the same. They all invited people to do the right thing and to choose the good over the wrong to avoid the same worldly and heavenly punishment that the Quran warns could happen to those who act against the divine rulings and verses suggested in this book and other religious scriptures or philosophical books.

For one reason or another, since mankind began to depend on the idea of government as a tool to secure the social contract that the majority approves, a few “chiefs, executives, rulers, and kings” agreed to limit their responsibilities to administering the legal entity or machinery that we call government and which those individuals in question are usually elected (appointed) to administer. Most “chiefs, executives, rulers, and kings” refuse to honor their obligations, and, since 1945, the elites have been allowing those servants (chiefs, executives, rulers, and kings) to focus on educating citizens on what they should drink, eat, and wear and what is permissible instead of limiting their responsibilities to ensuring, first and foremost, that their subordinates (judges, law enforcement officers, administrators, engineers, cleaners,

etc.) observe the laws (standards, norms, rules) that were specified in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, before they worry about whether or not citizens are observing those rules.

The unwillingness of the elites to stand firm on what the founding fathers of the UN suggested they be devoted to doing in the aftermath of WW2 (in 1945) created a vast hole in the new postwar international order, which made it impossible to be patched so mankind could work together to secure the UN goals. The unwillingness of the elites to put pressure on their servants (chiefs, executives, rulers, and kings) to make them accept carrying out the obligations contained in the Charter and the UDHR, and to limit, first and foremost, their responsibilities to improving the accountability and democratic legitimacy of the state (the government) before their responsibilities extend to improving the accountability of civil society, created an irreparable unbalance in the political and social order. This is because this change in scope propelled the critical thinkers and servants of the servants to begin to be devoted to changing what people should drink, eat, and wear and what is permissible instead of focusing on changing their own attitudes and habits first. World War One and World War Two erupted because the different chiefs, executives, rulers, and kings who were involved were the ones who were insulting, intimidating, conspiring, threatening, disregarding rules, and betraying each other, and not because of the disregard and contempt that their citizens were propelling. As the constant wars that have swept the world since 1945 show, the elites are not improving the state of goodness (peace and security) in the world but deepening anarchy.

In political theory (international relations), the word anarchy is not understood to mean a state in which an object stays in chaos, disorder, or conflict but rather a temporary one. In other words, it is possible to convert the object into an ordered relation. Evidently, the ability of the elites to rejuvenate their power under such dynamic conditions will depend on their ability to buy time and the preparedness of the people to buy the lies or honesty of their critical thinkers and servants about whether the policies they are adopting are really bringing about the changes they say are occurring (a just world socially and economically).

In this context, we can say that the ability of the elites to rejuvenate their powers under the anarchy that the world is confronting as of 1945 will depend on the ability of their critical thinkers to come up with ideas (strategies, policies) that are capable of creating balance without the different servants who are helping them to get their ways despite the resistance of others withdrawing their obligations to obey, or discover that the civilization mission that they are all chipping a hand to sustain is not programmed to make the world just but to buy time. This is because we already knew in 1945 that if the critical thinkers or servants of the elites do not observe the ideas and rules (standards and norms) that they are preaching, it is not possible to build a just world.

In addition, since we already know that it would not be possible to reduce the corruption, disregard, enmity, and hostility that exist between people for as long as the elites and their critical thinkers stay in favor of letting their servants develop and enforce parameters for everyday behavior (law and order) and be responsible for providing social programs at the same time, this means that the more sectarianism and division rise, the harder it will be for the elites to keep people united and focused on one concern. This concern is how to stay in group with them (the elites) and let them have a greater say in power than others. And since the more people distrust the elites, the harder it would be for them (the elites) or their critical thinkers and servants to avoid the use of force to neutralize the people who feel hostile toward the policies they are adopting, this means that the more the elites let their critical thinkers and servants focus on changing what people should drink, eat, and wear and what is permissible, the harder it would be for them (the elites) to prevent their collapse or resizing.

Put differently, since colonization (domination) ended in 1945 and basically all the societies are now free, there is no new dogmatic idea that the elites could use to gnaw at to make it easy for them to get their way despite the resistance of others. This signifies that the elites can only pick between two choices to keep their dominant role if their servants remain unprepared to observe the UN Charter or the UDHR in the future. The first is to defend the principles and institutions of democracy and open societies (i.e., the UN Charter and the UDHR). The second is to return the world to colonization, which is a very difficult task to do without first entangling the world in a new global

war. To defend the principles and institutions of democracy and open societies, the elites can only create a political enemy image against undesirable people, as the United States (and NATO) did at the start of the 21st century when they portrayed Saddam Hussein as the enemy number one of the world and Ousama Bin Laden and Islam to a great extent. For this enemy image propaganda strategy to succeed (i.e., persuade citizens to in-country gang against specific individuals or political figures and to destroy their human progress with their own hands), the elites need to ensure that the societies that they wreck to delay the human progress of their people from rivaling them are put back to work to rebuild, in accordance with the work program stipulated in the UDHR. For example, the United States (US) and NATO failed to make the people of Iraq, Afghanistan, etc. adhere to rebuilding their countries in accordance with the work program stipulated in the UDHR after they (the US and NATO) wrecked those two UN member states in question because the US and NATO were not observing the UDHR and the UN Charter in their dealings with people. The price that NATO and the United States are paying as of 2022 for not finding many societies that are ready to side with them to help the Ukrainians defeat Russia could be due to many societies distrusting both. That is to say, the elites cannot rely on enemy image propaganda to resize the societies whose human progress could be threatening them without putting back the people who would survive to rebuild in accordance with the work program stipulated in the UDHR. This is required to enable other societies to trust the elites and side with them to resize the individual, regime, etc. who they (the elite) want to be ousted from power. And hence, it would not be possible to recoup any result other than the one that the United States and NATO recouped in Iraq and Afghanistan when those two legal entities (the US and NATO) tried to rebuild Iraq and Afghanistan while themselves were not observing the UN Charter and the UDHR, any attempt to rely on enemy image propaganda to resize adversaries (individuals, businesses, societies, nations, kingdoms) will produce the same result that occurred in Iraq and Afghanistan and now in this on-going Ukrainian-Russian conflict. In Iraq and Afghanistan, sectarianism is malignant. In the on-going conflict between the Ukrainians and the Russians, the majority of the societies that are refusing to help the Ukrainians are doing it because they distrust NATO and the United States and not because they do not want to help

the Ukrainians. This is very serious and worrisome. This is because what is being torn down is the idea of Freedom when no UN member state rushes to help the Ukrainians. This also means that when the number of people who would be ready to defend the UN Charter and the UDHR shrinks, the number of people who would be refusing to stay with them (the elites) and to let them have a greater say in governance will rise. When the number of people who refuse to stay with them (the elites) rises, this means that their ability to keep their dominant role shrinks. Can the elites prevent their resizing when more people around the world distrust them?

As the above shows, if the elites want to stay in power while their critical thinkers and servants are at the same time not observing the UN Charter and the UDHR, they need to make sure that people around the world do not use their freedom to make themselves stronger. In other words, the elites need to be able to maintain the continuity of their strength and stability while anarchy or chaos is ongoing.

This strategy, which the elites and their critical thinkers appear to be relying on as of 1945 to keep their dominant position, is a good idea to stay in power, but like any idea, it has its benefits and its threats. Its threat is that it makes the political vision unattainable. In other words, it is not possible to attain political goals if the method to attain them is achieved through the intermediary of keeping the social order dynamic. Keeping the social order dynamic gives rise to warlords and strengthens militarism. This could explain why, as of 1945, there was a big rise in militarism in most UN member states instead of a decline (reduction). The founding fathers of the UN (the old powers) did not counsel the elites (their children) to transfer to the military complex governments in the aftermath of WW2, but to an elected civil body.

I have no way of knowing if the decision of the elites and their critical thinkers to have rulers and political rulers in most UN member states who do not resemble at all the political vision that they are inviting people to surrender freedom to them to attain reflects the authorities that they want to be associating them with. In other words, I do not know how they plan to improve democratic control when most UN member states are either ruled by monarchies or authoritarian regimes, and when neither one of those aforementioned political orders prevails,

the position is given to the highest bidder. What I do know is that it was not possible to create a unified political life before 1945, when the political order was organized as it is now around the world. Therefore, there is no reason why the political order that existed as of 1945 should work now if human nature has not changed. In addition, the constant wars that engulfed the world as of 1945 support the fact that neither the elites nor their critical thinkers have any vision to reduce the dynamism that the international order is experiencing; this means that the elites and their critical thinkers have no road map to improve peace and security. If the elites (and their critical thinkers) have no plan to improve the international order, this means that the elites (and their critical thinkers) do not know why they are supporting the different monarchical and authoritarian regimes that are standing instead of abolishing them completely or distancing them from having any role in the functioning of the state. Likewise, if the elites (and their critical thinkers) do not know why they are supporting the different monarchical and authoritarian regimes that are standing, this means that the elites (and their critical thinkers) have no common denominators with all those standing authorities. If the elites have no common denominators with all those standing authorities, this means that they have no road map to avoid their resizing.

Once again, I have no way of knowing how the elites (and their critical thinkers) are calculating or keeping account of the damages that are threatening the international order after more than seventy years of abuse and, in particular, a downhill trajectory. When a driver loses control and crashes, it is only possible to know the impact after the crash occurs or settles. Are the elites taking good notes of the impact of their decision to financialize the world and to let their critical thinkers and servants regard themselves exempt from observing the UN charter and the UDHR on the maintenance of their strength and security? This is because it would be their (i.e., the elites) wealth, power, and status that would be up for grabs if the international order continues to deteriorate and people continue to perceive that they are not qualified to stabilize the social order (reduce the gap). And so once again, if it is not possible to use the last seventy years to draw any vision, plan, or strategy on what is required to be done to attract people to each other to improve peace and security, can the elites manage to make people stay with them when the only result the world has to

show for in the last seventy years is that division, individualism, and self-help are on the rise? To put it differently, people came together in 1945 to implement the work program that was suggested in the UN charter and the UDHR. However, the elites used their authority, expanded and shifted the role of non-state and international institutions, and granted rights to such legal entities to provide political, economic, social, and cultural solutions in UN member states. This alteration has demonstrated so far, after one generation has passed, that it does not make it easy for the elites to have a greater say in power, nor does it increase the happiness of people. The only benefit that the elites have to show after more than seventy years of testing is that more people think that they can play their executive roles better.

As I just said, I have no way of knowing how the elites (and their critical thinkers) are concluding that people are going to be ready to accept that they stay playing the deputy of God role when only their servants are with them but not the “people”. Will the elites (and their critical thinkers) run into a different reality than the results they believe their actions are securing for their heirs? How are the elites concluding that their decision to deviate away from the work program set forth in the UN Charter and the UDHR and to let their critical thinkers and servants regard themselves exempt from observing those aforementioned principles would not have any bearing on the continuity of the strength and stability of their heirs? How are the elites (and their critical thinkers) concluding that people are not already tired of them and their weak policies or empty promises? Most importantly, how are the elites (and their critical thinkers) concluding they can control the future when people are not granted right to predict the future?

If, for as long as the elites (and their critical thinkers) adopt political solutions that continue to make people prioritize division, individualism, and self-help, there is no guarantee that the international order will not continue to deteriorate, then there is no guarantee that when the number of people that will be prioritizing individualism over collectivism increases, the power of “people” will weigh more than the power of the elites and their critical thinkers and servants. This is because when people’s distrust of the elites and their

critical thinkers and servants rises, the balance of power will tip more in their favor. In other words, when the elites and their critical thinkers stop coming up with logical ideas and arguments to justify credibly why their results are short of targets, it will not be possible to avoid having people put a score on their performance. In addition, since their (i.e., the elites) critical thinkers and servants are not prioritizing the interests of their masters (i.e., the elites) with all their hearts but with their tongues, this also means that their (i.e., the elites) critical thinkers and servants could betray them, and side with whoever improves their winnings.

Many questions beg answers. For one, can the elites (and their critical thinkers) manage to make people (the different communities) be ready to keep supporting and tolerating their poor political judgments in the same way their critical thinkers and servants do it without asking any question? That is to say, the critical thinkers and servants do not have the courage or ability to impose their will on the elites because their (i.e., the critical thinkers and servants) power is drawn from their masters (the elites) and not from their communities. Can the elites and their critical thinkers keep the awareness and knowledge of people low, thus making them unable to impose their ideas or will on them?

Once again, I have no way of knowing how the elites (along with their critical thinkers) plan to make people not impose their ideas or will on them after they decided to deviate away from the work program that the founding fathers of the UN (the old powers) counselled them to stay faithful to its principles so people could stay with them and be ready to grant them more powers, and began to implement a work program that is not giving people what they are promising them. For example, when the founding fathers of the United States asked people to split from the British crown, they promised the people who agreed to break away to deliver results, which they delivered. This enabled the American rulers and political class that came after those initial rulers to profit from the trust that citizens had in the government to deliver on the things that they liked, and therefore, they agreed to surrender freedom to them and to let them represent them without hesitation. The new American rulers and political class gave the people the results they were promising, and this made people trust them and not mind that they represented them or surrender freedom to

them from 1776 until the end of the 20th century. However, as of the start of the 21st century, we find that most rulers and political classes in the United States have stopped delivering on their promises, and lots of citizens are not trusting the promises those executives are making. Can the elites expect people to surrender freedom to them in the future when all the results that they (i.e., the elites) managed with their critical thinkers to make people reap in the last seventy-five years are higher taxes, greater dynamism around the world, and most importantly, the conversion of most UN member states into becoming authoritarian?

I have no way of knowing how the elites are concluding that they can make newborns (new people) perceive that their future will be better with them when the majority of the political policies that their critical thinkers are taking appear to undermine the worth and intelligence of people. Once again, I have no way of knowing how the elites are concluding that they can convince newborns (new people) to love them and trust them when the political and economic policies that they (the elites) are adopting are making them lose credibility. In other words, the political and economic results that people are reaping are making them lose confidence in the political ideas they (the elites) need people to stay believing in to be ready to stay with them.

Once again, I have no way of knowing what price the elites will ultimately pay if they continue to read reality wrong with their critical thinkers, thus continuing to adopt political and economic policies that are not producing the progressive results they expect. That is to say, if the elites continue to let their critical thinkers adopt political and economic policies that contradict the work program that the founding fathers of the UN (the old powers) counselled them to stay faithful to so people could stay with them and be ready to grant them more powers, the more the international order would be getting out of control and the harder it would be to stabilize peace and security. When Jesus entered a synagogue and found that it had been converted into a market, he had no choice but to overturn the tables of the money changers and the stools of those who sold pigeons to save the ideas that he was defending. Can the elites (and their critical thinkers) prevent “people” from overturning the international order on their

heads and resizing them as they resized all the rulers and kings who sold them empty promises?

Power is a consideration (a regard or an esteem). Can the elites (along with their critical thinkers) manage to make people respect them and in this way preserve their power, when their decision to financialize the world is little by little making people distrust them and making them perceive that they are not qualified to play an important social role in the world besides centralizing power?

Many religious and philosophical books suggest that the love of money is the root of all kinds of evil. In other words, power and money make a person unprepared to take advantage of the usefulness of the past to give him perspective on the problems of the present, including adopting political ideas that are baseless.

The idea of freedom is not a business (a legal entity), but a political discourse. If power and money are the root of all kinds of evil, can the elites (along with their critical thinkers) prevent other people from snatching from them the idea of freedom and starting to reap from its profit?

Victor Hugo was a French writer and politician who suggested that “success is a very hideous thing. Its false resemblance to merit deceives men.” Many people believed that if they raised their expectations and lowered the aspirations of others, they could increase their happiness, but later discovered that they reaped disappointment. World history is full of stories about rulers and kings who said one thing and did the opposite. Those rulers and kings thought that time was on their side, but history later showed that they were wrong. Those rulers and kings who prioritized their senses over the truth were not aware that the disregard that they were furthering was transforming into a large stone that would eventually set in motion, strike them, and revert them to a simpler form, just as Daniel suggested when he was interpreting to King Nebuchadnezzar his dream on how the kingdoms that would be succeeding his realm would be collapsing.

Different people have different aspirations. People (citizens) could stay unprepared to have the courage to stop the elites and their critical

thinkers and servants from denying them right to cooperate in accordance with the work program set forth in the UN Charter and the UDHR, and as a consequence, they will live for the rest of their lives being trampled on by the elites and their critical thinkers. The question that begs answers is different. Will the refusal of the elites to have the courage to stop their critical thinkers and servants from regarding themselves exempt from observing the UN Charter and the UDHR help them build an international order made of gold or clay?

I have no way of knowing why the elites are tolerating that their critical thinkers financialize the world and their servants become social operators when they (the elites) know very well that man does not create anything and that each object or element that exists around the boundary of our human body answers to a much greater force. And so the question that begs answers is: how are the elites concluding that their critical thinkers and servants could be an honest broker to help them continue to rejuvenate their power when all the kingdoms that collapsed happened when their rulers allowed their critical thinkers and servants to violate the laws (standards and norms) that they were depending on to create ordered relations?

To put it differently, as of the date the elites accepted that their chiefs, executives, rulers, and kings would not be devoted to carrying out the obligations contained in the Charter and the UDHR and to limit, first and foremost, their responsibilities to ensuring that their critical thinkers and servants improve accountability and democratic legitimacy instead of regarding themselves exempt from this appeal and focusing on ensuring that the civil society does it, this static created a vast hole in the new postwar international order, as I said before. That is to say, this shift converted the self-determination idea that the founding fathers of the UN (the old powers) wanted that every individual (society) practice to learn to develop the understanding needed to enable an individual (society) to make the right choice into what in mathematics (geometry) is called a pursuit curve. A pursuit curve is simply the curve that traces out the changes that are happening when one object is chasing another. For example, the path that a prey and a lion take when the prey is being chased by the lion, or one fighter jet chasing another, is a typical pursuit curve. And so the question that begs answers: is can the elites manage to make their

critical thinkers and servants from kings to doorman arrive at making “people” accept what to drink, eat, and wear and what is permissible, when the objects (the individuals) who are developing the parameters (standards, norms) are themselves not observing the laws they are preaching. Most importantly, when the individuals (the critical thinkers and servants) who are trying to arrive at making people drink, eat, and wear as per what they say are all objects, it is not possible to predict their path, and on top of that, there are machines that can deceive and betray.

If we trace out the progress that the critical thinkers and servants from kings to doormen of the elites have achieved since 1945 in their ongoing pursuit to make people accept what to drink, eat, and wear and what is permissible, we can say that the constant wars that have engulfed the world do not demonstrate that the elites are making kills in the same way lions do when they pursue a prey and catch it, thus letting how it will change be at their mercy. And so the question that begs answers is: can the elites continue to depend on critical thinkers and servants to rejuvenate their power, who as of 1945 have not accomplished anything other than making the objects (the people) that they are pursuing to have them drink, eat, and wear as per what they say, learn their tricks, and tangling the world in a cat and mouse chase, including going in circles?

I have no way of knowing how the elites expect their critical thinkers and servants to produce a different social order than the one that emerged in the aftermath of WW2, knowing that it would not be possible for those individuals involved (i.e., critical thinkers and servants) to make people be ready to accept to drink, eat, and wear as per what they say if they do not be the first to drink, eat, and wear as per what they are saying is permissible. Maybe the elites and critical thinkers believe that technology could help them make people ready to drink, eat, and wear as per what they say. Then again, mathematical equations are not magical equations. In other words, mathematical equations do not create but tell how objects work (i.e., grow, change position, etc.). That is to say, all mathematical equations have meaning and tell a specific story. The mathematical equations are analogous to how small or tall buildings in a city block look, each with its own unique architecture and functionality. It is not possible to see the

functionality of each equation physically, but people see only the results those equations produce to help us understand better how objects work (grow, change position, etc.). That is to say, it is not possible to expect a mathematical equation to give us information that is beyond its limitations. The problem that we are herein trying to find a solution for is how to predict how a medium (people) changes with respect to time when it is not possible to establish a predetermined path for it and is capable of deceiving (blending or morphing) and betraying at the same time. Most importantly, the objects (the people) who are doing the chasing to make others accept to drink, eat, and wear as per what they say is permissible (i.e., critical thinkers and servants) are themselves a medium that is behaving in the same way (and even worse).

Once again, I have no way of knowing how the elites expect that their critical thinkers and servants rejuvenate their power when the problem that the elites appear to be tangled in as of 1945 or after they decided to deviate away from the work program that the founding fathers of the UN (the old powers) counselled them to observe to stay faithful to its principal to keep their dominant role and ensure lasting peace, appears to be a paradox that is not any different than the Achilles and the Tortoise paradox that Zeno of Elea, a pre-Socratic philosopher, suggested and till now mankind was not able to find a solution for. According to the Achilles and the Tortoise paradox, whenever “the Achilles arrives somewhere the tortoise has been, he (the Achilles) still has some distance to go before he can even reach the tortoise.”

I do not know if technology can be more clever than human ingenuity, thus enabling the elites and their critical thinkers and servants to make people accept to drink, eat, and wear based on what they would be saying is permissible, and in this way end the historical dynamic that the world has known since antiquity. What I do know is that all the laws that the critical thinkers and servants of the elites are constantly cranking out on what is permissible and what is not permissible are not any different than the commandments suggested in religious scriptures. Be that as it may, since the date people began to let governments become economic operators, mankind has failed to stop this institution from degrading human conditions (i.e., producing) the most violence and death. In parallel, since people began to violate

constitutions or divine verses and rulings, the warnings that are suggested in biblical scriptures on the punishment that those who violate the divine verses and rulings could endure have not spared the individuals who claim to be working to safeguard such laws, but when they are on their own, they transgress them, violate them, and use them to serve their own ends.

For example, many rulers and kings who forgot the warning they had received in the Ten Commandments until the date when the Islamic prophet Muhammad suggested Surah Al-Araf (The Heights) were humiliated and resized in the course of time and things. Similarly, from the date when the Islamic prophet Muhammad suggested Surah Al-Araf (between 618 and 620 AD) and until today, lots of rulers and kings who ignored the warning signs (or stories) that were handed in this Surah or other religious and history books, including constitutions, faced the same humiliation in the course of time and things. Some were humiliated before they passed away, and others, if they had lived longer, would have observed that their heirs paid the ultimate price for their disregard. If, whenever rulers and kings lost sight of what their duties were, many rulers and kings faced the humiliations that religious and philosophical books suggest, then there is a good chance that the elites may endure the same end if they are not standing firm and defending the truth suggested in the UN Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR).

Arrogance is defined as “an attitude of superiority manifested in an overbearing manner or in presumptions, claims, or assumptions.” People have been denying the truth that is included in constitutions (or religious scriptures) since antiquity. In my opinion, this arrogance started to develop as of the date people began to financialize the world and to make it very hard for parents to raise their children themselves. For example, until the start of the second half of the 20th century, newborns (new people) first experiences of reality used to be through the intermediary of their parents. In other words, parents (mothers) used to be the primary educators of their children during the first half of the 20th century. For one reason or another, the elites and their critical thinkers adopted economic policies during the second half of the 20th century that made it very difficult for mothers to be housewives and to focus on being the primary educators of children.

This meant that schools became the primary educators of children, not parents, during the second half of the 20th century.

For example, one could suppose that the dynamism that the world knew throughout the 20th century would have been sufficient to make the elites (and their critical thinkers) recognize that their strategy of passing to schools the responsibility of upbringing children is not a smart way to teach newborns (new people) to keep constantly in mind the values included in constitutions (or religious scriptures) or to love them (the elites). In other words, it did not cross the elites or their critical thinkers minds that perhaps it would be better to slow down the financialization of the world so parents go back to being the ones who raise newborns (new people) in the same way a large number of animals in the animal kingdom do it. For instance, when a female dog gives birth to puppies, the mother does not give the puppies to another dog, hyena, snake, lion, fish, or bird to raise, teach how to hunt, etc., but stays with the puppies for as long as reality permits.

Strangely, the arrogance of the elites and their critical thinkers persuaded them to continue to believe that they would continue, as of the start of the 21st century, to forge through while continuing to let newborns (new people) be elevated differently than the way most animals do it. In other words, the elites and their critical thinkers did not think that it was important to slow the financialization of the world at the start of the 21st century so parents (or schools) could have breathing space and, in this way, reassign back to them the responsibility of teaching newborns (new people) personal judgment, common sense, and temperance. That is also to say, the elites and their critical thinkers did not want to factor in the fact that just because we all look alike in form, this does not mean that we all look alike in spirit (mental or character). The elites and their critical thinkers did not want to acknowledge that it is not possible to transfer feelings. Nor did the elites want to acknowledge that financializing the world and letting parents give their children to teachers and babysitters to raise, just because they look like parents in form, would have no bearing on how attitude is shaped. No teacher or babysitter can love a child in the same way a mother or a father love and protect their own children.

This different way of being in the world that the elites and their critical thinkers want newborns (new people) be raised has shown that it is not a good coping mechanism to help the fittest make the weak consider his opinion before taking action on his own as of 1945. In fact, as of the start of the 21st century, newborns (new people) are demonstrating compounding disregard and uncontrollable attitudes that were not forecast to occur as a consequence of the coming together of people to secure the “initial” UN goals.

Again, one could suppose that the elites or their critical thinkers would be worried about the divisions that exist between the nations that the founding fathers of the UN (the old powers) tasked with building and maintaining post-conflict peace and stability and to slow down the financialization of the world so people could start to go at a much slower pace and, in this way, have more time to spend with their children instead of all the time thinking about rivalry and how to make ends meet. After all, it is the elites and the critical thinkers who will gain the most if peace and security in the world improve. However, the arrogance of the elites and their critical thinkers exceeded all limits at the start of the 21st century (or the start of the third millennium). Despite most religious and philosophical books warning about “the day when no parent will be of any benefit to their child, nor will a child be of any benefit to their parent” [Surah Luqman 31:33], the elites and their critical thinkers started phasing out the little role parents or schools were playing to teach newborns (new people) how to keep in mind the common standards included in constitutions (or religious scriptures) and began wanting that governments and technology be responsible for the lion’s share, knowing that those two mediums are simply a means towards an end (to benefit the individuals involved). In other words, as of the start of the 21st century, it is no longer parents or schools who are the primary teachers (educators) of newborns (new people) in the art of choosing between what is right and what is wrong, or in how to develop personal judgment, common sense, and temperance, but the servants of the elites and technology are taking on this responsibility.

If technology and the servants (governments and international institutions) of the elites (along with their critical thinkers) are not educating newborns (new people) personal judgment, common sense,

and temperance, just as parents were doing until not too long ago, and are not helping new people to transform and embrace good habits and dispositions (love, sacrifice, giving, etc.), just as happens when parents send their children to school and teachers prepare them in different subjects or fields of study, then newborns (new people) would not be learning good habits or developing an optimistic attitude towards life's challenges.

I have no way of knowing if technology and the servants of the elites are managing to educate and discipline newborns in the same descent way parents or schools showed was possible till the end of the 20th century, or if this abnormal rise in intolerance and disregard, etc., that emerged at the start of the 21st century and people of all ages are showing is because the servants are failing in this responsibility in the same way they failed since the elites extended their responsibility to service state economies and public needs.

If newborns (new people) are not developing good habits and are prioritizing the self over the common good (collectivism), then the critical thinkers of the elites could be grooming monsters. In other words, the financialization of the world will not create the ordered hierarchical relations that the elites anticipate, but perhaps their demise.

The constant wars and bleak times that the world has known in recent years are events that are only new to our generation. Ever since the day the fittest (the rich, rulers, kings, judges, law enforcement agents, etc.) believed that it was possible to engage the will and to adopt laws (standards, norms, and rules) programmed to foster an environment of friendship without practicing what is being preached, this strategy has been shifting the world between periods of war and peace. The constant wars that engulfed the world as of 1945 are a result of the elites continuing with their critical thinkers and servants to extend this tradition of taking rulings out of context. That is to say, the constant wars that the world has known since 1945 are a result of the elites neglecting the portion of the law that decreases their happiness and upholding the portion that contributes to increasing it.

The idiom “do something till you are blue in the face” is an expression that means a person could be saying or doing something till his face turns blue and still find himself wasting his efforts and getting no results. As of 1945, none of the strategies that the elites legitimized to improve human rights, social justice, etc. through the intermediary of critical thinkers and servants who were refusing to lead by example succeeded in making citizens (businesses, nations, kingdoms) ready to submit to such a type of social relationship. Can the elites keep on letting their critical thinkers and servants turn away from their obligations to observe the rules lead to results that would be any different than what their predecessors reaped when they let their critical thinkers and servants come up with strategies that are intended to create ordered relations but without them observing what they are preaching? Most importantly, if whenever the fittest took rulings out of context, he failed to delude or daze people to make them be ready to submit to such social relations, and in the course of time and things discovered that his wealth, power, and status were not useful to him to prevent his collapse or resizing, could the elites avoid being resized if we already know that no authority managed to exercise power alone when it regarded itself exempt from observing the rules that it was preaching? In other words, whenever the fittest relied on deceit to allow him to exercise power alone or to enforce rules (standards, norms) that his critical thinkers or servants were not practicing, the more the number of people who started to regard themselves as qualified to sit at the round table increased instead of decreasing. That is to say, the number of people who used the corruption, deceit, disregard, and contempt that they learned to resize their rulers increased.

The awareness and knowledge of people are continuously evolving. Evidently, the more people become aware that the critical thinkers and servants of the elites are not observing the ideas that they are preaching, the more the number of people who would consider themselves qualified to sit at the round table will grow. Likewise, the more people there are, the more they will be devoted to doing exactly what it is now our turn to do. This is to convert the world into a court to solve people’s issues and pleadings by relying on corruption, deceit, disregard, and contempt instead of a battle field to find out who would be first to do good. Evidently, the more people try to have the upper

hand and have no respect for kinship or accords, the more people will be divided into two factions. One faction would preach uprightness while extending this tradition of taking rulings out of context (i.e., neglecting the portion of the law that decreases their happiness and upholding the portion that contributes to increasing it). The second faction would be totally going astray, and relying on corruption, deceit, disregard, and contempt to increase its happiness. Of course, both factions would be cursing the preceding generations for not having improved peace and security. And so, if every time an individual (business, nation, kingdom) disobey or shuns the laws that are suggested in constitutions (or religious scriptures) there appear to be an appointed time that no person has so far demonstrated is powerful enough to prevent its events from humiliating him, can the individuals (families/dynasties) who are deciding the course of the world and history (i.e., the elites) prevent their resizing (collapse) when the constant wars that have engulfed the world as of 1945 is because they are not doing enough to stop their critical thinkers and servants from regarding themselves above the law, or take real action to safeguard the principles set forth in the UN Charter and the (UDHR)? In other words, can the elites avoid their collapse when the people they need to depend on their wisdom to rejuvenate their powers and stay in control are worried more about what they eat, drink, and wear than how to dissuade each other to reduce disputes and inequity?

All the religious and philosophical scriptures suggest that “no soul knows what it will earn for tomorrow.” For this reason, the founding fathers of the UN (the old powers) suggested to the principal victors of WW2 (their children) that they foster human relations that are necessary for full human development. The founding fathers of the UN suggested laws (standards, norms, rules) in the UN Charter and the UDHR that are not different from the ones that are suggested in the Veda, Torah, Quran, etc. However, instead of the elites doing as their fathers (the old powers) suggested to them at the end of WW2, which was to not let the life of the world deceive them, the elites decided to let their critical thinkers and servants regard themselves exempt from observing the work program set forth in the UN Charter and the UDHR. As of 1945, the critical thinkers and servants of the elites are not only preventing people from relating what they already know to further their understanding of human knowledge, but are also denying

citizens the freedom to embrace truth and take ownership of their self-determination, as the founding fathers of the UN counselled (the old powers with allies such as the United States).

For example, the founding fathers of the UN (the old powers with allies such as the United States) suggested that the international organization named United Nations shall not intervene in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any state and to let each UN member state freely determine its political status and freely pursue its economic, social and cultural development; hence, by virtue of becoming a member of the United Nations, the nation in question would be accepting the obligations contained in the United Nations Charter or the UDHR. For one reason or another, the principal victors of WW2 (i.e., the individuals who are deciding the course of the world and history) deemed that this aforementioned suggestion does not rejuvenate their power in the aftermath of WW2, including transitioning mankind to a fairer and more sustainable world. The principal victors of WW2 granted right to civilian foreign aid and development assistance agencies to maintain a team that offers the same service that governments provide in each UN member state. In other words, in each UN member state, we have two authorities or two legal entities that are providing parameters for everyday behavior, including political, economic, social, or cultural solutions that are oriented to improve their well-being and happiness as of 1945. The respective government is one of those two legal entities, and the other is made up of thousands upon thousands of national agencies that offer foreign aid and development assistance, such as USAID, FCDO, AFD, and JICA, along with non-state actors and international institutions such as the United Nations, World Bank, IMF, Red Cross, NGOs, etc.

All people do after birth is explore and create change. If the elites (the western European monarchs and republics) believe that having so many legal entities in each UN member state provide parameters for everyday behavior is a good way to accelerate the rejuvenation of their power, including the transition of mankind to a fairer and more sustainable world, knowing that most of the individuals involved (rulers, kings, judges, law enforcement agents, human development experts, etc.) are not observing the principles that are suggested in the UN Charter and the UDHR, then two perceptions could be driving the

convictions of the elites. The first is if the perceptions of the elites (and their critical thinkers) are misleading them. The second is if the elites (and their critical thinkers) believe that the stories that are suggested in the biblical scriptures and the history books about the humiliations that individuals who stray from the laws (standards, norms, rules) suggested in such documents suffer are false.

I have no way of knowing which scenario between the aforementioned two could be propelling the elites to let their critical thinkers and their servants regard themselves exempt from observing the work program set forth in the UN Charter and the UDHR and still expect to be the ones who would be deciding the course of the world and history. What I do know is that political power and wealth appear to behave in the same way that parenthood works. In other words, parents have no way of knowing if their children will be weak (unable to look after themselves) or as healthy and clever as they are. And so the big question that begs answers is: how did the elites (along with their critical thinkers) conclude that their heirs (or the societies on which they are depending for their wealth and military superiority to keep their dominant role) would be as clever or as established as they are today in the future, when they cannot create anything or control life? In other words, if the only way for the elites to ensure that their heirs would inherit their wealth, power, and status is if all their servants embrace truth and prepare new people to love them, how did the elites (along with their critical thinkers) reach the conclusion that allowing their servants to regard themselves exempt from observing the work program set forth in the UN Charter and the UDHR would provide the optimum environment for such development?

Once again, I have no way of knowing how the elites (along with their critical thinkers) reached that point where they could make new people be ready to stay in group with them or to be ready to let their heirs have a greater say in governance when their servants are spreading corruption in the land after the founding fathers of the UN handed to them the readiness of the entire world population to have them play the role of the deputy of God or to reduce fear and want. What I do know is that the constant wars that have engulfed the world in recent years cannot be indicative of the servants of the elites managing to assist their masters (the elites) in training newborns (new people) to

constantly keep in mind the common standard suggested in the UDHR and the UN Charter, including constantly striving to secure their universal observance, but the occurrence of the opposite. Newborns (new people) appear to be relying on their natural state (their innate free will that was given to them by their creator), or their own personal judgment.

Personal judgment, common sense, and temperance are skills that newborns (new people) need to learn to make good choices, including how to exercise their will properly. If the constant disregard that swept the world as of 1945 is indicative of the failure of the critical thinkers and servants of the elites in assisting their masters (the elites) in training newborns (new people) in fostering respect for the common standard suggested in the UDHR and the UN Charter to enable them afterwards to develop virtue and sound judgment, then it is not possible to suppose that newborns (new people), around the world, are developing a desire to stay in group with the elites (or their heirs), or to be fostering the minimum virtue required to make them respect people they do not know.

In the book of Proverbs of the Bible, it is suggested that “he who walks with wise men will be wise, but the companion of fools will suffer harm.” [Proverbs 13:20]. It has not been demonstrated through the scientific method that the company a person keeps can influence his personality and behavior. In addition, “while it is not always true that a person’s friends define who a person is, it is certainly true that the people a person spends time with can have a significant impact on his attitudes, beliefs, and actions. This is because we tend to adopt the behaviors and values of those around us, and our social networks can shape our perspectives and experiences” as well.

For example, as of the date when WW2 was regarded as having ended, the elites are rejuvenating their power through the financialization of the world. In addition, the elites granted their servants (governments and international institutions) rights to regard themselves exempt from observing the UN Charter or the UDHR. Likewise, it was not demonstrated that technology can teach people to keep in mind the UN Charter or the UDHR and to observe the common standards suggested in those two documents. I have no way of knowing how the methods

that the elites are adopting to make people see them as role models are encouraging them to surrender freedom to them. What I do know is that the constant wars that have engulfed the world since 1948 can only be indicative of people not finding the policies that the critical thinkers of the elites are legitimizing indispensable and the manner in which their servants are behaving a complementary partner in the critically important task of educating new people to observe the UN Charter or the UDHR. Many questions beg answers. For one, can the elites prevent their collapse in the course of time and things if the only path ahead of them (the elites) to stay in power is for their critical thinkers and servants to stop prioritizing political corruption and self-indulgence so people would have no reason to disobey? Can the elites expect that future generations will be ready to let them possess more powers than others when their critical thinkers and servants are not leading by example and are teaching newborns (new people) that corruption, division, betrayal, backstabbing, etc., in politics is the right way to seek goodness in and through everyday life and work?

I have no way of knowing if the decision of the elites to let newborns (new people) come to learn from their critical thinkers, servants, and technology about how to love them (the elites) when neither medium is teaching them (people) to foster virtue could make people want to stay with them (the elites) and to be ready to lay their own lives for them. Likewise, if the elites decision to let newborns (new people) discover that their critical thinkers and servants are not observing the UN Charter or the UDHR and that all the examples that they are setting are paralyzing and not helping them to want to be even more united, it is a good strategy to make people love them (the elites). What I do know is that as of the start of the 21st century, the elites and their critical thinkers and servants do not appear to be interested in seeking to teach newborns (new people) to embrace good (love, sacrifice, giving, etc.), as the founding fathers of the UN counselled them in 1945 to be devoted to doing to attain the noble things that are included in the UN Charter or the UDHR, but the majority appear to be seeking to embrace science and to teach newborns (new people) to embrace science more than to learn how to cooperate in accordance with the principles included in the UDHR.

Once again, I have no way of knowing if the decision of the elites and their critical thinkers to make newborns (new people) perceive that the purpose of life is how to increase pleasure (material wealth and prestige), instead of how to increase tolerance, values and the idea of freedom, as the founding fathers of the UN suggested, is helping them (the elites) to instill good habits in people. In other words, it is advancing social and economic progress that helps people control their appetites, as most soldiers agree to do when they enlist in the army. What I do know is that despite all the striving or teaching that the elites and their critical thinkers have imparted since 1945 to make newborns (new people) rise above their current situation and culture in order to develop the minimum habit (training) of mind that would make them (people) start to appreciate what is deepest in our human condition (i.e., freedom), only a few leaders (rulers, kings, judges, law enforcement agents, human development experts, etc.), such as Ron Paul, an American diplomat, or Thomas Sowell, an American Economist, have managed to cultivate such aspects. Everyone else (i.e., most rulers, kings, judges, law enforcement agents, human development experts) has been living dwelling in the same way it was suggested in Surah Al-Araf, verse 176, that Bal'am ibn Ba'ûrâ' (a scholar) lived at the time of Moses. The Quran states that Bal'am ibn Ba'ûrâ' was like "a dog: if you chase it away, it pants, and if you leave it, it 'still' pants..." [Surah Al-Araf, 7:176]

Sayyid Abul A'la al-Maududi (1903-1979), a Pakistani Islamic scholar and philosopher, suggests that the Quran (or God) likened the person in question to a dog in this aforementioned verse to justify the following explanations: "A dog's protruding tongue and the unceasing flow of saliva from his mouth symbolize unquenchable greed and avarice. The reason for likening the human character described above to a dog is because of his excessive worldliness. It is known that in several languages of the world, it is common to call people overly devoted to worldliness as 'dogs of the world'. For what, after all, is the characteristic of a dog? It is nothing else but greed and avarice. Just look at the dog! As he moves around, he continuously sniffs the earth. Even if a rock is hurled at him, he runs at it in the hope that it might be a piece of bone or bread. Before he discovers it to be a rock, he hastens to seize it in his mouth. Even a person's indifference does not deter a dog from waiting expectantly for food – panting for breath, his tongue

spread out and drooping, and a whole world from one perspective alone – that of his belly! Even if he discovers a large carcass, he would not be content with his portion of it, but would try to make it exclusively his and would not let any other dog even come close. It seems that if any urge other than appetite tickles him, it is the sexual urge.”

I have no way of knowing if the constant wars that engulfed the world as of 1948 (the date when the first war erupted after 1945) and especially as of the start of the 21st century are because the elites and their critical thinkers and servants are behaving in the same way the Quran highlighted, via the metaphor of the dog, how this scholar who lived during the days of Moses was behaving despite all the advanced knowledge that he had gained. Alternatively, the abnormal intolerance that people are manifesting is because of forces that operate in the same way the Yin and Yang philosophical concept describes cosmology and interconnected forces. In other words, any rise in modernity and progress (rise in awareness and knowledge) creates a reciprocal rise in the unpreparedness of people to ponder and contemplate, as the founding fathers of the UN suggested in the UN Charter, specifically due to a rise in awareness and knowledge. What I do know is that in the last fourteen hundred years (since the death of the Islamic prophet Muhammad), there were two intervals in history in which mankind demonstrated awareness that rose above the way dogs are known to behave (i.e., continuously sniffing the earth). The first was when the founding fathers of the United States penned in 1776 that “all men are created equal”. The second time was when the elites (the western European monarchs and republics) with their allies such as the United States, the Soviet Union until the 1990s, China, and many others, penned in 1948 that “all human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights”.

This abnormal rise in intolerance that has emerged around the world since the start of the 21st century in particular can be attributed to two phenomena. The first is if the elites backed out of their determination to reduce fear and want and decided to go back to walking like dogs, continuously sniffing the earth. The second is if the elites are relying on critical thinkers and servants who do not understand the true nature

of their responsibility or how to act and therefore are walking like dogs continuously sniffing the earth.

In my opinion, this abnormal rise in intolerance or disregard that has swept the world since the start of the 21st century cannot be due to the elites backing out of their determination to reduce fear and want and going back to walking like dogs sniffing the earth. This is because most people believe that human choices are motivated only by the desire for increased happiness. Put differently, in a race, the runner who is in the lead cannot slow down because the other runners will overtake him. This means that the person who is in the lead must maintain his standing, or “height”. The runners who are racing to overtake the runner who is in the lead gain when they overtake the person who is in first place. Could the abnormal rise in intolerance that emerged around the world as of 1948 be due to the elites relying on critical thinkers and servants who are not understanding the true nature of their responsibility or how to act and therefore are walking like dogs continuously sniffing the earth?

I do not know the answer to the aforementioned question. What I do know is that in 1945, the founding fathers of the UN counselled the elites to end colonization and to let people freely determine their political status and freely pursue their economic, social, and cultural development, by virtue of the fact that they were going to be observing faithfully and strictly the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations and the UDHR, as I said before. In addition, the elites granted people the right to make territorial adjustments in accordance with their wishes. Most importantly, the elites declared that all people would have the right to self-determination, including the right to advance their social welfare.

If we compare what the elites proposed to help people work for a world free of want and fear to what Moses, Buddha, Confucius, Jesus, and, last but not least, Muhammad, proposed, we find that the elites proposed principles to help people embrace good that are far better if not equal. For example, Moses, Jesus, and Muhammad proposed to people that they postpone access to whatever material things they were not able to attain or possess in their lifetime to the afterlife. The elites proposed letting every newborn secure his aspirations right here on

earth. As we can see, the elites cannot be blamed for this rise in intolerance. The elites are not the primary educators of people but their critical thinkers and servants.

No matter which way we compare the goodness that the elites displayed at the end of WW2 to the way people have been reciprocating since the collapse of the Soviet Union in the 1990s in particular, or the invasion of the world wide web, which happened in the same period as well, we find that there was a big disconnect between the habits of mind that were prevailing before the occurrence of those two events and the unrestrained behaviors that emerged in the aftermath. In fact, there is hardly a society that is accepting of the principles suggested in the UN Charter or the UDHR as of the start of the 21st century, and only the infants and the dead (in person) are not passing on judgments and suggestions (ideas) on how people relations should be organized in the international order. Could the modern educational experiment that the elites and their critical thinkers adopted to let their servants and technology be responsible for educating newborns (new people) about keeping the common standards suggested in the UDHR constantly in mind, instead of letting schools or parents do it, be the detriment that is preventing people from making progressive progress toward this end? In other words, the decision of the elites to let their critical thinkers financialize the world is making most people walk like the person who the Quran (God) likened to a dog continuously sniffing the earth despite how educated and modernized he was.

No matter which way we compare the goodness that the elites displayed at the end of WW2 to the way people have been reciprocating since the collapse of the Soviet Union in the 1990s in particular, or the invasion of the world wide web, which happened in the same period as well, we find that there was a big disconnect between the habits of mind that were prevailing before the occurrence of those two events and the unrestrained behaviors that emerged in the aftermath. In fact, there is hardly a society that is accepting of the principles suggested in the UN Charter or the UDHR as of the start of the 21st century, and only the infants and the dead (in person) are not passing on judgments and suggestions (ideas) on how people relations should be organized in the international order. Could the modern

educational experiment that the elites and their critical thinkers adopted to let their servants and technology be responsible for educating newborns (new people) about keeping the common standards suggested in the UDHR constantly in mind, instead of letting schools or parents do it, be the detriment that is preventing people from making progressive progress toward this end? In other words, the decision of the elites to let their critical thinkers financialize the world is making most people walk like the person who the Quran (God) likened to a dog continuously sniffing the earth despite how educated and modernized he was.

As we look at the state of affairs in the world today, we find that there are many signs that support the fact that the interventions or investments that the elites and their critical thinkers have made till now to make people accept universal political and economic standards and norms (executive, legislative, judicial, and administrative) have not been a very profitable venture. In the Quran, it is suggested that humanity had once been one community, but then the disputes, jealousy, etc. that they were propelling scattered mankind to the present day. [Surah Al-Baqarah 2:213].

Surely, the advances that were made in science in modern history made it possible for technology to overpower the human body (and mind) against its natural will, and, therefore, this development invited many people (businesses, states, kingdoms) to start to have their own agendas. That is to say, the ongoing collection and digitization of the world's entire scientific and cultural heritage published in books and journals could be happening to lock up such information and roll back domination, subjugation, or exploitation. In the days of Pharaoh, this strategy worked, and Egypt was regarded as the world's greatest power, just as Great Britain, France, and other industrialized countries are perceived today. But again, Pharaoh was not able to run against the Almighty or his slaves. Pharaoh's strategy of disobeying his own rules and using tribal and cultural differences to punish the citizens who did not fit his own version of human rights worked until it didn't work.

A person reaps what he sows. In other words, Pharaoh cannot be blamed for taking advantage of the Israelites, because if the Israelites and the Egyptians who were profiting from his policies were not going

along with it, Pharaoh and his servants would not have confronted the humiliation that the Bible says they endured.

As I said before, the elites and their critical thinkers could plot and pursue any idea that they believed could help them rejuvenate their power. The question that begs answers is not about knowing what incremental changes the elites and their critical thinkers take to preserve their power, but whether or not the changes that they are taking are rejuvenating their power in the long run. To give an example, there are two ways to go from New York City to the Vatican City. The first is to draw a straight line between those two cities. The second is to draw an unlimited number of lines or pathways. At the end of WW2, the founding fathers of the UN counselled the elites to observe a political scheme suggested in the UN Charter and the UDHR to rejuvenate their power. In addition, the founding fathers of the UN did not leave for the elites an incomplete work program on what they must do to have their critical thinkers and servants secure the goals set forth in the UN Charter, but a completed one. However, the elites decided to deviate from this initial scheme and began to implement new approaches to secure this end (rejuvenate their power and accelerate the transition of people to a fairer and more sustainable world). The constant wars that the world is experiencing as of the start of the 21st century are a result of the elites and their critical thinkers and servants vying for influence to promote their own agendas instead of the agenda that was suggested in the UN Charter and the UDHR to educate newborns (new people).

In this context, the elites could continue to let their critical thinkers and servants promote their agendas (political corruption, mismanagement, betrayal) and to use their authority to censor what they do not approve of instead of leading by example, but this strategy of letting those two servants become sort of equal distance to them would not be creating ordered relations but would make them miserably fail.

For example, the naivete and ignorance of a UN staff member led him to believe that the elites are really determined to secure the UN goals, and he gave his best to secure this end. Throughout the years that he was employed at the United Nations, he refused to prioritize his own

interests over the interests of the elite. The conviction of this UN staff about the importance of securing the UN goals as per what the elites suggested that every member of the human family be doing as of 1945 made him pay a big price between 2013 and 2017.

In 2013, this UN staff member in question refused to go along with his supervisor's decision to use the UN bank account to launder money in the Democratic Republic of the Congo because it was a blunt violation and backstab by the principal institution that the elites created to defend and preserve the UN Charter on their behalf. His senior managers, instead of rewarding and promoting him for his courage, informed him that they were going to follow up directly about the issues he raised and then gave him two options: transfer temporarily to Sudan or reject and stay in the job until the date when his contract ends.

In Sudan, this UN staff member repeated the same stupid, naive, and ignorant behavior he showed in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. In other words, instead of starting to prioritize his best interests as his supervisors were doing, he continued to be stubborn and defend the best interests of the elites. In late 2014, the Government of Great Britain (DFID) bluntly informed this UN staff member that it was not going to finance a project under negotiation in the country unless he agreed to violate the UN Charter (the UN Financial Rules and Regulations). Then again, instead of remembering to choose his best interests and agree with what the Government of Great Britain (DFID) wanted done with its money, he chose the best interests of the elites (i.e., the British royal family and the people of Great Britain) and refused the request of the servants of the elites (i.e., the public officials in this country).

It is important that readers keep in mind that Great Britain is the principal founding nation of the United Nations. In other words, the government of Great Britain should be decorating this UN staff member for prioritizing the work program suggested in the UN Charter and the UDHR, and not telling him that if you do not violate the UN Charter, you will not obtain the funding in question.

The decision of this UN staff member to be against breaking the rules enshrined in the UN Charter in late 2014, which is also what her majesty the late Queen of Great Britain and the people of Great Britain counselled people around the world not to do, cost this UN staff member his career, dignity, and dreams. In less than twenty-four hours after informing the Dfid official in Sudan that he would not accept to violate the UN charter, his senior managers placed him on administrative leave to investigate charges that they said one of his staff members filed against him. The senior managers of this UN staffer did not tell him who charged him or give him details about the nature of the charges. Then, while this UN staff member was on administrative leave, the UN lawyers canceled the investigation and informed him that the UN was ending his contract because the organization was restructuring.

It is important that readers note that from the date the UN investigators (and UN lawyers) placed this UN staff member on administrative leave to the date when his contract ended, the organizations (the UN lawyers) did not tell this UN staff member what he was accused of or grant him any right to put into question any decision the United Nations made. In other words, the United Nations was treating this UN staff worse than what some human rights experts accuse the United States of doing following the Sept. 11 attacks. This was the US government's use of its power to arrest and detain individuals who this country has declared enemies of the idea of freedom. The United Nations was doing the opposite. The United Nations was stripping the individuals who were defending the idea of freedom of this right and placing them on administrative leave, including ending their employment.

Then again, the naivety and ignorance of this UN staff member about the elites being serious about defending the idea of freedom led him to continue to make the same stupid mistakes he was making before (i.e., choosing the best interests of the elites instead of his own best interests, as his supervisors were doing in the Democratic Republic of the Congo and the government of Great Britain in Sudan).

This UN staff member refused the offer the UN lawyers made to him to forget the past and to accept having his health benefits and pension

regulated, along with a two-year contract, because it did not include putting his career development back on track after the UN senior managers wrecked it or when they chose their best interests over the best interests of the elites.

In the year 2015, this UN staff member filed an application in the UN Tribunal, hoping that the elites would operate tribunals that were just and would indemnify him justly. Tribunals are the bodies that the elites depend on to make people voluntarily stay with them and be ready to let them have more powers than others. Once again, this UN staff discovered in 2017 that the UN tribunal is the entity that is accelerating the resizing and collapse of the elites, not the opposite.

The UN tribunal (judges, UN lawyers, UN senior managers, UN Secretary General, etc.) thought that if they looked in their bag of rules and pulled a technical excuse to dismiss the application of this UN staff member, the entire world would not know how the United Nations (the legal entity that Great Britain created to preserve its strength and security) and the British government, whose British monarch relies on the wisdom of its officials to keep the British monarchy standing, are doing it. Most importantly, the UN judges, UN lawyers, UN senior managers, UN Secretary General, etc. (those servants) thought that by stumbling on the truth, they would be protecting the elites (i.e., the families/dynasties who control the British monarchs and the rest of the western European monarchs and republics) and that those powerful families (i.e., their masters) would continue to look favorably on them.

I have no way of knowing if the UN judges protected the elites when they accepted the technical administrative argument the UN lawyers and UN senior managers gave to justify why the case of this UN staff member should not be accepted and dismissed it, ignoring all the corruption, denial of rights, etc. included. In other words, the UN judges saw the needle in the haystack but could not see the hay (i.e., the corruption schemes that the supervisors of this UN staff member were operating).

Two outcomes resulted from the decision of the UN senior managers, UN supervisors, UN lawyers, and UN judges to stumble under their

feet on this UN staff member and the elites (western European monarchs and republics) and specifically, the United States (the custodian of the idea of freedom), because this UN staff member was protecting their interests.

First, the UN supervisors, UN lawyers, and UN judges continued to use the United Nations as a platform to deepen corruption in the world. The corruption and mismanagement scandal in which the UN was caught red-handed operating in 2022 (and which involved the same UN supervisors who stumbled with their foot on this UN staff member for choosing the work program included in the UN charter over his self-interests) supports the idea that this intergovernmental organization is failing the elites miserably. Second, this former UN staff member (who is a US national) distrusts, as of 2017, his country, its rulers and political class, the elites (all western European monarchs and republics), and all international institutions. This former UN staff member is not prepared to serve his country, the elites, or the United Nations if they are to offer him all the money in the world before a neutral tribunal reopens this case and disciplines him if he is guilty or re-indemnifies him for all the abuse the UN put him through to gain a few dollars. Here again, we can see that the elites are failing miserably.

Put differently, if for as long as the elites do not stop their critical thinkers and their servants from continuing to regard themselves exempt from observing the work program set forth in the UN charter and the UDHR, the more shallow human relations would be getting, then the longer this crucible situation lasts, the more the elites would be inviting relations that take place when a substance undergoes a chemical change instead of a physical change. It is not possible to return a substance to its original state after it undergoes a chemical change. In other words, it is not possible to convert a piece of wood that was burned and became ash back into the same piece of wood.

The elites could continue to apply political policies that work in the same way bandages work, but applying bandages to a broken foot does not knit the bones back together but expands or widens the damage or fracture. And so the question that begs answers, as I said before, is not about knowing if the elites could avoid their resizing if they continue

to be unprepared to go back to observe the work program that the founding fathers of the UN counselled them to stay faithful to its principles to keep their dominant role or not, because we already know that this would not be the case if the stories that are suggested in the biblical stories are true and history can repeat. The question that begs answers is: how are the elites reaching the point where they can deviate away from the work program that the founding fathers of the UN counselled them to stay faithful to its principles to keep their dominant role and still expect to be able to rejuvenate their power when people were not granted the right to predict the future or how the change they effect contributes to the preservation of their power? To put it differently, how did the elites determine that newborns (new people) would be prepared to stay with them in groups after they deviated away from the work program to which the founding fathers of the UN counselled them to stay faithful to its principles to keep their dominant role and allowed their critical thinkers and servants to educate people about how to love them when those two (their critical thinkers and servants) are not leading by example and are promoting their own agendas?

I have no way of knowing how the elites are reaching the point where they can continue to rejuvenate their power when they are letting critical thinkers and servants who are not observing the work program included in the UN Charter and the UDHR be the lens through which newborns (new people) are evaluating their experiences and knowledge. What I do know is that babies first learn to get around by creeping, just like dogs, or pulling themselves along on their tummies, just like fish glide in water.

The constant wars that engulfed the world as of 1948, could be due to one of two scenarios: The first is if the elites are letting newborns (new people) start to walk before they learn how to creep first (or run before they learn how to walk). In other words, the decision of the elites to let their servants and technology educate newborns (new people) to observe the principles set forth in the UDHR (knowing that those two legal entities can never prioritize truth) instead of letting parents and, to an extent, schools do it is the wrong strategy. That is to say, this strategy (i.e., the financialization of the world) is sinking the ship of state. The second is if the elites believe that time is on their side and

that the policies that their critical thinkers are adopting are always putting the ship of state on course. In other words, the incremental short term changes (day-to-day gains) that the elites are generating will always be sufficient to preserve their power, wealth, and status and keep them afloat.

Once again, I have no way of knowing which scenario between the aforementioned two could have propelled the elites to perceive that deviating away from the work program that the founding fathers of the UN counselled them to stay faithful to its principles is more effective to rejuvenate their power and keep their dominant role. What I do know is that if the elites continue to tolerate that their critical thinkers and servants regard themselves exempt from observing the work program set forth in the UN Charter or the UDHR (i.e., ignoring the damage that this disregard could be posing to newborns / new people), there could be a cost that they may pay. To put it differently, when an infant tries to walk (stand up) before learning how to creep, the fall could hurt the infant's head more if the fall is done when the infant is in a standing position instead of when the infant is in a creeping position and the head is close to the ground. And since we have no way of knowing if the efforts that an infant makes to stand up before learning how to creep are motives that his own impatience propels or if some unnatural forces (God) are driving such motives, we have no way of knowing if such actions are intended to outrun parents or to be an aid to them. This means that the more children are protected, the easier it is to regulate their behavior. Likewise, the more the behavior of children is regulated, the easier it will be for the elites to control them.

If the aforementioned statement contains any elements of truth, then the elites should be in favor of letting people (societies) determine their own political, social, and economic development in the aftermath of WW2, as the founding fathers of the UN suggested, and not be in favor of accelerating the modernization of societies or extending the responsibilities of their servants to the economy and public service to accelerate this transition. This is because the faster this transition is accelerated, the harder it becomes to regulate people's behavior. The harder it gets to regulate people's behavior, the faster the elites need to

run after them to regulate their behavior. The faster a person runs, the higher the chances of getting injured or fatigued.

Then again, it would be naive to suppose that the elites or their critical thinkers are unaware of the threats of accelerating the modernization of people on the maintenance of their stability and strength. That is to say, it would be naive to suppose that the elites or their critical thinkers do not know that if they let newborns (new people) learn how to use computers before learning how to hold a spoon properly, such a quick rise in the awareness of people could be a threat to them. No one can claim that he knows how exposing an infant to objects that develop his awareness faster can affect his behavior or character.

If the elites (and their critical thinkers) are not worried about how exposing infants and children at an early age to knowledge or awareness that they have no way of knowing if it would be of benefit to them (the elites) or a detriment in the future, then one of two scenarios could be persuading the elites into perceiving that extending this cycle of the financialization of the world would not have any impact on the rejuvenation of their power. The first is that the elites figured out how to control people's appetites. The second is if the elites believe they are invincible.

I have no way of knowing which scenario between the aforementioned two could persuade the elites (and their critical thinkers) into believing that if they stimulate the awareness of newborns (new people) to knowledge at a much earlier age than what the natural force that programmed people appear to have wanted to be awakened or stimulated could be the right choice. What I do know is that we cannot expect that the critical thinkers and the servants of the elites will start to observe the principles set forth in the UDHR any time soon, so we can say that their (the elites) decision to want governments, international institutions, and technology to educate newborns (new people) on how to build personal judgment, common sense, and temperance is preparing children to have an optimistic attitude towards life's challenges. In addition, we can also say that for as long as the elites stay in favor of the financialization of the world and in wanting that their servants and technology educate newborns on what they need to be doing to learn good habits instead of letting parents or schools do

it, it would not be possible for them (the elites) to educate newborns (new people) in the same way farmers cultivate horticulture plants, but in the same way farmers cultivate crops, which is usually a large-scale production process and is a characteristic of agriculture.

Indeed, the way the elites and their critical thinkers divided societies into distinct clusters in the aftermath of WW2, and helped some to be happier than others after the founding fathers of the UN suggested to them that they should be acting towards every person in a spirit of brotherhood is analogous to and not any different from the way farmers cultivate plants.

Some plants (societies) are being tended to very carefully in gardens or greenhouses, such as the people who live in Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Great Britain, the United States, etc. Others are dealt with in the same way crop farming in large-scale production of grains or forages is happening, such as the people who live in most Asian countries and countries in the Americas. There are also people (societies) who are allowed to develop in the same way plants grow in forests and in the wild, such as the people who are living in Lebanon, Iraq, Haiti, most of Africa, etc.

In anthropology, it is suggested that the systematic husbandry of plants and animals helped people transition from existing as tribal societies into civilized ones. In this context, we can say that the transition of the people who live presently in Lebanon, Iraq, Haiti, and most of the African countries, etc., into becoming civilized in the same way that the people who are living in Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Great Britain, etc. have the right to question every detail in those countries, minus the way the political order is structured, is an opportunity for the elites. Likewise, the reversal of the people who live in Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Great Britain, etc. and their adoption of the uncivilized behavior of the people who live presently in Lebanon, Iraq, Haiti, and most African countries is a threat to the elites. This is because the majority of those uncivilized societies have remained unruly since 1945.

I have no way of knowing how the elites and their critical thinkers plan to make newborns (new people) grow to be living in the same

way people in Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Great Britain, etc. are doing, whereby citizens have the right to question every detail in those countries, minus the way the political order is structured, and not turn out to be unruly as the people who live presently in Lebanon, Iraq, Haiti, and most African countries exhibit being.

If two people cannot fill the same void space, the elites have two ways to make newborns (new people) grow up to be living in the same way people in Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Great Britain, etc. have been doing since 1945. The first is to daze the newborns (new people) into becoming convinced, like the people who live in Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Great Britain, etc., that their rulers and political class are more civilized than the rulers and political class who rule the societies that have been unruly till now. The second is to stop letting governments, non-state actors, and international institutions support and accelerate the transition of newborns (new people) to a fairer and more sustainable world, and then go back to treating every newborn (or government) in the same spirit of brotherhood that the founding fathers of the UN suggested.

It is not needed to elaborate on how the international order will change if the elites start to implement the work program that the founding fathers of the UN suggested in the UN charter and the UDHR, because the happiness that the United States managed to achieve for its citizens from 1776 to the end of the 20th century, when this country relied more on the US constitution than on the personal power and conscience of its rulers and political class, is living proof.

I will analyze how we can expect the international order to change if the elites continue to let their critical thinkers foster complex relations that drag their servants to prioritize deceit, crimes, and disregard instead of truth to achieve unity.

If the elites continue to let their critical thinkers grant rights to their servants and technology to foster complex relations that drag newborns (new people) to prioritize deceit, crimes, and disregard instead of the principles set forth in the UDHR to enable afterwards people to achieve unity, it would be necessary that the elites figure out how to control new people in the same way human settlers in antiquity

controlled plucky wild dogs to stop them or outwit them from being vermin and ruthless predators.

To put it differently, infants (children) and puppies are both taught how to behave calmly around others, including good manners, to get them to not display unwanted behaviors. However, even though dogs and people can both jump up on people and bite them, dogs run faster than people. In addition, animal experts say that while “lions have a 30% hit rate, wild dogs are so successful that nearly every hunt ends with a meal.” And so, if the constant wars that engulfed the world as of 1948 could be due to the critical thinkers and servants of the elites running ahead of their masters (the elites) in the same way dogs run ahead of their masters (owners), can the elites avoid having their servants outrun them if both appear to know how to adapt to changing situations and are altruistic? That is to say, can the elites avoid having their servants outrun them when more and more people around the world start to behave in the same way Bal’am ibn Ba’ûrâ’ was doing in antiquity, prioritizing excessive worldliness (greed and avarice) instead of truth and values, instead of as per the way the founding fathers of the UN suggested? Most importantly, if what Jesus suggested in John 15:18-17, Luke 6:40, or Matthew 10:24-26 about how a student can become as good as his master or teacher when the right awareness and knowledge are transferred to the student or servant is also true.

And so, once again, the question that defies ingenuity and begs answers is: how are the elites and their critical thinkers concluding that they can keep all the people of the world on a leash, including their servants, when the only way to do it is as per the way settlers were controlling wild dogs in antiquity, or when everyone observes the work program set forth in the UN charter and the UDHR? In other words, can the elites stop the majority of their servants from politicking to secure that outcomes are shared on equal rights, instead of accepting to do what the person who is above them in the hierarchy is commanding, and still stay in power? In fact, can the elites make their servants cooperate with them in the same way wild dogs cooperate with one another?

For example, wild dogs “maintain strict hierarchy, but the dogs make it appear that every member of the pack is vital. Most importantly, “when a new puppy is born, the little puppy takes priority over even the alphas.” On the other side, most people are not willing to care for and feed those who are young, poor, injured, ill, or elderly unless they are paid or they are promised a reward.

Can the elites and their critical thinkers stop people around the world and their servants from tearing the international order apart when every member of the human family is focusing on sitting at the round table instead of on how to surrender some of their freedoms and submit them to the authority of the political order in exchange for protection of their remaining rights or maintenance of the social order? Likewise, can the elites and their critical thinkers stop people around the world, including their servants from being bound by their personal power and conscience after they (the elites) decided to stop parents and schools from educating newborns (new people) to keep the common standards suggested in the UN charter and the UDHR constantly in their mind, and tasked legal entities who its principal administrators (rulers, kings, judges, law enforcement agents, human development experts) are taking advantage of the political order to profit and to deepen corruption, deceit and disregard, instead of to lead by example so citizens would have no reason to withdraw their obligation to obey, or to refuse to fulfill their part in the social contract agreement?

Actually, there is another challenge that is threatening the international order pursuant to the rise of many candidates (rulers, philanthropists, executives, etc.) in recent years who believe that they can reduce rivalry and make people ready to settle disputes through negotiation and arbitration instead of conflicts and wars better than the individuals (families/dynasties) who have been playing the deputy of God role since 1945 and their servants. How can we be sure that if the individuals (families/dynasties) who have been playing the deputy of God role since 1945 are resized and new families/dynasties start to play their role, those new families/dynasties in question will be better and not worse if no one is observing the UN charter and the UDHR except infants and monks who left mainstream society to live a life of prayer and contemplation?

To put it differently, the Bible states that Jesus washed his disciples' feet before he was betrayed by one of them. [John 13:17] In so doing, Jesus left "no room for doubt in interpreting His own actions: you are not above Me, so if I act humbly and in support of others, you have no right to refuse to do the same." Most importantly, Jesus told his disciples that if they did as he had done, they would be blessed. And so if we cannot say that all the early Christians did as Jesus suggested, because if this were the case, we would have been all living under the authority of the Roman Empire and Christians, then there is a good chance that the powerful families/dynasties who are playing the deputy of God role, or their heirs will be resized in the same way the families/dynasties who were controlling the Roman Empire were resized in the course of time and things, and the families/dynasties that would take over would be worse, just as happened after the families/dynasties who controlled the Roman Empire were resized.

That is to say, hence we cannot say that there is a UN member state whose citizens are cooperating in accordance with the rules set forth in the UN Charter or the UDHR as of 1945, this then signifies that the servants of the elites are not withholding toward their masters (the elites) the same strong feeling that most dogs (or horses) exhibit toward whomever they see as their leader (master), and are just acting out that they are committed to securing the ends set forth in the UN Charter just as false teachers do. If the servants of the elites are looking like sheep on the outside, but on the inside they are really like wild wolves, [Matthew 7:15] then there is a good chance that the elites discover their true character late if the suggestion that is made in Surah Al-Furqan about how some harmful people are made as a trial for others to test a person's true faith (patience, values) is true. [Al-Furqan 25:20]

Said differently, there are two reasons why the servants of the elites are refusing to observe the UN Charter or the UDHR. The first is if God is testing their (the elites) true determination to secure the UN goals. The second is because the servants of the elites believe that they do not need to be loyal to their masters (the elites) to stay in power. That is to say, the servants of the elites are thinking that they are greater than their master.

In John 13:16, it is suggested that Jesus told his disciples: “Very truly I tell you, no servant is greater than his master, nor is a messenger greater than the one who sent him.” Hence, we have no way of knowing if the political and economic authority that the elites exercise are divine rights or not; we also have no way of knowing if the decision of the servants of the elites to put their masters (the elites) to the test could reap the same harvest that the Israelites reaped when they disobeyed the ten commandments that Moses said God suggested to him, or if this test would lead to the same fate that people endured during the story of the flood.

To give an example, the Lebanese decided to put their masters (the elites) to the test since 1945, and since 1975 they have been wandering just as the Israelites were wandering in the desert for 40 years. Only two choices can help the Lebanese find their way back to the promised land (i.e., improve peace and security). The first is if they (the Lebanese) push their avarice aside and start to cooperate in accordance with the principles suggested in the UN charter and the UDHR. The second is if they (the Lebanese) wait until this present lost generation dies; then hope that the new one who would succeed the generation that would have passed agrees to be wise and to choose to do what their fathers are refusing to do. Evidently, the Lebanese can choose to engulf this country in a new civil war to accelerate death and hopefully create balance earlier.

In addition, since we have no way of knowing if the international order is undergoing the same challenges that the Lebanese have been dealing with since 1945 at the microscale (i.e., after they decided to deviate away from observing the principles suggested in the UN charter and the UDHR), this means that the elites could be wandering with the rest of the people of the world in the same way. In the Bible, it is suggested that the Israelites managed to distinguish between what is right and wrong to enable them to continue the journey, but the people who were living during the days of Noah were not as lucky. That is to say, the individuals who were in positions of leadership during the days of Moses managed to educate newborns to prioritize the ten commandments or the political order that was in vigor, but the

individuals who were in positions of leadership during the days of Noah failed.

The rulers who were living during the days of Noah failed to prevent their resizing because they were allowing citizens to regard themselves exempt from observing the political order. This disregard later spread, until it became uncontrollable. In other words, if the elites do not wipe out the people who live in Lebanon, for example, from the face of the earth, or interfere and remove all the individuals who are administering the Lebanese government in this country from power (their positions), along with distancing all the international institutions who are working in Lebanon, starting with the United Nations, World Bank, IMF, etc., so newborns (new people) in this country would not continue to be exposed to disregard, the more the elites would be injecting barren seeds instead of seeds that can bear good fruit. In other words, the elites would be expanding the number of people with uncivilized behavior, or, as I said before, the number of people who are developing in the same way plants that grow in the forests and in the wild (fruitless).

In addition, since this disregard that is happening in Lebanon on a small scale is also happening over the entire world, but we have no way of knowing its magnitude, because humans were not granted the right to see in all directions, this means that the more newborns (new people) develop in the same way plants that grow in natural forests do (fruitless), the more useless people would be colonizing the land, just as the Lebanese have been behaving since 1975 despite all their sophistication and intelligence. The more fruitless plants (useless people) would be colonizing the land, the more those fruitless plants (useless people) would be choking the plants that bear good fruit (good people), or the type that the elites want more of to keep their dominant roles, such as the people who live in Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Great Britain, etc. The more shrubs (fruitless people) choke the plants that bear good fruit (good people), the more competition each plant (fruit tree and fruitless) would have for water, light, soil, and shelter. The more the plants that bear good fruit (good people) are denied water, light, soil, and shelter, the more their capacity to bear good fruit (produce good people) shrinks. When a healthy tree is denied the right environment, it dies over time. This means that the

decision of the elites to have societies be carefully protected and others ignored is a very poor strategy, and in the course of time and things, it will result in the reversal of the elites to a simpler form.

Actually, the decision of the elites to be in favor of deviating away from the work program that the founding fathers of the UN suggested to them (the elites) to keep their dominant role could be tangling them and mankind in challenges that are more complex and much harder to resolve than the challenges that the Israelites dealt with in antiquity or the Lebanese are dealing with presently, if they (the elites) continue to be unprepared to accept that the detriments that occurred to the people who violated the truth included in constitutions or biblical scriptures could happen to them and their critical thinkers and servants.

In Surah Az-Zumar, it is suggested that “It is Allah who calls back the souls of people upon their death as well as the souls of the living during their sleep. Then He keeps those for whom He has ordained death, and releases the others until their’ appointed time.” [Az-Zumar - 39:42]

If it is not people who decide if they will wake up from their sleep or not but God, then the longer the elites stay asleep (i.e., unprepared to play their role) to avoid that their servants take advantage of their condition and brainwash people, the harder it would be for them to make people be ready to stay with them if their servants are not observing the rules set forth in the UN Charter or the UDHR and are teaching people worldly things instead of being an example.

Said differently, if the critical thinkers and servants of the elites are not teaching people to be tolerant as the founding fathers of the UN suggested in the UN Charter or the UDHR, and instead, are teaching citizens about why they should not be losers, and why they should be displaying impressive creativity to realize the full development of their personalities or arrange that outcomes are shared on equal rights, then there is good chance that the elites may not be able to avoid their collapse if their servants are teaching citizens to stop being unmindful about happiness (knowledge, awareness, wealth, power, freezing social space, accumulating material things) and to begin to grab or to

satiate their houses and bank accounts from whatever they can put their hands on.

That is to say, if the critical thinkers and servants of the elites are teaching people to take advantage of the pleasures of the present moment and to be devoted to storing up food, drink, clothes, etc. instead of inviting people to live at a slower, more contemplative pace as the founding fathers of the UN suggested in the UN Charter or the UDHR, then it would not be possible to make citizens develop the right understanding of themselves so they could start to love their neighbors or love the elites instead of being focused on loving themselves.

Jesus suggested that “no one can be a slave of two masters; he will hate one and love the other; he will be loyal to one and despise the other.” [Mathew 6:24]. For the elites to succeed at making people stay with them, they need to make people love them more than themselves, if not equally. The critical thinkers and servants of the elites are not embracing the ideology or political agenda that is depicted in the UN Charter or the UDHR and which invites people to be thankful for what they have, but are teaching people to be unappreciative and impatient, which has created innumerable social problems in the world since 1945, including lots of confusion and chaos. Can the elites make people love them more than they could love themselves when their critical thinkers and servants are not teaching people to not worry about what to eat, drink, or wear, as Jesus suggested, but to become aware that the day that passes from their lives without fighting to have what their neighbor has is a waste?

I have no way of knowing how the elites count on making people continue to love them after they pushed people around the world through their critical thinkers and servants to rethink their relationship with them (the elites). What I do know is that people have throughout history looked for shortcuts and tried to always be one step ahead of the truth included in constitutions and biblical scriptures.

Likewise, I have no way of knowing if there are policies that are flexible enough to allow the fittest and the weak to create ordered relations without continuing to extend this culture of shortcuts around

truth in the hope of the fittest managing to flounder all the time the weak in false promises or vice versa.

Similarly, I have no way of knowing if there are shortcuts to truth or if there are policies that are flexible enough to allow the fittest and the weak to create ordered relations. This means that the fittest and the weak will continue to extend this cycle of peace and war, without any sign of it clearing up for as long as people refuse to prioritize truth (i.e., the UDHR).

Evidently, if the elites and their critical thinkers want their servants and technology to educate newborns (new people) to consider their opinion before taking action of their own and not withdraw their obligation to obey, they (the elites) will have to stay fit and capable to defeat any new rising star (political adversary) or twist of fate.

Unfortunately, no individual (society, business, nation, kingdom) proved itself to be competent to make prudential judgments in any situation, thus managing to keep its dominance indeterminately, but in the course of time and things were pushed to the fence. In other words, the fittest failed to recognize the reality of evil in the world, especially after mankind converted the idea of government from its true purpose into a violence-wielding apparatus.

The elites and their critical thinkers can continue to try to let their servants and technology make newborns (new people) keep in mind the laws (standards and norms) that they (the elites) depend on to rejuvenate their power instead of letting parents and schools teach newborns (new people) this mastery. However, I am sure that the elites and their critical thinkers also know that laws (standards and norms) do not define the character that constitutes each person. In other words, if the families/dynasties that control the people who live in Norway stopped forgoing other societies rights to possess the material things that they provide to citizens to keep them tamed, their behavior would not be any different than the obnoxious behavior that the Lebanese are showing despite all the intellectual and moral education they possess. And so, if it is not easy for a government (society) that was controlling the violence for its own benefit to bounce back when its political order becomes like a ship that the waves toss in all

directions, unless the invisible hand of God does its job or the government (society) in question relies on its personal power and conscience, then all the good will that the elites and their critical thinkers could be counting on tapping into to make people work hand and hand with them to reduce fear and want may not produce the outcome they expect (i.e., keep their power intact) if political recovery does not work in the same way a sports fighter can manage to recoup his title after he is defeated.

To put it differently, in politics, when a faction gets in control of this violence-wielding apparatus that we call government, the first thing that the individuals involved do is repress their adversaries to prevent them from taking part in political life, and prioritize clientelism. This strategy persuades citizens to keep each foot in a different boat. In other words, citizens become prepared to turn their backs on their rulers at any opportunity. And so, if it is very difficult in politics for a faction who was in control to bounce backs after its members are removed from power, when every member in a given society becomes an inside operator (i.e., enabling the defeat of his neighbor to wield his power), then there is a good chance that it would not be possible for the elites to make citizens develop the fortitude and temperance that would help them to be ready to accept the political order they legitimize if people around the world continue to be focused on how to be one step ahead to dominate at range instead of on how to develop the strength that can help them to attune their heart to the principles that are included in the UN charter or the UDHR.

That is to say, if we have no way of knowing if people will be delivering on their promises in the future, then there is a good chance that as people continue to tyrannize each other and show no regard to the standards included in the UN Charter or the UDHR, it will not be possible to attract people to the goodness of reality, and everyone would be trapped in how to unleash his signature moves to recoup from his neighbor the material things he managed to spring up or was gifted with.

Since antiquity, people have been devoted to learning how to improve their ability to parlay their indispensability into power. This reliance on their personal power and conscience to get their way despite the

resistance of others instead of on the political order made them learn when to run and when to fight. This power that people exhibit to fight their battles on all sides makes it very difficult for the fittest (individual, business, society, nation, kingdom) to prevent his defeat or to not be run over when the dark side of man starts to stifle reason. Can the elites and their critical thinkers compete with the dark side of man to determine who could wield more power when more people start to perceive that they have nothing to lose if they conquer injustice or resize their neighbor?

In some religions, the word judgment day means “the time when the world ends and people are judged by God for the way they lived.” For one reason or another, world history supports the idea that many individuals (society, business, nation, kingdom) faced this accounting and judgment before the world ended. For example, the families/dynasties who were controlling the Soviet Union, or the families/dynasties who were controlling Iraq, and Libya found themselves in the same hopeless situation not too long ago. If the families/dynasties who were controlling the Soviet Union, Iraq, and Libya could not cash in on the investments they made when the dark side of the people who they groomed (rulers, political class, military officers, security officers, educators) betrayed them, then it is highly possible that all the servants (governments and international institutions) on whom the elites are depending to protect them will betray them if people are chasing after how to displace their neighbor to have access to his happiness instead of how to complement each other.

To put it differently, perfecting virtue is a process that includes true contemplation. People generate their contemplation from their senses and internal forces. In politics, political incumbents rely on promises and the poor performance of the person on the job to make people switch and support their candidacy. It is not possible to expect that people rise above their desires (money, wealth, power) to build a stabler world when the individuals who are leading this process are themselves relying on sectarianism to liberate mankind from the evil that reside within each person.

In addition, because it is not possible to coexist with others when sectarianism and racism are hijacking or taking control of the political order and persuading people to constantly feel resentment and hostility, this indirectly also means that it is not possible that the dynamism that would ensue would not invite people to be continuously contemplating the political and economic stances that rulers and the political class claim they are defending and the real changes that those adopted policies are making in the lives of people.

Hence, it is not necessary for a person to be an economist to recognize that the political and economic policies that the critical thinkers of the elites have been adopting since 1945 are pushing human worth to a dead end; this means that it is not possible to stop people from contemplating the promises that the critical thinkers of the elites are continuously making and the empty benefits or returns that people are reaping. In addition, if it is not possible to make people feel enthusiastic about policies that they already know will not increase their happiness, and the elites and their critical thinkers have no other choice but to fight and defend those policies because they rejuvenate their power, then it is not possible to prevent the anger that would develop on both sides from clashing if the elites and their critical thinkers are teaching the common people to stop being content with what they have and to transition into becoming a trader of ideas such as equal rights, freedom, and democracy to build a fairer and more sustainable world. In other words, increase people's attachment to sectarianism and racism.

Many questions beg answers. For one, can the elites stop this systematic destruction from resizing them or depriving them of their power, wealth, and status when the higher acuity rises around the world, the harder it will be for the elites to make them not become attached to what deeply disdains them while their critical thinkers and servants are focusing on how to turn the page and look forward?

Once again, I have no way of knowing if the decision of the elites to partake in this disregard that their critical thinkers and servants have been demonstrating since 1945 by refusing to observe the work program laid out in the UN Charter and the UDHR could ultimately be

a detriment or an advantage. What I do know is that there is always more than one way to do something.

For example, Jesus suggested in one of his sermons a formula or a way of life (a political project) to improve relations and reduce corruption, sectarianism, racism, resentment, and hostility that is totally different from the one the critical thinkers and servants of the elites are pursuing to rejuvenate the power of their masters (the elites). Jesus suggested that if a person is about to offer a gift to God at the altar and there he remembers that his brother has something against him, he should leave the gift there in front of the altar, go at once and make peace with the brother, and then come back and offer the gift to God. [Matthew 5:23]

For one reason or another, the elites have not found Jesus's suggestion on how to reduce anger and improve relations attractive, just as most rulers and kings concluded before 1945. The elites want the apparatus that we call government with its different organs (judicial, security, economy, etc.) to create balance between people, societies, businesses, nations, etc. instead of letting clarity in thought help people perfect how to be righteous.

Evidently, this strategy has been a total failure since 1945. This is because accelerating the handing out of models that improve the righteousness of action and attitude does not lead to a cultural change. Humans are not like computers, capable of being updated to new operating systems just as happens when a software company releases new software versions and updates people's computers at home through the intermediary of the internet. People need to undergo a contemplative process before they can undergo any transformation.

It is not possible to expect that people will develop the right habits of mind, if other people are imposing on them their own political, economic, and social choices. The founding fathers of the UN suggested to the elites that they be devoted to strengthening the self-determination or contemplative process of people in the aftermath of WW2, so this exercise helps them to make the right choices (connect their thoughts to their actions), and not to improve the capacity of governments in UN member states to help such organs make choices on behalf of citizens.

Improving the capacity of governments in UN member states to make choices on behalf of citizens means transforming the government into a national corporation whose business activities center on accelerating the erection of administrative buildings, judicial buildings, roads, bridges, prisons, etc. but not building the capacity of citizens to have no reason to need to use such facilities. The deepening of the role of governments in the economy and public service deepens tribalism and leads governments, in the course of time and things, to become obliged to repeal laws, just as happened in the United States when this country had to legalize the usage of certain substances after the amount of money that the government was spending on criminalizing offenders became huge.

The founding fathers of the UN did not suggest to the elites that they develop a political system that, as we know, cannot come up with any solution or response to solve the challenges that it creates. The founding fathers of the UN suggested to the elites that they build a postwar world order that reduces the role of government in the economy and public service and does not prepare governments to rival them or rival each other. In my opinion, this is one of the principal reasons why Jesus suggested that people make peace first with the individuals with whom they are disputing and then come back and offer gifts to God.

In addition, the suggestion of Jesus to people to go make peace first with the individuals with whom they are disputing and then come back and offer gifts to God could also be an advice to people to focus on the past more than the future to help achieve or accomplish something else. In other words, Jesus's suggestion to people to focus on events that occurred in the past could be an end in itself.

As of 1945, the elites do not appear to be focused on resolving the events that happened in the past as much as they appear to be focused on the future to resolve the problems of the present.

If Jesus believes that people fix (resolve) first the past before moving to the future, and the elites believe that neglecting the past and concentrating on the future is more beneficial to them to keep their

dominant role, then one of them must be wrong. That is to say, if the elites (and their critical thinkers) believe that orienting the energy of people to make advances in transportation, communication, defense, and even medicine is more advantageous to them to maintain their strength and stability, this means that they are saying that consoling the mothers, fathers, and children who lost loved ones in Afghanistan, Iraq, and other places after their servants (the United States, Great Britain, France, and other UN member states) decided to take the law into their own hands and killed many innocent people to satisfy their inhumane desires has no bearing whatsoever on the future maintenance of their strength and stability.

Once again, I have no way of knowing what Jesus was trying to tell people when he advised them not to focus on creating change that has the potential to improve the future before first fixing the pains of the past (ignorance, distortion of awareness, might makes right, etc.). What I do know is that ever since the date when people stopped being in favor of using the present to fix the problems of the past and began to just use the present to change it so it does not include the events of the pasts, people have not been able to come up with perspectives that have the potential to change the future for the better.

If people continue to use the present to create change that is programmed to improve the future before fixing the problems of the past first, as Jesus suggested, this means that people are busy creating change that ensures the survival of the past instead of changing the past, which is a prerequisite to creating a better future.

I have no way of knowing what propels the fittest (chiefs, executives, rulers, etc.) to be indifferent about the past, preferring instead to use the present to change the future, thus ensuring the survival of the pains and wounds of the past. What I do know is that the longer the elites and their critical thinkers (the fittest) focus on using the present to change the future instead of using the present to address the events of the past, they (the elites) will not be able to let the future be free of the events of the past because people will be stepping into the future while bringing along with them the pains and wounds of the past. That is to say, for as long as the elites and their critical thinkers stay focused on finding solutions whose goals are to increase their happiness in the

future (rejuvenate their power) instead of being devoted to addressing the pains and wounds of people first (i.e., concerned for the good of others), people would not be capable of speaking the same language, and everyone would be going along with them but with one preoccupation on their mind. This preoccupation is how to ridicule them (the elites) and castigate them for the events of the past. This is because the policies of the elites in the present are what caused the events of the past. In this context, the more the elites focus on the future instead of the past (i.e., modernization), the more this strategy exposes them and accelerates their demise. This is because people do not use modernization to reduce fear and want but to profit from the advances in science to find out who could make the weakest consider the opinion of the fittest. Therefore, the more the elites use the idea of human rights, social justice, and democracy as just a slogan instead of a work program, as the founding fathers of the UN suggested, the more the changes that would be taking place would be loaded with modernity and an equal amount of pain, wounds, etc. And since the project of the elites (and everyone else) is how to resize his neighbor (i.e., use the idea of human rights, social justice, and democracy to create ordered relations or domination instead of equal rights) instead of who can be the first to observe the UDHR, the more the elites (and everyone else) struggle towards determining who could have greater say in governance, the more the state of the ship (the international order) would be like a vessel that the waves of the sea and wind are blowing and tossing in all directions. When a ship (or a pendulum) tilts to the right or left, all the people on board shift. In other words, the captain of the ship does not have the power to prevent the people who are onboard the ship from staying in place. This also means that it is not possible to expect that new people will occupy the void space that becomes empty when the ship tilts to the right or to the left if everyone onboard is forced to change his position against his will.

Once again, the question that defies ingenuity and begs answers is: how are the elites and their critical thinkers concluding that they focus on developing policies that do exactly what Jesus told them (people) they should not be doing “to add to the troubles that each day is already bringing” and that they would be able to prevent their collapse if the more they adopt policies that make people “worry about tomorrow,” the more the policies that they (the elites) would be

adopting would be making people devoted to pursue all the outcomes minus the outcomes included in the UN Charter or the UDHR? In addition, we already know that the further away people get from observing the UN Charter or the UDHR, the harder it will be for the elites to prevent their collapse.

That is to say, it is more advantageous to people that the world stays dynamic, just as it is advantageous to the elites (and their critical thinkers) that it stays that way, because when people's awareness rises, it becomes very difficult for the fittest to make the weak stay with them voluntarily. Therefore, dynamism is a more effective way to displace people than if this exercise were done through civilized methods. And so if, in theory, it is more advantageous for the weak that the world stays dynamic to resize the fittest faster, how are the elites concluding that keeping the international order dynamic would in the long run be beneficial to them when we already know that no kingdom managed to keep its dominant role intact when it accelerated dynamism (change)? In other words, how are the elites concluding that it would be possible for them to continue to preserve their power, wealth, and status when, whenever dynamism rises, they would be left with two choices? The first is to leave the political arena in the same way fighters retire before a new rising fighter defeats them and humiliates them. The second is to wager on the newborns (new people), to whom they would be handing their power, wealth, and status, being as clever as them at keeping the state of the ship stable. Once again, the question that defies ingenuity and begs answers is: how are the elites and their critical thinkers concluding that the newborns (new people) to whom they would be handing their power, wealth, and status would be as clever as them at keeping the state of the ship stable when none of the policies that they are taking are making people love them? In other words, the policies are not making people not worry about tomorrow.

People's own convictions are responsible for the choices they make. Some things cannot be hurried, and only time makes it possible to later know if the convictions that were acted upon were right or wrong. In the meantime, we can say that for as long as the elites refuse to prioritize the work program of Jesus in Matthew 6:34 (which is also the same work program of the founding fathers of the UN), the only

project that people would be implementing would consist of a faction who would be looking for rulers and political class (i.e., critical thinkers) who are combative and who would be devoted to lifting them up and fighting for them and not fighting with each other so much as fighting for the people, and another faction who would be using the idea of human rights, social justice, and democracy to create ordered relations (domination), instead of equal rights. The more people rely on political corruption, mismanagement, disregard, contempt, etc. to resize each other, the more people will be drowning economically and emotionally, and grasping for pockets of air to get a break will grow. The more the thoughts and feelings of people become unstable, the more their pleasure or displeasure will strengthen their dependence on the things they already know could improve their overall well-being and financial health, such as tribalism, sectarianism, and division. The more people rely on their personal power and conscience for their own self-help, the more their moods and temperaments propel them to act in accordance with their own tendencies instead of what rulers and the political class are telling them not to do.

Throughout history, the relative power, wealth, and military superiority of a ruler or king were not sufficient to prevent the collapse of their realm when tribalism (religion, race, color, dogmatism, etc.) became a trump card and citizens began to rely on such distinction to increase their own happiness. And so, if till now no ruler or king managed to avoid that tribalism (religion, race, color, dogmatism, etc.) enchants (bewitches) the mind of people when their awareness or disenchantment rises, could the critical thinkers of the elites prevent the collapse of their masters (the elites) when the number of people who become aware that “they are here today and gone tomorrow” [Matthew 6:30] or become aware that the policies that they (the elites) are adopting and inviting people to surrender freedom to secure are not programmed to produce the results that they (the elites) say would reduce fear and want, to ensure that outcomes are distributed on equal rights, but instead, ordered relations?

Once again, I have no way of knowing how the elites or their critical thinkers are reaching the conclusion that the laws (standards, norms, and rules) that they are busy adding, including the ones that they have already delegated to technology to enforce, will help them to preserve

their power when, till today, no law or tool helped any ruler or king to stay in power when citizens distrusted the leadership of such executives.

Indeed, the tools (the technology) on which the elites are depending presently to keep their dominant role are different than the tools on which societies (kingdoms) depended before WW2 erupted to stay in power. Therefore, it is highly possible that the advances made in technology in recent years could be the impetus that is persuading the elites and their critical thinkers to perceive that they could be spared from the humiliation that most rulers and kings faced when they distrusted the truth included in constitutions to rejuvenate their power.

Then again, the force that created reality (or God) appears to possess sufficient power to have made humanity of one color, sex, and height, and all people wealthy, healthy, and strong, without there being people who are poor, weak, or sick. If this force that created the world did not appear to have been in favor of all people being rich and healthy and wanted some to be poor and sick and the majority to use distinction or tribalism to displace each other instead of through fierce tools (horns, teeth, claws, energy such as fireflies or electric eels), then it would be naive to suppose that this force (or God) wanted people to use tools that people's own exploration produced to dominate each other.

That is to say, we have no way of knowing, as I said before, if the wealth and high status that some people achieve and others fall short of securing are divine rights or not. Could the decision of the elites or their critical thinkers to put at the disposal of people tools (technology) that make it possible for a person to produce contents that have the potential to have millions of people following them or being ready to stay with them just by publishing a statement or a picture on a social media platform be a strategy that is helping the elites to stay in power when all people are using the same tool to deny each other's rights? This tool is the word. In other words, if the word made it possible for every person in recent years start to consider himself as a journalist, a political analyst, economic analyst, economic expert, can the elites make people be ready to let them have more powers than others after their critical thinkers converted the medium (the word) which they need to be depending on to make people be ready to stay with them

(i.e., democracy, equal rights, social justice, etc.) into a commodity, and their servants converted the tools (technology) that they need to be depending on to keep people be ready to let them have more power than others into a platform to make people see themselves worthy of being presidents', senators', ministers', chiefs', etc.?

I have no way of knowing if Jesus, Muhammad, etc., or their first adherents, disciples, etc. could have managed to make people ready to follow them if they were not leading by example? Likewise, I have no way of knowing if sheep can learn to follow the voice of the shepherds if the latter start to communicate with such beasts digitally instead of being there with them physically. What I do know is that since people began to equip penitentiary centers with technology and to communicate with inmates remotely, this strategy has not helped those who are incarcerated obey the jail keepers. Likewise, since people began to sell to the highest bidder the truth included in constitutions and biblical scriptures, no ruler or king managed to make other thieves (rulers) not steal his sheep (his dependent people).

Once again, I have no way of knowing if the elites can prevent other thieves (people) from stealing from them their power, wealth, and status if they continue to allow their critical thinkers to financialize the world and their servants to perceive that their role is to posit and legitimize laws instead of to lead by example. Likewise, I have no way of knowing if digital governance is a framework that can make the weak be ready to consider the opinion of the fittest before taking action on their own, or if only physical or tangible communication can inform this process. What I do know is that until now, people have managed to learn on their own or through the intermediary of other people or tools (technology) every art, minus the art of discipline. In this area, only one framework of policies and guidelines helped people demonstrate accountability, transparency, fairness, and responsibility. This result happened when the individuals who were informing the conduct process or developing the parameters were not positing or enforcing laws (norms and standards) but were practicing the existing ones.

For example, Jesus, Muhammad, and the founding fathers of the United States were not handing out chariots, horses, wine, wives, jobs,

etc. to make people surrender freedom to them or follow them, but they were dazzling them with words. Likewise, the successors of Jesus, Muhammad and the founding fathers of the United States (till 1945) could not have dazzled people with handing out chariots, horses, wine, wives, jobs, etc. to make them stay in group with them, but with words as well. This is because chariots, horses, wine, wives, jobs, etc. are functions of change, whereas the word (i.e., truth) is not a function of change. In other words, if Jesus, Muhammad, the founding fathers of the United States, and their successors were handing chariots, horses, wine, wives, jobs, etc. to people to make them surrender freedom to them or stay with them before WW2 erupted, then it would not have been possible for them to avoid stumbling on the same challenges that the elites stumbled upon as of 1945 or after they decided to delegate to technology the role that the human body was created to fulfill in nature and granted the right to their critical thinkers and servants to regard themselves exempt from observing the truth included in the UN charter or the UDHR.

Put differently, in the epistle of John, it is suggested that “in the beginning was the word,” and not the form. If through words every thing was made (i.e., the political order) and without words nothing was made that has been made, and the elites (along with their critical thinkers) are of the opinion that it is not important that people coexist with one another in the same way the apostle John suggested the word (people) is in unity with God (people in unity with people and not people in unity with tools), this then signify that the elites (along with their critical thinkers) do not believe that it is important anymore to have so many roam the earth and to have many children as they can so that their descendants will live all over the earth and bring all the things that exists under their control, and that machines could do it better.

Indeed, the decision of the elites (along with their critical thinkers) to let people coexist with tools (machines, AI, computers, robots), instead of being in favor of letting people coexist only with people, or to let tools (machines, AI, computers, robots) be in charge of lots of things that humans depend on to sustain their survival needs and earthly desires instead of having real humans (human ingenuity) be responsible for them, even if the effectiveness of this aptitude is small

as compared to tools, is a good strategy to help them (the elites) preserve their power, wealth, and status.

Then again, this aforementioned strategy that the elites (along with their critical thinkers) adopted is not any different from the strategy that the Bible suggests God adopted after he created man. The Bible states that after God created Adam and Eve, He placed them unsupervised in the Garden of Eden. Later, a snake whispered in the ear of Adam and Eve and persuaded them to disobey God's instructions.

Luckily, the elites (along with their critical thinkers) do not need to worry about the things that people hide in their hearts weakening them because they now have access to tools (technology) that permit them to monitor in real time how people rely on their self-help to plot things against them (the elites), including turning the switch on all the tools that people depend on to sustain their earthly desires and earthly desires off, or to intervene to stop people from depending on the things they want to be good at to increase their happiness.

Then again, there is a good chance that God must have recognized after Adam and Eve failed him in the Garden of Eden that all people want to do is be the measure of all things. In other words, all people want to do is resize their masters to increase their own happiness or whisper words in their neighbor's ear to make their neighbor disobey and stay with them.

In fact, if we take the story of the fall of man that is included in the book of Genesis and compare it to the way the elites (along with their critical thinkers) decided to preserve their power, wealth, and status in the aftermath of WW2, we find that the elites are more courageous and confident about their power than even God.

For example, in the story of the fall of man, we are told that only one serpent whispered in the ears of Adam and Eve, thus making them unprepared to stay faithful to the instructions that God suggested to them. As of 1945, the elites provided people with access to technology that makes it possible for a person to have all the words that people around the world are saying at his disposal. Not to mention that the

elites do not appear to mind that their servants regard themselves exempt from observing the principles set forth in the UN Charter and the UDHR as well.

Surely the elites are more courageous and confident about their power to get their way despite the resistance than God, who the biblical scriptures claim created man.

In fact, if we factor in what the Bible says about how God refused to let Moses and the Israelites make their trip from Egypt to the promised land on their own just as he left Adam and Eve in the Garden of Eden and preferred to stay with Moses and the Israelites throughout this entire journey, we find that He (God) was either overprotective or he knew something that the elites (along with their critical thinkers) are either ignoring its impact on the maintenance of their strength and security, or they believe they have resolved every obstacle that can occur and figured out a solution to it. In other words, God did not task his angels, critical thinkers, and servants to accompany Moses and the Israelites to the promised land in the same way the elites and their critical thinkers are perceiving that if they let people observe standards that they delegated to technology to oversee its compliance on their behalf, including allowing their servants right to regard themselves exempt from observing the principles set forth in the UN charter and the UDHR, that such a strategy would prevent people from tapping into the “word” that they are naturally programmed with and resize them with. That is to say, the elites and their critical thinkers believe that all people would be ready to surrender freedom to them on their own, just as the people who are living in the Scandinavian countries are doing to avoid the heavy fines that would be imposed on them if they refused.

Then again, I have no way of knowing what God was afraid of if he let Moses and the Israelites do this trip from Egypt to the promised land alone and preferred to not leave them and to stay with them the entire time. What I do know is that the Bible states that when God gave Moses and the Israelites his non-objection to destroy, he was not asking them to cherry-pick the specific individuals who were responsible for the obstacles they were encountering but agreed to let

them wipe out the societies that acted inhospitably towards them in their entirety.

That is to say, Moses (or God) ensured that he stayed away from getting involved in tit for tat brawls with the individuals (societies) who were rivaling him (i.e., he did not create vertical or horizontal pockets of foes within the societies that were rivaling him) and instead kept his contests directed at the whole, even though a large number of the people his forces were murdering were innocent. For example, when Moses and the Israelites attacked the Canaanite king of Arad, it is highly likely that there were people who sympathized with them. Moses and the Israelites did not go ahead and start to spare the people who were sympathizing with them and kill only the individuals who were rivaling them. Moses and the Israelites destroyed the people (societies) who were delaying their progress in their entirety.

Indeed, the strategy that Moses and the Israelites adopted to get to the promised land is not at all how the elites and their critical thinkers believe it would be possible for them to keep their dominant role intact. The elites believe that they can preserve their power by having their servants and technology follow each individual to know who is upholding what in his heart and then cherry-pick the individuals who they deem a threat and resize.

If the elites and their critical thinkers believe that they can preserve their power by having their servants and technology follow each individual to know if what he is upholding in his heart could be a threat to them or not knowing that there is no secular law that could prevent bias, sectarianism, etc., this then signifies that they (the elites) believe they can take on any person in the same way when police officers gang on a fugitive, thus making it impossible to runaway.

Evidently, world history has shown so far that this strategy of relying on security forces to administer people is not a winning tactic when the agents of the fittest are not leading by example. This is because, until now, no government has proven to be mightier than civil society when its members join forces. And so the question that begs answers is simple and straightforward. If mankind invented the idea of government to prevent citizens from joining forces, how did the elites

and their critical thinkers conclude that if they let citizens around the world have access to tools (i.e., technology) that make it possible for every individual to become a government, they would be able to defeat all those extra governments and prevent them from joining forces to resize them when it has not been possible for them to control people when they are grouped into 193 clusters (or UN member states)?

Put differently, the fittest depend on the idea of the government controlling people (civil society) through its institutions. The fittest needs the government institutions to be functional because it is through their different apparatuses that he improves his wealth, power, and status (i.e., collect taxes, pass laws, deny rights, do business, etc.). That is to say, the fittest (the rich) expect that the weak (citizens) use the institutions of this apparatus, which we call government, which he usually controls, to enable him, through this legal entity, to keep his control and to have a greater say than others. But if technology empowers a person to form his own government from the comfort of his own home, then the longer it takes real governments to deliver on the promises or projects that they raise taxes to finance and are expecting to deliver to stay in power, the harder it will be for them to make people want to use their different apparatuses as a medium of protection. And so, if at the start of the 20th century when people around the world were divided into close to fifty monarchs or republics and their relations were not intertwined as the case is like now, it was not possible for the old powers to prevent people from joining forces and to challenge them thus tangling the world into two back to back global wars, could the elites and their critical thinkers prevent that people not join forces and to defeat them when the only way to enslaving people is to keep them away from the word (education), and all what they (the elites) have been doing since 1945 is saturate or inundate people with words on why they should stop to be ready to stay with them or to let them have greater say than others?

Once again, I have no way of knowing how the elites and their critical thinkers could convince people to stay together with them and to let them be the ones who are defending the principles and institutions of democracy and open societies when the more they grant rights to governments and international institutions to be economic and public service operators, the harder it would get for them to avoid having the

government and international institutions be the only employers, just as is the case in most UN member states. What I do know is that when Moses was on his way to the promised land, the Bible says that when God was granting him and the Israelites the right to eliminate the societies that were attacking them or capturing some of them, he (God) was not asking them to cherry pick the individuals who were rivaling them but to totally destroy those societies, as I said before. That is to say,

I have no way of knowing why God was against dealing with the societies that were rivaling the Israelites by favoring that they create large change (destroy the entire city) instead of being in favor of creating small change (destroy the specific individuals who were rivaling them only). What I do know is that without it, the Israelites may not have managed to reach the promised land. This is because, as of 1945, the elites have been creating small change (destroying the specific individuals who were rivaling them only) to reach their own promised land, and since then, all they have to show for it is that they have been wandering in a dark labyrinth, and with every new day, the complex network of the labyrinth is getting them more and more confused and further away from the exit. And so many questions beg answers. For one, can the elites and their critical thinkers (with the technology that they are depending on) determine how much manpower they need to control every individual when the mind is not made of matter?

Zeno of Elea was a pre-Socratic philosopher, who suggested that we should not trust our senses but only the truth (logic). Zeno of Elea was a student of Parmenides of Elea, who is considered the founder of ontology. Zeno of Elea developed some of the most important and ingenious paradoxes that have puzzled men to this day, such as Achilles and the tortoise, the dichotomy, the arrow, and others, and which are even regarded as the principal premise (backbone) on which the entire field calculus (i.e., the study of change) is buttressed.

I have no way of knowing how the elites and their critical thinkers are reaching the conclusion that they are making progress on their goal of securing the aspirations they suggested in the UN charter when most of the choices that people are making appear to be a reversal of the

milestones that our predecessors secured for us in the aftermath of WW2. Likewise, I have no way of knowing if rounding out all the outcomes that our predecessors secured for us by the end of WW2, such as freedom, equal rights, social justice, etc., and then stripping them from us can help stabilize peace and security or rejuvenate the power of the elites better. Similarly, I have no way of knowing if using the electoral system as a tool to continuously create coalitions and subject people to one version of what our society should look like is the right way to improve peace and security and preserve freedom (i.e., keep people tangled in changing leaderships and getting nothing done because of all the fights and division). What I do know is that no matter what policies the elites adopt to rejuvenate their power, they must first reach the infinitely many half points that come before securing this end, as Zeno of Elea suggested a person needs to usually do when he travels between two points. Simply put, the elites (i.e., their critical thinkers) must be able to quantify how the policies they are legitimizing are effecting citizens and to measure if they are making people love them, thus enabling them to advance closer to their ultimate end of keeping their power rejuvenated, or if the policies in question are hindering such progress (weakening their power).

For example, the Bible states that Moses and the Israelites managed to finish all the half-point marks that could have existed from when they started their journey in Egypt until the date when they arrived in the promised land and did not continue to wander or to be arbitrarily close to their final destination. In other words, there were no infinite number of fractions that Moses and the Israelites needed to add on to their journey, which, according to Zeno of Elea, is impossible to limit.

Once again, I have no way of knowing what Moses and the Israelites did to create the threshold that enabled them to reach their final destination (the promised land), when in reality this journey should have been impossible to complete if each new step they were taking was giving rise to an infinite step to complete first.

Put differently, if, as Jesus suggested in Matthew 6:34, a person must “not worry about tomorrow; it will have enough worries of its own. There is no need to add to the troubles each day brings,” this signifies that if Moses and the Israelites were doing when they deviated away

from the Mosaic laws as we (and in particular, our rulers, political class, judges, and law enforcement agents) are now doing by deviating away from the UN Charter and the UDHR and worrying only about what to eat, drink, and wear, this attitude should have tangled them in the same challenges that we are now dealing with (or it is our turn now to deal with). That is to say, it would be naive to suppose that peace and security would improve if the elites and their critical thinkers and servants did not begin to observe the UN Charter and the UDHR or restore (bring back) domination, which means extending this cat and mouse or false hope attitude that it is our turn now to live and our predecessors lived before.

But again, the aforementioned statement cannot be true because Moses and the Israelites reached their final destination. In other words, Moses and the Israelites managed to let the Mosaic laws help them speak the same language to reach the promised land. Likewise, the people who embraced Islam managed to build the largest empire the world has known, thus showing that it is possible to build a global community. And most importantly, the Americans managed to show from 1776 to 1945 that it is possible for a community to increase its happiness when its people put aside distinction and build relations based on truth (constitution). And so if motion (change) is not an illusion, even though it appears to be so mathematically, because a person can go from one point to the next and reach his destination, as the Israelites in ancient history, the people who embraced Islam in the middle ages, and the people who lived in the United States in modern history did, it looks as if the elites are at a crossroad. This crossroad is to decide if they (the elites) and their critical thinkers want to take Jesus's suggestion and stop making people worry about tomorrow and add troubles, or do as their fathers were doing before WW2 erupted (i.e., relying on domination, subjugation, and exploitation to keep their dominant role), in the hope that this strategy would help them to rejuvenate their power and extend their dominant role. In other words, continue to be against placing leashes on their critical thinkers and servants just as masters do to dogs to keep them near them, and hope that the next segment that they would cross (i.e., a global war) to the second half would end while securing the same outcomes that their fathers managed to achieve at the end of WW2. This was the readiness

of people to stay with them and to let them have a greater say than others in governance.

I have no way of knowing what the elites (and their critical thinkers) will decide to do to limit this carnival or puppet show that emerged in the world in the aftermath of WW2. What I do know is that, as of 1945, it appears as if people are letting the distance that should be covered to improve peace and security and to help them (the elites) rejuvenate their power get longer instead of shorter. In other words, the troubles that each day is bringing are adding more and more fractions to this journey that they (the elites) decided to embark on or use to rejuvenate their power, which is getting infinitely large. This is very serious and worrisome. This is because if the distance is getting infinitely large, then this development does not only prevent the elites from reaching their goal, but it would also bring the international order closer to the starting point (zero). This is very serious and worrisome.

Put differently, the more the elites let their critical thinkers adopt economic or financial policies instead of political policies, and let their servants regard themselves exempt from observing the work program set forth in the UN Charter and the UDHR, the more the length of the journey that the elites and people would need to travel to reach their final destination would be getting longer and closer to how the world order was like before WW1 or WW2 erupted.

In the years prior to WW2, people's awareness and knowledge were different. In addition, all the societies that agreed to enter and fight on the side of allies during WW2 did it because the old powers had promised to free them. Presently, the challenges that are confronting the world or the international order are different. The issues for which people would be ready to lay their lives down and die are not the same. Hence, the challenges that are confronting the world as of 1945 are due to the critical thinkers and the servants of the elites adopting economic or financial policies instead of political policies as the founding fathers of the UN suggested in the UN charter, including regarding themselves exempt from observing the work program set forth in the UN Charter and the UDHR, the only solutions the elites have to make people be ready to accept that they stay with them and to let them have more powers than others is if they let their critical

thinkers and servants observe the rules legitimized or engulf the world in a new global war in the hope that its outcomes would be in their (the elites) favor.

But because the longer the elites take to engulf the world in a new global war, the more their critical thinkers and servants will be devoted to writing new rules (standards, norms) instead of practicing the ones that are already existing, thus adding more confusion and chaos in the world, this means that the longer the international order stays dynamic, the greater the perception (awareness and knowledge) of people about the elites and their critical thinkers and servants being hypocrites will rise. The greater the perception (awareness and knowledge) of people about the elites and their critical thinkers and servants being hypocrites, the tighter the rope that would be hanging around the neck of the elites would be. And because the more people become aware of how the critical thinkers and servants are operating with no accountability for their ethical behavior grows, the more the international order will lose legitimacy.

This development would not only bring the international world into a meltdown or an eventual explosion, but the more people realize that they need to rely on their self-help to increase their happiness, the more the number of people who would be devoted to resizing their neighbor to have access to his happiness, just as the critical thinkers and servants of the elites have been doing since 1945, would be growing. In addition, because the more the elites and their critical thinkers and servants rely on tools (technology) to get their way despite the resistance of others, the more knowledge they would be adding would make more people figure them out quicker; this means that the more the political discourse deteriorates, the more people will become unprepared to tolerate outcomes that are not shared on equal rights. The more people refuse to accept that outcomes are not shared on equal rights, the more the social order gets dynamic. The more the social order becomes dynamic, the harder it will be to prevent the human condition from returning to a state of nature when the preoccupation of people becomes divided between how to deny their neighbor's rights or how to agree on ethical rules that everyone can follow.

In conclusion, Benjamin Franklin, the 6th president of the United States and one of the founding fathers of this country, stated during the closing speech at the Constitutional Convention (1787) that "A republic, if you can keep it." There is no doubt that the citizens of the United States managed to put "all their prejudices, their passions, their errors of opinion, their local interests, and their selfish views" from 1776 to the end of the 20th century to the side to keep this republic, and succeeded in being the happiest. This does not appear to be the case with the new people who are living in this country, and they appear to be starting to wander more and more. This is very serious and worrisome, because the Americans are the culture that mankind needs to keep healthy to keep the idea of freedom alive. In other words, the Americans are the culture that mankind needs to create change in the same way that a culture of yogurt is added to milk to change it to yogurt. If the American culture continues to go bad, as the behavior of its rulers and political class, as of the start of the 21st century, seems to allude, mankind could be doomed.

I have no way of knowing why people around the world are refusing to do the same and demonstrate the same will that the Americans showed from 1776 to the start of the 1990s to keep the milestones that were achieved in 1945 alive, but instead want to be at each other's throats in the same way that the policies that the United States practiced toward the Soviet Union until not too long ago and now Russia and China look like. In other words, I have no way of knowing if people are refusing to put away their misgivings (or stay as far as possible apart from meddling in each other's lives) and preferring to stay divided because the elites and their critical thinkers are pursuing aspirations beyond the ones suggested in the UN Charter and the UDHR, or if the reason for this abnormal rise in intolerance is because people are pushing forward and are trying to prove that they could come back from behind and defeat the victors of WW2 for their support of colonialism (dictatorship, apartheid) before WW2 erupted. If the constant wars that engulfed the world were due to any one of the aforementioned scenarios, the world would be stuck in a cycle of violence that would not end until one faction caved in for the other. Evidently, the only victim here will be the idea of freedom.

To put it differently, until the end of WW2, a small percentage of the world's population (the western European monarchs and republics) dominated the world. The United States, which many people around the world regard as the custodian of the idea of freedom and a global policeman began to adopt policies, especially after the fall of the Soviet Union in the 1990s, that made it very hard for people to trust its qualifications as a global policeman after its explosions (i.e., wars and irrational global policies) were not few and far between. The country (or legal entity) that plays the global policeman, role must show that its corps (executives) are capable of making people around the world perceive that they are poised and are prioritizing truth (the idea of freedom) over the senses, so people would be ready to stay in group with them or accept to execute the rules they legitimize.

I have no way of knowing if the elites (the western European monarchs and republics) would manage to continue to keep their dominant role over the rest of the world population after the knowledge and awareness of people globally changed, or if the families/dynasties who control the western European monarchs and republics (i.e., the elites) would task the Chinese (or another society) with becoming the future global policemen after China demonstrated so far that it is more poised to play this role than the United States. What I do know is that if the elites (the western European monarchs and republics) continue to demonstrate that their wealth, power, and status are of paramount importance to them (reaffirm their dominant status despite forming a small percentage of the total world population), they would need to be able to squash the rest of the world population with technology in the same way they (their fathers) were doing before WW2 erupted (i.e., rule with an iron fist). Alternatively, if the families/dynasties that control the western European monarchs and republics (i.e., the elites) decide to empower the Chinese, Indians, Arabs, Africans, etc. to be the new global policemen as they empowered the Americans in the aftermath of WW2, they would need to be able to convince people around the world to do what the Quran or the US constitution proved so far is capable of doing better than any other political dogma or religion. This is to make people put their distinctions, tribalism, religion, etc. aside and not mind that they are ruled by people of different races, colors, etc.

Once again, I have no way of knowing what the elites (the western European monarchs and republics) will decide to preserve the continuity of their power in the future. Evidently, the biggest question would be to know if the way they (the elites) are connecting with the rest of the people around the world is so far sustainable. Certainly, the constant wars that have been engulfing the world support the idea that the policies that were adopted have connected people poorly. This also means that the difficult times that the world is experiencing will not be resolved until the elites start to make governments and international institutions carry out the obligations contained in the United Nations Charter instead of just accepting those servants and letting them confuse people.

I have no way of knowing how the elites plan to pluck up the necessary courage to throw their friendship, which they built with all their servants, into the trash and to start to adopt strategic autonomy. This is because the longer the elites take to deconstruct all the monarchies and republics that they helped build, the more those monarchies and republics will try to be equal to them instead of vassals or followers. This is also because all their servants now know their business and the style they use to keep power inside and out.

Evidently, if and when the elites decide to go against their servants, the elites will need to figure out how to resize them (their servants) without letting any sign of desperation show in their behavior. This is because the poor international policies that their critical thinkers adopted in the last seventy years made every UN member state believe that it should be independent in terms of technology (economy), defense (security), energy, and politics. This means that the game plan of the victors of WW2 must center on showing docility all the time while being prepared to go the extra mile to gain in any situation, no matter what the long haul looks like or takes. I have no way of knowing if the elites will find the right adjustment to go the distance and even out any situation, at least when they become more and more surrounded by servants (governments and international institutions) who are selling the same bill of goods and are flip-flopping depending on who is paying them the most.

In politics, just as in sports, no victory or defeat is permanent. The only way for a ruler or king to stay undefeated in politics is to stand their ground and deliver on the promises, not extend the theoretical debates or promises. This means rolling back political corruption or reducing the role of big dark money in politics, which usually their principal servants (governments and international institutions) are promoting and not the common people.

Finally, I have no way of knowing how the elites (and their critical thinkers) plan to make people maintain the right perspective about their good intentions to reduce fear and want when the captains (governments and international institutions) who are steering the ship of state appear to be, as of 1945, of the opinion that “might makes right.” In other words, those captains (governments and international institutions) are sailing us away from the trajectory that our predecessors put us all on at the end of WW2 in order to reduce fear and want and appear to be using their awareness and the instruments that are at their disposal to bolster impulsive policies that test the human spirit instead of being focused on looking out. What I do know is that the founding fathers of the UN counselled the elites not to let their critical thinkers and servants spread corruption in the land after they had put things in order and to confront those who were drawing red lines.

Then again, I am sure that the elites (or their critical thinkers) know that it is not possible to hold the line because the people who were living in the past are not the same people who are living in the present. I have no way of knowing if the elites will be humbled if they continue to let their servants defraud people and spread corruption in the name of human rights, justice, etc. What I do know is that if the elites (or their critical thinkers) fail to change the adversity that people are facing into prosperity, corruption will continue to flourish and more people will be arguing falsely. When people’s hearts become sealed with distrust, their capacity to daze starts to devour their minds, just as magicians stun people.

Will the elites (or their critical thinkers) manage to make people stay with them when people start to believe more in their servants than in them? This is a question that the elites need to ask and answer. This is

because it is their own power, wealth, and status that would be stripped if their servants defeated them and started to play their role. The only advice I can give the elites so their servants do not shame them is to remind them of the events that the Bible states happened before the Israelites left Egypt for the promised land. The Bible states that when Moses went to Pharaoh and his chiefs and asked them to change their behaviors or to let him and the Israelites go. Next, Moses threw down his staff, and it became a real snake, thus supporting through this action that he was empowered by unnatural power. Then Pharaoh brought his magicians, and like Moses, they threw down their staff, and it made such a great display of magic that all the people who were present were stunned. However, the biblical scriptures claim that Moses then threw his staff and devoured all the objects that the magicians of Pharaoh put out. The biblical scriptures suggest that the truth (freedom) prevailed and the illusions failed. Will the elites manage to make the truth prevail over the false teaching that their critical thinkers and servants have been peddling, thus going back to leading humanity into the promised land in accordance with the work program the founding fathers of the UN suggested, or continue to live in the same way people lived during Pharaoh until the truth (a new Moses rise) takes people away from them and wipes them out? This is something that they (the principal victors of WW2) and the critical thinkers need to decide!