

The Merchant of Death

**Reflection on how the victors of WW2
converted truth into a commodity and
the United Nations into a trading venue**

Salim Maloof, PhD

Copyright 2021 by Salim Maloof

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

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

Suggested Citation:

Maloo S., The Merchant of Death, 2023

This is a work of non-fiction.

Salim Maloof
The Merchant of Death

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 Pierre and Charlotte Diang

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Motive that propelled the author to prepare this work
Special Note to All UN Member States
Special Note to All Staff Members of the United Nations
Special Note to All People of Faith
Definitions

PREFACE

The Merchant of Death

- | | |
|--|-----|
| 1. Putting the World Together: one step forward
and two steps back | 25 |
| 2. Price for letting irrational passions and appetites
guide truth | 43 |
| 3. When the mind goes mad and corrupt the land | 75 |
| 4. Is Aristotelian science for moral guidance
creating an existential crisis? | 102 |
| 5. Is the United Nations destroying the cycle of
life and development? | 132 |

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

Competition between living organisms occurs naturally in nature. At the end of WW2, the founding fathers of the UN (the families/dynasties who were the principal victors during WW2) counselled their successors (their heirs) to be devoted to using the work program suggested in the UN Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR) as a tool to rejuvenate their power and build a complete structure of a world order under law (i.e., create ordered relations). However, instead of the successors of the families/dynasties who were the principal victors of WW2, acting on the counsel of their fathers, they (the successors) decided to financialize the world and to teach people that creativity should not be well paid on the side of rulers, white collar workers, and those who possess exceptional skills such as athletes, music artists, inventors, architects, mathematicians, etc. only, but on the side of blue collar workers such as machine operators, street cleaners, police officers, cooks, etc. as well. It is not possible to create hierarchical ordered relations when the king and the beggar (or the judge and the thief) are both using the idea of God, good, order, stability, freedom, nationalism, race, color, human rights, social justice, democracy, etc. to strive for goals that cannot be shared on equal rights such as wealth, power, and status. This is because the mind is discrete and laws are continuous.

This work tries to show how the solutions that the fittest are always adopting to make people want to stay with him and to let him have more powers than others end up weakening his power, wealth, and status rather than improving them because he refuses to stay faithful to the work program that he pledges to observe. In other words, the decision of the fittest to make subjective settlements does not work in his favor but extends people's reliance on killing, assassinating, spying, eavesdropping, deceiving, cheating, and betraying to increase their happiness.

The decision of the victors of WW2 to not learn from past world history and to be in favor of letting their critical thinkers and servants (governments, non-state actors, and international institutions such as

the United Nations) regard themselves, in the aftermath of WW2, exempt from observing the work program suggested in the UN Charter, and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, has turbocharged dynamism that makes it very difficult to comprehend how the victors of WW2 can walk out unharmed from or without being resized first. That is to say, the decision of the victors of WW2 to want that people stop coping as they were doing before WW2 and to want that people use the ideas included in the UN Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights as a tool to rejuvenate their power instead of a tool to create ordered relations produced a political situation in which we have close to eight billion people who now believe that they can fulfill the political role that the victors of WW2 are playing to secure the UN goals better.

Throughout history, people have used the ideas of liberal democracy, personal freedom, and scientific progress to dominate, subjugate, and exploit each other instead of securing the outcomes that such ideas promise. At the same time, all the rulers or kings who wanted that their dependent people observe the political order that they were preaching while themselves were regarding themselves exempt from this appeal failed to recognize that people are all the time changing and that the knowledge and awareness that they are constantly acquiring is also changing the way their outlook on life and what exactly they would like to be getting out of this one opportunity that they had of becoming from among the living.

Therefore, since the victors of WW2 decided to preserve their power by having all people be devoted to killing, assassinating, spying, eavesdropping, deceiving, cheating, and betraying each other instead of racing to determine who would be the first to lead by example, it becomes impossible to avoid that people organize disorder or chaos so people improve their self-help.

Considering that people are going to stay for life crushing each other and eliminating from each other access to any source of alternative power, including keeping each other lathered up by being angry at somebody somewhere else, this means that it would not be possible to have people walk together to produce the continuous change that Aristotle showed is possible in the wheel paradox, and mankind

relations will continue to produce the change that Galileo showed (i.e., with skips). This also means that it would not be possible to expect that the victors of WW2 (i.e., the families/dynasties that control the international order and the money supply of the world) or their successors could avoid their collapse if they continued to adopt the same assumptions that their fathers (the old powers) adopted, or history could repeat itself.

In this context, since for as long as the victors of WW2 (i.e., the families/dynasties that control the international order and the money supply of the world) extend the colonial project that their fathers (the old powers) counselled them in 1945 to stay away from and to begin to act only on the political project that they (their fathers) suggested in the UN Charter and the UDHR, it would not be possible for them to avoid having to continuously find rewards in divisiveness. This means that they must be capable of constantly dazing people with the ideas they depend on to keep their dominant really strong so people would want to stay with them and to let them have more powers than others.

In the Good Shepherd and His Sheep parable, Jesus portrayed the kingdom of God as a pen. He also said that it is very important that all the sheep learn to respond only to the voice of "their" shepherd and not to others. The book *The Merchant of Death* tries to explore if the victors of WW2 (i.e., the families/dynasties that control the international order and the money supply of the world) would be able to make people listen to their voice while their critical thinkers and servants (governments and non-state actors and international institutions) are regarding themselves exempt from observing the work program suggested in the UN Charter and the Universal Declaration and Human Rights just as they are doing and teaching people to be “lovers of themselves, lovers of money, boastful, proud, abusive, disobedient to their parents, ungrateful, unholy, without love, unforgiving, slanderous, without self-control, brutal, not lovers of the good, treacherous, rash, conceited, lovers of pleasure rather than lovers of God— having a form of godliness but denying its power.” [2 Timothy 3:2], or if their strategy to let the United Nations (nations and organizations) become a den of thieves is melting their power, wealth, and status until, in the course of time and things,

their glory will be stripped from them and new families/dynasties start to play their role.

1

Putting the World Together: one step forward and two steps back

Joe Biden is the 46th President of the United States. He is 80 years old. The United States will hold a presidential election on November 5, 2024. In April 2023, Joe Biden announced that he would be running to win a second term as president of the United States in the upcoming 2024 election.

CNN is an American multinational news channel that is based in the United States. On July 9, 2023, CNN aired an interview held with Joe Biden in which the CNN interviewer asked the US president about how his age could affect the decisions that he would be shaping if he were to be reelected, which could range from fighting wars, working with Congress, to even entertaining.

If wisdom comes with age, and if all people explore and are always looking forward to taking the path that minimizes action, Joe Biden should be one of the wisest presidents that are serving today in such a role around the world. Only serving presidents who are much older than Joe Biden can be regarded as wiser or experienced enough to know which smallest action produces the most efficient outcome.

In fact, the reply Joe Biden gave to the CNN interviewer exemplifies how wisdom and age complement each other. Joe Biden said that he wanted to seek a second term as president of the United States in the upcoming 2024 election “to finish what he started”. This was to “put the world together.”

In my opinion, there is no wiser answer that any president can give to justify why he or she would be interested in continuing in public life than the reply Joe Biden gave. Throughout history, the river that mankind has been trying to navigate in its waterway has been about how much more freedom or rights the fittest should grant or deny the weak. Definitely, Joe Biden will have lots of partisans who will be sharing his determination to strengthen the idea of freedom and supporting him to secure this second bid. But, at the same time, we cannot be sure that all those who would be coalescing around him to secure this new bid would be all doing it to make it more difficult for the fittest to deny the weakest freedom or right, but to profit from using the idea of freedom as a tool to deepen their hegemony. And so, if since the date people began to be mindful about freedom (i.e., the need to collectively work to improve human rights, social justice, freedom, democracy, etc.), and mankind has been unable to make giant leaps as Neil Armstrong believed he made in 1969 when he stepped on the moon for the first time but only small steps instead, can any person “put the world together” when we cannot deny the presence of links between governance and corruption in politics?

The effect of mankind allowing the linkage between governance and corruption in politics to propel small leaps in human rights or social justice instead of large steps can have disruptive effects, and its ramifications can fundamentally change the way people establish relations or hierarchy. Human rights, social justice, freedom, democracy, etc. are unicellular ideas that people depend on to create budding or form strings that show multicellular characteristics. People do not use unicellular ideas such as human rights, social justice, freedom, democracy, etc. to reduce fear and want but to create hierarchy (ordered relations). In other words, people do not use ideas such as human rights, social justice, freedom, democracy, etc. to create change in the same way a piston engine with two or more cylinders converts the motion of pistons attached to a crankshaft from being a reciprocating motion into rotational motion uniformly. People want that the effects of unicellular ideas such as human rights, social justice, freedom, democracy, etc. mean and produce different outcomes in each other's lives in the same way a differential in a car allows the vehicle's wheels to turn at different rpms. Put differently, the way people want unicellular ideas such as human rights, social justice,

freedom, democracy, etc. to work could also be analogous to having a fuel engine with two or more cylinders, but while the fuel that is feeding each combustive piston is entering at a different rate so the force that gets transferred to the crankshaft becomes unbalanced.

In addition, individuals who depend on unicellular ideas such as human rights, social justice, freedom, democracy, etc. to get their way despite the resistance of others do not want the complex motion that they want others to observe be limited to such unbalanced equilibrium. Those individuals in question want that this complex and unbalanced motion stay unchanged so they could pass it on (transfer it) to their heirs (children) or designated individuals so those successors could benefit from its disequilibrium to preserve their powers, wealth, and status.

History does not repeat itself. However, hence people want the past to be “the set of all the spacetime that occurred before a given point in time,” and at the same time, to define the present and the future, this means that the individuals who are always competing to make the weakest consider their opinion before taking action of their own must always maintain a good starter culture (a stock) of people who are believing in unicellular ideas such as human rights, social justice, freedom, democracy, etc. so their heirs (children) could use as seed or yeast to enable them to balance off with such concepts competing unicellular ideas. In addition, hence only unicellular ideas such as human rights, social justice, freedom, democracy, etc. can create budding or form strings that show multicellular characteristics without the need to rely on force to create such strings but on the power of words only, this means that individuals who want others to consider their opinion before taking action of their own are better off relying more on the power of words instead of on force to get their way despite the resistance of others. This is because history has shown that until now, force has not been a powerful tool to help the fittest get their way despite the resistance of others.

As the above shows, the need to rely on unicellular ideas such as human rights, social justice, freedom, democracy, etc. to daze people and make them ready to voluntarily surrender freedom to the fittest through the instruments of such concepts is not an elective but a

mandatory axiom to create equilibrium. This is besides the fact that reliance on such ideas to daze people and make them ready to voluntarily surrender freedom to the fittest offers lots of advantages, such as eliminating the need to rely on force or on making predictions when people were not granted right to predict the future.

Accordingly, I have no way of knowing if the elites are rejuvenating their power by relying on making giant leaps in unicellular ideas such as human rights, social justice, freedom, democracy, etc., as of 1945, or if they are relying on other cellular ideas such as corruption, betrayal, backstabbing, disregard, contempt, etc. What I do know is that when people make small improvements in human rights, social justice, freedom, democracy, etc., this means that they are making bigger steps in other cellular ideas such as corruption, betrayal, backstabbing, disregard, contempt, etc. Additionally, hence, it makes no difference if people rely on ideas such as corruption, betrayal, backstabbing, disregard, contempt, etc. to increase their happiness or on ideas such as human rights, social justice, freedom, democracy, etc. to achieve the same end, because people do not share on equal right the outcomes or transformations that they are creating but use such unicellular ideas to create ordered relations only; this means that the complexity to avoid being resized grows with every new person who becomes among the living. Furthermore, hence people refused to share outcomes on equal rights no matter what the number of people that were living was, this means that for as long as there would be individuals who believe that they should regard themselves exempt from observing the common standards that the majority believe are capable of making everyone not become envious of anybody else's wealth, power, or status, it would not be possible to stop envy from making people constantly devoted to reordering themselves to determine who could have a greater say in governance.

In addition, hence people rely on an idea called social contract to prevent actions from being bound by the personal power and conscience of the fittest, this means that the constant insecurity that the world is always entangled in its web could not be due mainly to citizens in UN member states prioritizing natural freedom over law and order (standards, or norms), but rather to the individuals who legitimize and enforce natural and legal rights and then regard

themselves exempt from observing the standards, or norms they constantly legalize principally. This is because it is not the sheep who lead the shepherd, but the shepherd who leads the sheep.

For example, the dynamism that swept the world as of the start of the 21st century is a result of the disequilibrium that the elites and their critical thinkers and servants induced after they created unbalance between all the different unicellular ideas that people depend on to get their ways despite the resistance of others. This unbalance could be due to the elites stopping to think that it is no longer important to rely on unicellular ideas such as human rights, social justice, freedom, democracy, etc., to rejuvenate their power in the future, or after the advances that were made in science as of 1945 made it possible to control the human body and eliminated the need for people to negotiate over how outcomes should be shared.

Be that as it may, the relaxed or calm way the elites are dealing with how all people, and in particular their critical thinkers and servants, are undermining the milestones that the founding fathers of the UN secured in the aftermath of WW2 and counselled them (the elites) to ensure that all people observe to build a complete structure of a world order under law means that they (the elites) do not believe that they could stumble on events and circumstances that could destabilize them or make it harder for them to convince people to stay with them or to let them have more powers than others. Most importantly, if the elites do not believe that making their critical thinkers and servants prioritize attachment to material things and emotions before attachment to truth and values as suggested in the UN Charter and the UDHR is important to keep their dominant role, this then means that the elites do not believe that truth has the power to weigh people down or to set them back to conditions that would be worse than where they would have started initially when envy rises or outcomes are not divided fairly.

Until now, no society or kingdom that followed in the footsteps of the wise but stopped short of seeking what the wise sought managed to preserve its power, wealth, and status indefinitely. Can Joe Biden manage to rejuvenate the power of the elites any differently than as per the small steps that he has been himself making since he was elected president in 2020 or that his predecessors in the United States and

around the world have secured since 1945, even if people in the United States reelect him as president of this country for eternity in 2024? Put differently, can Joe Biden get too far in his aspiration to improve freedom and rights in the United States if he happens to be reelected for a second term when the delays that he is already knowing to resolve the obstacles that he said were hurting the United States and the world when he campaigned to become president to supposedly solve are still unresolved, mainly because of his own servants in the government (political advisors, governors, judges, police officers, and public officials) holding him down, making him go in round, and propelling him to go one step forward and two steps back?

Accordingly, can the elites get too far in their aspiration to become the deputy of God on earth for eternity when Joe Biden and all the other rulers and political class in UN member states are with their political advisors, governors, judges, police officers, and public officials regarding themselves exempt from observing the work program suggested in the UN Charter and the UDHR either because they do not believe that their disobedience would have any bearing on the power, wealth, and status of the elites or because they are convinced that their disobedience are necessary steps to ultimately produce the ordered relations that would preserve the power, wealth, and status of the elites? For example, to tidy a messy room (or to solve a Rubik cube), it is necessary to make the room more disordered first to be able to tidy it.

I have no way of knowing how the critical thinkers (mathematicians and physicists) of the elites are concluding that if they let servants (rulers) in UN member states such as Joe Biden, King Charles of Great Britain, etc. disregard the work program included in the UN Charter and the UDHR, it would be possible for them (the elites) to preserve their power, wealth and status when according to the second law of thermodynamics, energy is most usable when it is concentrated and less usable when it is spread out. In other words, energy becomes inefficient when it is spread out, and it becomes impossible to recover it back (i.e., it is irreversible). Not to mention, violence rarely ends disputes effectively, and envy and freedom are two insatiable parameters.

That is to say, if the critical thinkers of the elites do not want that their masters (i.e., the elites) fall from their glory, they need to be relying on increasing the number of servants who are observing the work program suggested in the UN Charter and the UDHR and not doing the opposite and letting rulers in UN member states, starting with King Charles of Great Britain, whose fathers and grandfathers designed the international order, to perceive that disregarding the principles included in such international milestones does not carry any drawback. Put differently, if we take a Rubik cube, there is only one algorithm that we know off hand that is capable of solving this puzzle. If we do not follow this one way that we know can solve the puzzle, the more turns we make to it, the further and further away we will be from ever becoming capable of solving it. And so the question that begs answers is: why are the elites letting their critical thinkers and their servants regard themselves exempt from observing the work program suggested in the UN Charter and the UDHR when they know very well that it is not possible to undo the damages that their apathy is creating in the international order, as the constant wars that the world has known since 1945 support? This is because it would be naive to suppose that the elites do not know that when they let their critical thinkers or their servants spread out in all directions and not observe the UN Charter and the UDHR, the energy that they would be exhausting to secure the UN goals would be making small leaps and not giant leaps, as the state of world affairs since 1945 has supported.

I have no way of knowing why the elites are neglecting the effect of letting their critical thinkers and servants regard themselves exempt from observing the work program suggested in the UN Charter and the UDHR on the maintenance of their strength and security. Nor do I know how the elites are concluding that if they let their critical thinkers and servants regard themselves exempt from observing the work program suggested in the UN Charter and the UDHR, such disregard would not influence people negatively and convert them into becoming a destructive and disobedient force instead of obedient?

If the elites do not want to admit that they could not be helping themselves nor helping their critical thinkers and servants to rejuvenate their power when they allow them to regard themselves exempt from observing the work program suggested in the UN Charter

and the UDHR, then only two reasons could be pushing the elites into perceiving that the disorder that their disregard is creating would not have any effect on the maintenance of their strength and security and is harmless. The first reason is if this optimism stems from their (the elites) conviction that time is on their side and that their critical thinkers and servants would ultimately wise up and recognize that nobody gets too far by keeping the international order going like that with one step forward and two steps back. The second is if they (the elites) are convinced that they can outsmart the truth by design.

I have no way of knowing which scenarios between the aforementioned two could be leading the elites into perceiving that that negative emotional response that people are upholding toward them in their hearts and they are expressing it by withdrawing their obligation to observe the standards and norms that their critical thinkers and servants are legitimizing is harmless when human nature has not changed from before and after 1945. What I do know is that after Isaac Newton discovered the laws of motion and universal gravitation in the 16th century, mankind started to believe that everything was predictable. In fact, in the 17th century, Pierre-Simon, Marquis de Laplace, developed a famous thought experiment, now called Laplace's demon, which made it possible to imagine how the future could be easily predicted using Newton's laws. Laplace suggested that because everything in the universe is made of atoms, if a vast intelligence (as suggested by Laplace) knew the current location and momentum of every atom in the universe, it would be able to tell the past from the future.

Presently, supercomputers are capable of predicting the location of people in space and time and, henceforth, how people could be moving in the future, thus making it possible to predict the future. However, this information alone about the position of people in space and time is not sufficient to enable the elites to maintain their strength and security or prevent harm from touching them. When Cain murdered his brother Able, it was not possible for Abel to predict this action. In other words, knowing the position of a person in space and time is not sufficient to determine the future or to see through it to know what an adversary is plotting.

In my opinion, only one design has been known to be effective at making the future fall in accordance with the way one anticipates. I believe Scheherazade, the protagonist in the book *The Thousand and One Nights* (also known as the *Arabian Nights*) that was compiled during the Islamic Golden Age (traditionally dated from the 8th century to the 13th century), was one of the most successful individuals at making the future fall in accordance with her design to date.

The *Thousand and One Nights* are a “collection of largely Indian, Persian, and Middle Eastern stories of uncertain date and authorship.” The tales vary widely and include love stories, tragedies, comedies, erotica, and various other forms. For example, the fictional characters Aladdin, Ali Baba, and Sindbad the Sailor are tales from the collection of stories included in this ancient Arabic collection.

The main frame story in the book *The Thousand and One Nights* concerns Shahryār, a Sasanian king who discovered that his own wife was infidel. Shahryār had his wife killed, then he decided that all women are the same. Shahryār began to marry a new woman every day and then execute her the next morning before she could have a chance to dishonor him. Eventually, Shahryār’s killing spree of a new wife every day drained the kingdom of candidates, leaving only Scheherazade, the daughter of his vizier (his most senior political advisor), to be a victim of his cruel plan. On the night of their marriage, Scheherazade began “to tell the king a tale, but did not end it. The king, curious about how the story ends, is thus forced to postpone her execution in order to hear the conclusion. The next night, as soon as she finishes the tale, she begins another one, and the king, eager to hear the conclusion of that tale as well, postpones her execution once again. This goes on for one thousand and one nights, hence the name.” Different versions of the book contain different endings. The versions that are circulated today suggest that Shahryār pardoned Scheherazade.

Indeed, the explanations that the critical thinkers and servants of the elites are constantly giving to justify why the efforts that they are exhausting as of 1945 to secure the UN goal are not decreasing fear and want but instead increasing the anarchy of the international order

do not appear to be any different from the subframe stories that are included in *The Thousand and One Nights* book. In fact, since 1945, the critical thinkers and the servants of the elites appear to have a good reason to justify why they are making small steps to secure the UN goals and not a large leap, in the same way students who fail an exam justify their poor performance. For example, one day the problem is due to communism, and the other day the problem is due to capitalism. One day the problem is due to the Soviet Union, and the other day the problem is due to the United States. One day the problem is due to Iran, and the other day the problem is due to China. One day the problem is due to the rates of growth of human populations, and the other day the problem is due to environmental degradation. One day the problem is due to technology, and the other day the problem is due to a lack of knowledge. In fact, as of the start of the 21st century, the critical thinkers and the servants of the elites appear to be using a new trend to justify why they are making small steps to secure the UN goals and not a large leap. This trend involves the creation of an enemy image, just as is done in films. For example, at the start of the 21st century, the challenge that was preventing mankind from securing the UN goals was due to Osama Bin Ladin (even though there has not been real proof linking him to the Sept. 11 attacks till today except for the claim the United States makes about him being the mastermind) or Saddam Hussein (the President of Iraq), and now, two decades later, the problem is due to Vladimir Putin (the President of Russia).

Who would the critical thinkers and the servants of the elite blame next to justify their reasons for disregarding their obligations to observe the work program included in the UN Charter and the UDHR? Most importantly, are the elites supposing that if they convert with their critical thinkers and servants the idea of freedom into a narrative that can be treated in the same way the frame story in *The Thousand and One Nights* book sets the stage for shorter sets of stories, it would be possible for them to deceive people and to continue to postpone their reversal to a simpler form in the same way Scheherazade was doing it by design?

The elites can continue to let their critical thinkers and servants come up with excuses to justify why they are not observing the UN Charter and the UDHR, just as Scheherazade was each evening telling king

Shahryār a story in the hope of putting off her execution, but this tactic does not tell us with certainty if this action plan is fragmenting the wealth, power, and status of the elites or is rejuvenating them. This is because if people's attitudes behave in the same way objects tend to keep on doing what they are already doing, as suggested by Isaac Newton's happens to object in his first law, and when people become accustomed to old habits, they grow old with it, as analogously Rudolph Clausius was saying happens in the second law of thermodynamics when energy is not concentrated, then the international order may not be as stable as it may seem if the mind behaves in the same way objects in a three-gravitational body problem work.

For example, in the three-body problem (also known as the no-body problem), mathematicians and physicists are not capable of writing all the equations that can completely predict the motion of the gravitating objects involved. In other words, in a three-body problem, the number of unknown variables makes it impossible to find a general solution for the set of equations involved. That is to say, it is not possible to write for each unknown an equation that independently describes it.

To be specific, if we put three people in a closed room and ask each one separately to watch out for the behavior of the others, it would be impossible for any one of them to predict what the others are thinking in their minds or whether or not any of the individuals involved will act on the emotions that are being played out in their minds or not. Throughout the time that those three individuals are together, the two who are in close proximity to each other the most will pose the biggest threat on the survivability of each other. If each one stays distant from the other, then the survivability of each would be equal.

The founding fathers of the UN proposed to the elites that they preserve their power by ensuring that UN member states stay within the same distance of one another. In addition, the founding fathers of the UN proposed to the elites to let governments in each UN member state determine their own political and economic solutions, for as long as they observe the UN Charter and the UDHR. For one reason or another, the elites thought differently. The elites decided to create non-state actors and international institutions and to invite them to take

separate action (i.e., parallel) to the one governments are providing in UN member states to supposedly accelerate that attainment of the UN goals. Thus, we now have in each UN member state two authorities who are providing political, economic, and social solutions to reduce fear and want, but without the individuals involved observing the provisions of the UN Charter and the UDHR. Those two legal entities are respective governments and non-state actors or international institutions.

The decision of the elites to bring governments and non-state actors or international institutions together to establish relationships with one another without the individuals involved observing the provisions included in the UN Charter and the UDHR did not accelerate the preparedness of all people around the world to secure the UN goals (i.e., reduce fear and want), but accelerated the transitioning of all people around the world to modernity.

Throughout history, modernity (i.e., rise in awareness and knowledge) reduced the power of the fittest and converted him to a simpler form in the course of time and things. The question that begs answer is: how did the elites conclude that if they let their critical thinkers and servants violate the work program suggested in the UN Charter and the UDHR, this disregard would not have any bearing on their ability to continue to transform the conditions and outcomes that matter to them despite their military superiority or technology (artificial intelligence) telling them the location of every person in real time?

To put it differently, in atomic theory (i.e., Bohr's atomic model), it is suggested that atoms consist of a small, dense nucleus surrounded by a series of outer shells on which electrons revolve, that could be regarded as analogous to the way the solar system looks. Accordingly, each shell represents the energy level. The shell that is closest to the nucleus is the shell that has the lowest energy. Each subsequent shell has more energy. In addition, it takes energy to move an electron that is located in the shell that is the closest to the nucleus, for example, to an outer shell. Most importantly, on the first shell, only two electrons can be accommodated. The second shell can accommodate a maximum of eight electrons. The third shell is eighteen, and so forth.

As per the aforementioned description of how energy level and electron configuration are organized in atoms, one would think that just as the first shell that orbits the nucleus contains the lowest energy and the smallest number of electrons, the elites would be equally vigilant in ensuring that they keep the number of people who are telling them how humanity should be organized in the international order low. Strangely, instead of the elites letting the international order be organized in the same way energy levels in electrons and atoms are organized (which is, by the way, what the founding fathers of the UN suggested to them be organized like), the elites decided to have thousands upon thousands of non-state actors and international organizations working in each UN member state offering political, economic, and social solutions on how to improve human rights, social justice, democracy, freedom, etc. In other words, as of 1945, we have a huge number of non-state actors and international organizations that are preventing people from practicing tolerance and living together in peace with one another as good neighbors, therefore endangering the maintenance of peace and security. This is because people do not use the idea of good to unite in strength to maintain peace and security, but to create ordered relations. For example, people do not investigate disputes or any situation that might lead to friction or give rise to a dispute in order to determine whether the continuance of the dispute or situation is likely to endanger the maintenance of peace and security, but rather to personally profit from the hardship or misfortune of others. That is to say, the solutions that people buy and sell to each other to resolve disputes do not promote the economic and social advancement of all people, but their outcomes are programmed to strengthen the economic and social advancement of the individuals who are recommending appropriate procedures or methods of adjustment. This also means that when people use machinery that promotes social progress and better standards of life in larger freedom to improve their own self-help instead of the collective security of all people, the transformations that people produce cannot create conditions of stability and well-being without distinction as to race, sex, language, religion, etc. but deepen disregard and contempt instead. In other words, this aforementioned hypocritical or biased approach to improving collective security teaches people why they should stop coping and be dedicated to stripping the elites and the rich from their wealth, power, and status instead of being obedient or

grateful. This is because all people ardently desire how to increase their happiness, not who will be the first to sell what they possess and give it to the poor. And so, if throughout history, all the businesses, societies, kingdoms, and empires that collapsed happened after the individuals involved decided to create an imbalance in the number of people who are deciding how the group should be organized in the shells that are the closest to the nucleus, could the elites prevent their collapse or reversal to a simpler form after they allowed that only infants and the people who are not yet born tell them how humanity should be organized in the international order since 1945? In other words, could the elites prevent their collapse after they began to allow that the circumstances of the people who are within their inner circle (an example would be family members, aids, etc.) or their servants who are usually very close to this inner circle (an example would be disputes between the members of the UN Security Council) raise the energy level that exists around them (i.e., disputes, scandals, etc.) instead of keeping it low, thus giving people good reasons to distrust them?

I have no way of knowing why the elites are not stopping their critical thinkers and servants from regarding themselves exempt from the appeal of observing the work program suggested in the UN Charter and the UDHR, so people stop to be angry at current and previous governments for failing to reduce political, economic, and social crises. If the elites do not mind the provocations that letting their critical thinkers and servants regard themselves exempt from the appeal of observing the work program suggested in the UN Charter and the UDHR could incite or disturb in the public order, this means that the elites believe that the practice of violating existing laws (standards and norms) or going in circles could not have any bearing on tearing up their power, wealth, and status. In other words, the elites do not believe that when they let their critical thinkers and servants regard themselves exempt from the appeal of observing the work program suggested in the UN charter and the UDHR that they would be walking without any landmarks to guide them, and therefore, walking in circles instead of walking in a straight line to reach their ultimate implicit and explicit goals.

Once again, I have no way of knowing if the decision of the elites to let their critical thinkers and servants regard themselves exempt from observing the landmarks that were suggested in the UN Charter and the UDHR is ramping up political, economic, and social tension that could be making them walk in circles instead of walking in a straight line to reach their implicit and explicit goals. What I do know is that it is the brain that usually plots the course to take to go from point A to point B. All the landmarks that people depend on to go from point A to point B are located on the outside of the human body and are constantly changing. This means that when the elites decide to let their critical thinkers and servants temper with the landmarks that were suggested in the UN Charter and the UDHR (i.e., come up with different standards or norms or regard themselves exempt from observing the suggested standards or norms), it would not be possible to avoid that they (the critical thinkers and servants) could be leading their masters (the elites) down a random, meandering path. When the errors in a particular direction (such as a river or watercourse) build up (i.e., become random meanders, etc.), it is not possible to avoid that the series of sinuous curves result in the formation of circles. Many questions beg answers. For one, how are the elites concluding that if they let their critical thinkers and servants veer from the landmarks that were suggested in the UN Charter and the UDHR, they would not be walking in complete circles? This is because people are able to track (with their own minds and technology) the way their neighbor is physically moving, but they are not able to track the way the mind of their neighbor is moving (changing). If visual cues cannot help the elites overcome having their critical thinkers and servants walk in circles, can the elites prevent that their critical thinkers and servants walk them into political, economic, and social challenges that it would not be possible for them to have enough energy to escape from the gravity of its drawback in the future?

To put it differently, in physics, any charged object that revolves in a circular motion gains acceleration gradually. The faster an object moves in a circular motion, the more its acceleration will increase. When the acceleration of an object increases, it's bound to liberate energy in some form. If the energy being released continues to rise, then the object will lose all its momentum and fall into the nucleus. In real life, when a farmer forgets the place where he planted his seeds,

the rain later tells him where he dropped his seeds. However, when it comes to color, it is not possible to make two people agree on the same color because people see color differently.

If the elites continue to let their critical thinkers and servants confuse people and make them (people) stop to agree on staying focused and zooming in or remembering to only see and observe the political, economic and social aspects that the founding fathers of the UN suggested in the UN charter as of 1945, and allow them (the critical thinkers and servants) to legitimize political, economic and social aspects that lets people interpret the surrounding in the same way two people could interpret color differently, then it would not be possible to avoid that the number of people who would be proposing political, economic and social solutions to the elites on how the international order should be organized but without any one of the individuals involved observing the work program suggested from growing controversially in the future.

Earlier I said people are discrete but are able to let through the words they communicate to bud or form strings that show multicellular characteristics. In other words, form several concentric layers in the same way a longitudinal section through an onion bulb looks.

When we look at an onion sliced in half, we observe that at the base of the bulb there is a bud that is undeveloped and is protected by a layer of scales. This bud, which is usually located at the center of the bulb, appears to be unable to expand and form a full-fledged scale or a flowering shoot. In other words, this bud looks as if it is either in a dormant condition or the scales that surround it choke it and prevent it from flowering or growing beyond its embryonic shoot. Many questions beg answers. For one, how are the elites concluding that if they let their critical thinkers and servants veer from the landmarks that were suggested in the UN Charter and the UDHR and legitimize political, economic, and social solutions that make people develop into forming scales that look in the same way a longitudinal section through an onion bulb looks instead of developing into a longitudinal section through an apple, the scales that people would be forming around them (the elites) would not choke them or keep them in this dormant condition that occurs to buds that are located at the center of

an onion bulb? In other words, how are the elites concluding that the political, economic, and social difficulties (i.e., poverty, unemployment, jealousy, corruption) that they are allowing people to endure at the hands of their critical thinkers and servants will not backfire? That is to say, produce results that they are not anticipating, knowing that mankind does not appear to possess until now knowledge on how to stop unicellular ideas such as God, good, justice, and happiness from making people bud or form strings that show multicellular concentric characteristics.

Most importantly, how are the elites concluding that they can prevent people (including their critical thinkers and servants) from ganging on them and chocking them after they allowed their critical thinkers and servants to be attracted to them by teaching people that the purpose of the coming together of mankind in the aftermath of WW2 to collaborate in the economic field was programmed to arrange that outcomes be shared on equal rights among all members of the human family instead of creating ordered relations in the same way an onion forms or an apple grows? In other words, if the elites have no power to make the first orbit of scales that encircle the bud in an onion move into the fourth orbit or vice versa, how are the elites concluding that if they let their critical thinkers and servants veer from the landmarks (standards and norms) that were suggested in the UN Charter and the UDHR and to legitimize political, economic, and social solutions that make people be organized in the same way people see color differently (i.e., based on race, sex, language, religion, etc.), that they (the elites) could make people want to stay in group with them or to grant them more power than others? This is because if the elites are thinking that they can always rely on resets (i.e., pandemics, wars, famine) to keep their dominant role intact, this tactic invites another question. How are the elites concluding that they would be the victors in an upcoming new reset (i.e., pandemic, wars, famine) if they decide to program a new one? Likewise, if the elites think that they could by design make people back off from their conviction about outcomes becoming shared on equal rights after they granted rights to their critical thinkers and servants to teach people to stop to cope unless the constitution in Great Britain is changed so any person around the world can become a king of this realm instead of being obedient to this king as the apostles were obedient to Jesus or the companion of the Islamic prophet

Muhammad were obedient to his teaching after his death, then chances are that such cooling will require that the same process that happens when an electron changes from one orbit to the next occur. This orbital change requires the exhaustion of lots of energy. Can the elites whisk people so that they begin to accept and practice tolerance until they finish with satiating the expectations of all the people who are protecting them first before moving on to satiating the expectations of the people that follow them next, when they do not appear to have power over this energy that has been deciding why one area is arid and another fertile, or why one person is born rich and another poor?

2

Price for letting Irrational passions and appetites guide truth

Shantideva, was an an 8th-century CE Indian philosopher, Buddhist who addressed the topic of worrying. Shantideva stated “If you can solve the problem, then what is the need of worrying? If you cannot solve it, then what is the use of worrying.”

I have no way of knowing if the elites can solve the problem which they have created in the world after they gave their non-objection to their critical thinkers and servants to interest people to unite with them to work together to ultimately arrange that outcomes become shared on equal rights (i.e., to strip the elites from their power), instead of tasking their critical thinkers and servants to interest people into agreeing to be ready to surrender freedom to them and to practice tolerance to build the international postwar world order suggested in the UN Charter and the UDHR. What I do know is that everything around us seems to be spinning like a toy top or a Frisbee flying disc, and the things that are not spinning are behaving in the same way the sea waves change the equilibrium of ships. If the elites do not want that their power tip over and fall (i.e., their relative economic and military superiority stability and equilibrium does not become unbalanced), they need to ensure that people do not become disinterested in them or in their ideas, so the detachment that people would be feeling would not destabilize them and increase their wobbling, just as happens when the energy of a top reduces or a Freesbe loses lift due to friction or drag and fall.

It looks as if the choices that the elites could pick from to preserve their power, wealth, and status without all the people who are rivaling reverting them to a simpler form are boiling down to only two choices after they decided to let their critical thinkers and servants convert them into becoming the tip or the sharp point that is located at the bottom of a top body and on their shoulders rest the weight of this mass (i.e., all the people and their problems) and the randomness that can affect its surface area (i.e., environmental change), instead of converting them into becoming the symbol that kings place atop orb, thus representing their dominion over the world. The first is to increase death rates (i.e., wars, famines, epidemics) to reduce desires. The second is to do nothing and to continue to let the international order spin as it appears to be doing since 1945 on autopilot in the hope of the preventive measures that they would be implementing being successful at preventing their resizing.

It is important that readers keep in mind that in classical mechanics, the rotation of dynamical systems such as a spinning top (which is the role the elites appear to be playing in the international order) is not an integrable problem. Spinning tops are chaotic systems, and only three specific cases are known to have been integrable. These three specific cases are the Euler, the Lagrange, and the Kovalevskaya top. The difficulty in integrating the motion of such a dynamical system is due to confining its integrability “to a submanifold of much smaller dimensionality than that of its phase space.” Phase space, in dynamical systems theory, is the space “in which all possible ‘states’ of a dynamical system are represented, with each possible state corresponding to one unique point in the phase space.” That is to say, hence people are legitimizing as of 1945 the “state” (the values) that the elites believe can rejuvenate their power, and this “state” does not represent all possible values, all people, or the rule-based order that the founding fathers of the UN counselled the elites to observe. This means that the slightest disequilibrium in the degree of freedom of the international order (its direction, speed, and timing) is bound to generate randomness that its trends could have dire consequences on the conservation of the stability or strength of the elites. This is due mainly to the large number of discrete variables (i.e., people) who are subscribing to the rule-based order in order to profit from its potential to help them rival and not necessarily secure its ends.

Put differently, if the elites believe that they could rely on resets (i.e., increasing death rates) to rejuvenate their power or to tackle a rise in distrust, there is no guarantee that the instability (dynamism) that they provoke does not destabilize the international order or get it out of control, as happened in Iraq after the United States led a coalition to overthrow Saddam Hussein from power.

When we take a deck of cards and shuffle them, it is not possible to put the deck back in the right order without someone who knows the right sequence already doing it. It looks as if humans were not granted right or the upper hand to put the things that they disorganized back in the order that they perceive is right, except when this meddling is done to chip a hand to order things back according to the way the force that controls the natural world has decided in advance how things should be ordered. For example, as of the date the United States ended the military operation to topple the Iraqi government, none of the Iraqi people or non-Iraqi expats whom the Americans appointed or invited to help them put the Iraqi social order back in the order that they wanted managed to reorder the Iraqi people except in the same disordered way that they were organized in it before the Iraqi government was toppled. This is very serious and worrisome. To put it differently, if the only action that could make the Iraqi people become reorganized in a manner that preserves the power, wealth, and status of the elites after the United States disrupted their equilibrium is if the Iraqi people observe the work program suggested in the UN Charter and the UDHR, and if the United States relate with them based on the same principles, this means that all the meddling that the elites are permitting their critical thinkers and servants to effect in the international order but without the individuals involved observing the provisions that they are preaching could be producing the same phenomenon that resulted in Iraq.

If the international order is changing as of 1945 as per the way the political and social order started evolving in Iraq after the United States led a coalition to topple the Iraqi government to prevent the people of Iraq from developing knowledge and awareness that could threaten the maintenance of its stability and strength in this region of the world, this then means that the stability of the equilibrium of the

international could be changing in the same way that happens when we open or shake a bottle of soda to create an explosion and not when we open a bottle of wine. When we shake a bottle of wine, the drink does not create bubbles or explode.

Put differently, if the policies or solutions that the critical thinkers and servants are coming up with to supposedly secure the UN goals are repelling people away from their determination to stay in groups in the same way the action of opening a bottle of soda causes the excess carbon dioxide that is dissolved in the drink to escape as bubbles or give this fizzy characteristic taste, then there is a good chance that the behavior of the international order will be analogous to the behavior that happens in the case of carbonated water or drinks that get exposed to air. When all the dissolved carbon dioxide escapes, the drink becomes flat like water. The same can be said when we add salt to a cup of water. Initially, the salt dissolves in the water, but after adding a large amount of salt, the salt stops to dissolve and stays in its actual shape or form. If the international order behaves in the same way the drink that is stored in soda bottles comport after its mixture gets exposed to the air (i.e., flat), and the elites are permitting their critical thinkers and servants to make people lose their equilibrium as the United States did in Iraq after this country meddled in the equilibrium of the Iraqi people then stopped short of wanting to cooperate with them in accordance with the provisions suggested in the UN Charter and the UDHR so the Iraqi people would have no reason to disobey, then there is a good chance that people's emotions around the world toward them (the elites) or their ideas could be getting affected in the same way the emotions of the Iraqi people toward the United States changed from before to after this country meddled in their existing equilibrium.

Since antiquity, people have been using the idea of good or evil to make the weakest consider the opinion of the fittest. The question that begs answers cannot be about doubting the likelihood of the elites stumbling on the same challenges that their predecessors stumbled upon when they chose to depend on the same recourses or methods that their fathers depended on to rejuvenate their power. The question that begs answers is: how are the elites concluding that they are far mightier than the kings who were destroyed before, thus not minding

granting their critical thinkers and servants rights to regard themselves exempt from observing the laws (standards and norms) they are preaching when people do not appear to have been granted right to put the things that they meddle with and disorder back the way they like, but only as per the way the force that controls the natural world always ordain?

To give an example, in the Quran, it is suggested that when Moses confronted Pharaoh to change his behavior or to let him and the people with whom he was forming a group go out of Egypt, the people of Egypt regarded this standoff between Moses and Pharaoh (and his critical thinkers and servants) as a dispute that did not concern them. [Az-Zukhruf 43:54] The Quran then adds that the more Pharaoh and the people of Egypt were ignoring the importance of truth in building meaningful relations, the more the disregard that they were effecting was worsening the political or social order until, in the course of time and things, they all drowned. [Az-Zukhruf 43:55]

If whenever the fittest mock the weak or disregard the truth, there is no guarantee that he could avoid his resizing, how are the elites reaching the point where they can let their critical thinkers and servants regard themselves exempt from observing the provisions included in the UN Charter and the UDHR and avoid confronting the same fate that Pharaoh endured when he chose to depend on the same recourses or methods that his fathers were depending on to rejuvenate their power (i.e., double standards) instead of truth?

Put differently, if for as long as the elites refuse to stop letting their critical thinkers and servants regard themselves exempt from observing the work program suggested in the UN Charter and the UDHR, it would be impossible to doubt that the international order will evolve any differently than toward the unstable and confounding way that exists in Iraq, Lebanon, Egypt, the United States, etc. today, this means that the constant wars that have swept the world as of 1945 could be due to people being united as of this date to sustain a chaotic system instead of to produce meaningful relationships. This also means that until the elites stop to let their critical thinkers and servants from confounding them with how the solutions which they are enforcing are precursors to organize people to relate in accordance

with the standards suggested in the UN Charter and the UDHR (or stop to accept the reasons they give them to justify why they are not observing the UN Charter and the UDHR), the more the transformations that they (the elites) would be tolerating its final results could be eating away from the determination of people to being ready to let them continue to have greater say than others in power in the same way erosion eats away from fertile land, and clog waterways and cause declines in fish and other species little by little, or textile fabric rot thus becoming so weak and brittle that it just crumbles into dust.

Fabric is formed by interlacing threads. Interlacing means the intricate crossing together of threads to form a fabric or cloth. People interlace relationships and connections with one another to enable them to get their way despite the resistance of others in the same way they interlace threads to form fabric.

If anarchy, dynamism, wars, corruption, disregard, etc., or compassion, fairness, justice, etc., weaken the intricate relationships and connections that people build to rejuvenate their power in the same way dry or wet mold eats away textile or cloth so it becomes weak and brittle when it is subjected to poor temperature and moisture control, then the longer the elites keep people united and exposed to the false declarations that their critical thinkers and servants make about how they are reducing fear and want, the more the conviction of people about the importance of staying united to keep the international order stable and firm would be shrinking and getting brittle. And since, the only reason why people are staying with the elites in group is because they are believing their appeal about how they can help to raise some in rank above others so those who rise may employ others in service, and those who are abusing their power to shrinking it, then the more the elites let their critical thinkers and servants be bound by their personal power and conscience to increase their happiness instead of keeping them on a leash and ensuring that they observe the provisions suggested in the UN Charter and the UDHR, the more the reliance of people on self help to realize the full development of their personality or on distinction such as race, sex, language, religion, etc. to increase their happiness or to make the weakest surrender freedom to the fittest before taking action of his own would be growing. And since when

people rely on their self-help or distinction, they increase their wealth, power, and status much faster and much bigger than when they rely on laws (standards and norms), the more the legitimacy of the authority of the state over people shrinks, the more the unpreparedness of people to observe the political order grows. When the readiness of people to observe the political order shrinks, it becomes very difficult to make people agree to voluntarily consent or to give up their natural freedom to obtain the benefits of the political order, as the state of the political order in all the UN member states as of 1945 shows. This is very serious and worrisome. This is because it is not possible to know how long it could take for people to reestablish equilibrium. For example, no one knows how long it took our ancestors to learn to count from one to ten. In fact, it took our predecessors from the story of the flood all the way up to 1945 to accept settling disputes through negotiation and arbitration instead of war. In other words, the longer the elites turn a blind eye on the injustice and human rights violations that their critical thinkers and servants are propelling in the name of building a complete structure of a world order under law, the more the power, wealth, and status of the elites will be shrinking and nearing crumbling.

Once again, I have no way of knowing if the decision of the elites to let their critical thinkers and servants regard themselves exempt from observing the work program suggested in the UN Charter and the UDHR since 1945 is making things harder for them to maintain their strength and security or easier. Likewise, I have no way of knowing if the decision of the elites to permit that some people in different geographical areas do more work than others, and in the areas that are not considered a priority now for them to consume its people with civil wars or lawlessness (i.e., divide and rule), thus keeping such social orders unproductive, is a strategy that is also reducing jealousy and creating equilibrium between people instead of disequilibrium. What I do know is that coexistence or partnership cannot be sustained without respect for equal justice and equal freedom. If the elites believe that they can divide people (societies) hierarchically and preach to them about equal rights while still expecting people (societies) to coexist as if such a divide does not exist, this means that the elites believe they can control jealousy. I have no way of knowing if the elites can now control jealousy. What I do know is that the Bible states that God

failed to control people's jealousy or envy, and all the tests that people carried out to control jealousy or envy failed to produce emotions that made a person not desire what the other person possessed. In fact, since antiquity, the more people's exploration (knowledge and awareness) widens, the more the jealousy and envy that people uphold in their hearts deepen. The more people's jealousy and envy deepen, the more their minds get corrupted. The more wicked people become, the more this attitude deepens division and increases corruption or disregard (i.e., chaos).

Accordingly, since the elites believe that keeping people divided and compartmentalized in the same way cargo bays on ships are designed (i.e., into multiple cargo bays instead of having one large giant tank to carry cargo) ensures that free surface effects does not generate forces that can capsize the ship, or when one bay floods the rest of the ship stays afloat and does not sink is a strategy that can keep jealousy or envy under control and unable to bind and form a string that could weaken their power, wealth and status, this means that the elites must believe that the redundancies that they are depending on to keep their dominant control intact are more than adequate to prevent such an upset.

I have no way of knowing if the decision of the elites to compartmentalize people in the international order into distinct groups just as cargo bays or water ballast on ships are compartmentalized and then to have some groups stable and others unstable is a strategy that rulers or kings in antiquity tested with and if its outcome helped them to preserve their power or not. What I do know is that if division makes it easier to control chaos (corruption, disregard, etc.) or can convert chaos into a property that behaves in the same way mold or rust forms on surfaces, whereby some areas develop such characteristics faster than others, thus giving a person a chance to control the environment, then chances are that the Greek Empire would not have collapsed. This is because the Greek empire controlled many islands or compartmentalized societies before its collapse.

If dividing people (societies) into smaller groups does not provide political stability or can effectively control people's disenchantment with the political order when rulers and the political class refuse to

practice what they preach, then chaos (corruption, disregard, etc.) must be a parameter that builds up or swells in the social order in the same way waves move water from side to side on the outside of a ship, and the effect of this motion can sometimes cause the ship to capsize.

To put it differently, ship builders divide the cargo area into multiple smaller holding bays instead of keeping the hull area into one giant storage area to avoid primarily, as I said before, free surface effects. If people in the different compartmentalized territorial boundaries become disenchanted with the way their rulers and political class are increasing their happiness or if people begin to withdraw their obligation to obey because they distrust their rulers and political class, then the dynamism that such a phenomenon could be impacting on the integrity or stability of the international order (and henceforth the power, wealth, and status of the elites) could be analogous to how rough seas destabilize ships from the outside, except that instead of this destabilizing action being generated from external forces, it would be getting generated or formed from within. Put differently, there is no difference between a person applying force to roll a barrel on the ground or entering inside the barrel and pushing from the inside, thus creating the same rolling effect.

If whenever the forces that act on the hull of a ship are being generated from the outside of the vessel or when they are being generated from within, their effect is the same (i.e., they both can capsize a ship), then if the elites continue to let their critical thinkers and servants continue to regard themselves exempt from observing the political order enshrined in constitutions, the UN Charter, and the UDHR, it would not be possible for them (the elites) to avoid that people begin to withdraw their obligation to obey, thus subjecting the international order to know the same instability that occurs when rough seas destabilize the stability of ships.

I have no way of knowing if the decision of the elites to compartmentalize people (societies) into different territorial boundaries while keeping critical thinkers and servants regard themselves exempt from observing the political order enshrined in constitutions or the UN Charter and the UDHR could prevent people in the different distinct territories from uniting or synchronizing their

disenchantment so the dynamism that their critical thinkers and servants are propelling in the system (the world) does not resize them (the elites). What I do know is that the elites have divided the Middle East in the aftermath of WW2 into different societies (sovereign nations) and appointed regimes that its rulers and political class have refused since 1945 to observe the political order enshrined in constitutions or the UN Charter and the UDHR, yet this strategy failed to prevent citizens in the different territories from forming fronts or resistance movements to challenge the political order that the elites have established in each society (sovereign nation) to rejuvenate their power. For example, before the start of the 21st century, the societies that were against the decision of the elites to displace the Palestinian people from their land to create a Jewish state were launching punctual attacks against the people who started living in this new country to discourage them and persuade them to leave based on an uncoordinated strategy between all the disenchanted groups. Presently, the people who are resisting the decision of the elites to create this new Jewish state formed a front that started to coordinate and threaten the people who are living in this country from various locations.

If people can unite and synchronize fronts or resistance movements that works across borders or states, and without the need for the people who are jointly coordinating their own security to threaten others to leave their position in space or time, this then means that if people disenchantment with the political and economic solutions that critical thinkers and servants are legitimizing in UN member states continue to deepen, it would not be possible for the elites to avoid that people around the world form a united front or to synchronize their resistance so that the force that they would be creating cause the international order to collapse just as happens when extreme free surface effects cause ships to capsize irrespective of whether the ship's cargo bays are partitioned into multiple holding areas or are a one giant cargo bay.

Once again, I have no way of knowing if the decision of the elites to let their critical thinkers and servants regard themselves exempt from observing the political order enshrined in constitutions, the UN Charter, and the UDHR could have ramifications in the future for the maintenance and stability of their security. What I do know is that resistance operations evolved throughout history in the same way an

infectious disease spreads and affects the entirety of the human body, or a dim light works.

Light is a form of energy, and its measurement is subjective because it depends on how each human eye is measuring the level of brightness. I have no way of knowing if the elites can measure the intensity of corruption, bias, disenchantment, disregard, etc. in the same way scientists measure the intensity of a beam of light or sailors adjust the buoyancy of ships to ensure that the hull stays submerged so waves do not move or destabilize the ship easily. What I do know is that on ships that transport crude oil, sailors are supposed to keep the crude oil hot to reduce viscosity for easy pumping. In other words, I have no way of knowing if the political and economic solutions that the elites are depending on to make people stay with them are keeping them in the right spirit in the same way sailors keep crude oil within a specific temperature range to keep its viscosity manageable or when people bring milk to a certain temperature before making yoghurt for yoghurt bacteria to grow properly. What I do know is that the constant wars that the world has been knowing since 1945 or after the elites decided to compartmentalize people (societies) in the international order into distinct groups just as cargo bays or water ballast on ships are compartmentalized do not support that their critical thinkers and servants are managing to keep people in the right spirit and/or are properly determining which society (nation) must do more work than others and which one its people are supposed to stay consumed by civil wars or lawlessness to keep balance in the international order, in the same way sailors seem to know how to keep the weight distribution in ships even to avoid unwanted accidents.

If the critical thinkers and servants of the elites continue to get it wrong about which society (nation) must do more works than others and which one its people are supposed to stay consumed by civil wars or lawless to keep international order in balance in the same way sailors are capable to do with weight distribution onboard ships, then the miscalculation that they would be propelling would not be shrinking people intolerance or widening their tolerance and henceforth improve the capability of the elites to better manage the international order or to keep it stable and safe, but this status quo would be increasing misjudgment (i.e., human error). In addition, hence people cannot discard from their behavior bias, overconfidence,

denial, delusion, misperception, etc., this means that the longer the elites allow their critical thinkers and servants to be economic operators and pursuing the realization of the full development of their personality while they are preaching to people about human rights freedom, social justice, etc., the more the elites would be depending on critical thinkers and servants who are not observing the work program suggested in the UN charter or the UDHR to secure the best interests of their masters but are using their role to widen their own propensities. When servants (the weak) prioritize their natural tendencies instead of obeying the command of their masters (the fittest), servants (the weak) stop to become capable of accurately assessing situations on behalf of their masters (the fittest) and to report back objectively or without hiding incomplete or ambiguous information. The constant wars that have engulfed the world since 1948 do not support all the political and economic solutions that the elites have taken since 1945 to make people love them or to make them surrender freedom to the work program suggested in the UN Charter and the UDHR has appealed to them. Are the elites confident that their critical thinkers and servants are serving their implicit and explicit goals when there is no difference between a terrorist group being a threat to global security and rulers and political classes in UN member states refusing to observe the work program suggested in the UN Charter or the UDHR on the international order?

On the other hand, I have no way of knowing if human nature changed in the aftermath of WW2 or if technology can now help rulers and kings calculate and control damage better than humans are capable of doing it and therefore prevent saboteurs from resizing them. What I do know is that in 2019, the MV Golden Ray, a modern large cargo ship launched in 2016, capsized with all its haul off the coast of Georgia in the United States. According to some commentators, the MV Golden Ray lost its stability and capsized due to a miscalculation by its seafarer.

The elites navigate the international order in the same way seafarers navigate ships. Seafarers rely on calculations and on mechanical parts that are all designed so that when they are connected together, they could convey hauls, be they humans or live cargo, from one point to another. During the journey, each mechanical device or instrument

stays doing what it was employed for or to serve and does not try to fulfill the part that its neighbor is fulfilling.

Many questions beg answers. For one, can the elites avoid losing control of the international in the same way the seafarer of the MV Golden Ray lost control of the ship when they miscalculated how to properly sync the mechanical parts of the vessel with natural conditions, knowing that in the case of those mechanical parts they all stay doing what they were built or employed to fulfill and do not try to fulfill the part that their neighbor is fulfilling, which is not something that humans are prepared to do (in the case of humans, each person believes he can play the role his neighbor is playing)? Put differently, if despite all the technological advances that the critical thinkers and servants of the elites are depending on or using to stabilize the international order and make people love them or be ready to surrender freedom to the laws (standards or norms) that they are constantly legitimizing and enforcing, none has managed to deter failure or avoid inadvertent escalation, can the elites reduce the hidden, incomplete, ambiguous, or biased relations that their critical thinkers and servants are stirring around the world so they could come up with an accurate assessment, thus reducing miscalculations?

Once again, I have no way of knowing how the elites are concluding that letting their critical thinkers and servants continue to adopt policies that extend this state of spinning of the international order out of control as the constant wars that have engulfed the world in the last seventy-five years could be happening to this order, and to let the technological advances that are constantly being developed accelerate this spinning is a strategy that is helping them to keep their dominant control intact. What I do know is that as of 1945, people are increasingly refusing to observe the political order enforced or to develop meaningful relations, and a large number are preoccupied with what their neighbor is doing rather than observing the provisions included in the UN Charter and the UDHR as I said before. Accordingly, the question that begs answers is: how are the elites concluding that letting their critical thinkers and servants adopt policies that keep people in the “state of the ship” always divided and the stability of their emotions constantly changing from highs to lows in the same way roller coasters or waves alternate the stability of vessels is helping them to preserve their dominant role, and not

preparing them to confront situations that happen when someone quickly tries to kick a stool out from under a person sitting on one already and the comfort that the sitting person was enjoying quickly disappears?

Put differently, how can we be sure that all the dynamisms, errors, miscalculations, wrong policies, etc. that the elites are granting rights to their critical thinkers and servants to effect in the lives of people, including the right to regard themselves exempt from observing the standards and norms suggested in the UN Charter and the UDHR, are not changing the international order in the same way rusted surfaces form and look. The physical appearance of rusted surfaces disguises the magnitude of the damage that exists under the visible surface. However, when a person touches a rusted surface, it breaks apart (crumbles) like a flaky substance. That is to say, how do we know that if the elites continue to let people stay divided or let the state of the international order deteriorate, and when they decide to take matters into their own hands, it will be too late?

History shows that when people around the world become confounded and start to no longer understand each other or to speak the same language, it is not possible for the fittest to avoid that disregard and contempt resize him. This also means that when nothing that the critical thinkers and servants of the elites propose to do would be impossible for them, the wealth, status, and power of the elites would be shrinking, and when the critical thinkers and servants speak the same language or understand each other (i.e., observe the UN Charter and the UDHR), the elites chances of preserving their power and avoiding becoming reverted to a simpler form easily grow.

Evidently, the reason why the fittest has always assumed that he was the measure of all things is mainly due to his ability to weave his power, wealth, and status into the institutions that control religion or money. In other words, the fittest believe that even if the political order collapses, the idea of God or people's reliance on accepting to use money as a medium of exchange would not stop, and therefore, his controlling power (or the controlling power of his successors over those two mediums or institutions) would not shrink or go nowhere as well. This conviction is not true because history has shown that only

the children of the parents stayed together in groups, but then the children of their children and so forth formed or belonged to different groups, hence the reliance of the fittest on distinctions such as religion, sex, nationality, etc. as a tool to make the weak stay in groups with him. In addition, history has shown that whenever people's distrust in a given religion or political order swelled, the fittest failed to make the people who are staying in group with him not change their allegiance as well.

Hence what sustain the conservation of the power, wealth or status of the elites is mainly the tolerance that people exhibit either due to fear or disinterest in the excuses that critical thinkers and servants are constantly giving to justify why they are not observing the UN Charter and the UDHR or why they are unable to reduce the gap between the rich and the poor, this means that for as long as the elites lets that nothing that their critical thinkers and servants propose to do would be impossible for them, the more people's adaptability with the aimless political and economic methods which the elites are depending on to rejuvenate their power would be getting entrenched in their mind or behavior.

In biology, adaptation has three related meanings. "Firstly, it is the dynamic evolutionary process of natural selection that fits organisms to their environment, enhancing their evolutionary fitness. Secondly, it is a state reached by the population during that process. Thirdly, it is a phenotypic trait or adaptive trait (i.e., character state), with a functional role in each individual organism, that is maintained and has evolved through natural selection."

People dominate, subjugate, and exploit each other by conquering each other's minds. The way people conquer each other's minds happens through telling each other things that are true and then luring each other into believing that they are really working to secure the goals in question, when in reality they are working to create ordered hierarchical relations.

When people rely on excuses, deceit, cunning, betrayal, etc. to get their way despite the resistance of others, the dynamic that such conduct creates induces an adaptive trait (i.e., character state) that can

affect the entire population and even affect the evolution or interaction of people in their own habitat or environment. When people begin to adapt or become acclimatized with excuses, dirty tricks, discord, cunning, betrayal, slander, etc., then distrust gives rise to self-help. Self-help gives rise to individualism. Individualism gives rise to envy. When people start to slander, ruin the reputation of each other, and envy, they covet. Till today, no king managed to avoid having his servants (rulers, political class, judges, law enforcement agents, citizens) destroy his wealth, power, and status when his servers started to covet (employ dirty tricks, discord, cunning, betrayal, etc.) either directly against him or against each other. In other words, when the servants (rulers, political class, judges, law enforcement agents, citizens) of the king began to distort the truth to preserve their own power, status, or wealth instead of the power of their masters.

In a race, all the athletes who are participating have one goal in mind. This goal is to overtake the athlete who is in the lead. Many questions beg answers. For one, how are the elites (the families/dynasties that control the international order and the money supply of the world) concluding that it would be possible for them to conquer the minds of their servants (rulers, political class, judges, law enforcement agents, citizens) when the more they become acclimatized with corruption, dirty tricks, discord, cunning, betrayal, etc., the more this adaptive process would be making them more determined to defeat them?

To give an example, in 2022, Russia invaded Ukraine under the pretext of the military operation it launched, which was intended to accomplish a number of goals, including countering the expansion of NATO into territories that Russia claimed could destabilize the balance of power that exists between its territories and this international organization or the nations that use NATO's stated objectives to get their way despite the resistance of others. Despite all the efforts that NATO, the United States, and the western European monarchs and republics exhausted to conquer people's minds around the world and convince them that what Russia was doing was wrong, most people have not been influenced by the psychological tactics that NATO, the United States, and the western European monarchs and republics employed to manipulate them into believing that what Russia was doing in Ukraine was wrong (i.e., that Putin is foolish). This

conduct is totally contradictory to the behavior that people around the world manifested after the Sept. 11, 2001, attacks. The United States and the western European monarchs and republics managed to build compassion after the Sept. 11, 2001, attacks or in the weeks leading up to their invasion of Iraq and Afghanistan at the start of the 21st century that Saddam Hussein and the Taliban in Afghanistan were humanity's number one enemies, including making people around the world not mind that the UN Charter be violated or force be used to remove the people who were controlling the regime in those two UN member states from power. Twenty years later, the majority of the people are considering this latest flagrant violation of the UN charter by Russia in Ukraine as business as usual.

No one knows if the rationale that the United States and the western European monarchs and republics gave to their citizens and to people around the world to support that the people who were controlling the regime in Iraq and Afghanistan were working to destroy humanity (i.e., those two countries had links to the Sept. 11 attacks or to producing weapons of mass destruction), and the subsequent discovery of such claims, which on their premise the use of force was justified as being totally false, is playing a role in people's unpreparedness to regard Russia's invasion of Ukraine as wrong. But if the moral lesson that was suggested in The Boy Who Cried Wolf fable of Aesop's fables about the relationship between making false claims and the subsequent threat of not being taken seriously when speaking the truth or when danger looms is true, then the elites could find themselves alone and with nobody wanting to come to their aid, just as the United States and the western European monarchs and republics are finding themselves alone and nobody wanting to come to their aid to help them defeat Russia after this country bluntly violated the UN Charter. This is very serious and worrisome. This is because if people are a species that can wise up when their knowledge and awareness around them grow and not let themselves be tricked a second time, as the moral lesson that is suggested in The Cat and the Old Rat of Aesop's fables depict, then the elites could confront serious threats in their ongoing efforts to make people stay in group with them if the plans that their critical thinkers and servants are devising to make people surrender a portion of their freedom to them are not reducing

economic inequality or delivering on the promises they constantly make about how their efforts are reducing fear and want.

Nonetheless, if people are not fearing the impact of this proxy war that Russia and the United States and the western European monarchs and republics are using in it the Ukrainian territories as a legitimate military target and the United States and the western European monarchs and republics are using the Ukrainian people as soldiers escalating to a level which would necessitate the use of weapons of mass destruction to end it, or the implications of such development spiraling into a full fledged nuclear exchange, this then means that either people are not regarding that the physical destruction and mental or emotional pains that would ensue would affect them, or people stopped to regard the notion of fairness, justice, and interdependence important to rejuvenate their power.

The elites invited people around the world in the aftermath of WW2 to unite with them in order to make it easier for them to make people ready to lay their own life to protect them or protect their ideas, and not to reinforce their own ideas. If people are not moved by the pains that the Ukrainian people are suffering as of February 2022, when Russia invaded Ukraine, this means that either patience, wisdom, kindness, perseverance, warmth, and resolve stopped to mean lots of things to people around the world, or the distress or double standards that the critical thinkers and servants of the elites made people endure as of 1948 caused the emotional response of people or spirits to ache from compassion to compassion fatigue.

If people are regarding that identifying with other people is no longer an essential process for human beings to minimize violence and cruelty or improve kindness and forgiveness, there is a good chance that people around the world will not be interested in defending the elites if a potential threat is to confront them or their heirs. Put differently, if the political, economic, and social structures that the elites have been creating since 1945 to uphold universal moral principles, such as human rights or social justice, are not helping people to improve compassion or sympathy but instead are fatiguing or burning out people, then people would not be able to understand and share each other's feelings, which is a precursor to staying together or letting one person in the group have more powers than others.

The Chariot Allegory of Plato, which appears in the Phaedrus (composed around 370 BC), is a discussion that revolves around the nature of the human soul and the art of rhetoric and how it should be practiced. Plato compared the human soul to a chariot that drives a pair of horses. One horse represents the soul's rational or moral impulses, and the other is the opposite. That is to say, the soul's irrational passions, emotions, appetites, and concupiscent nature. At the end of WW2, the elites invited charioteers (i.e., critical thinkers and servants) to help them with the task of keeping balance between the two horses that reside in human nature. The constant wars that have engulfed the world as of 1945 are a result of the elites and their charioteers letting the horses that guide irrational passions and appetites in their human nature do the lion share of the driving since this date. The compassion fatigue that people are manifesting as of the start of the Ukrainian-Russian War in early 2022 is evidence of people's lack of enthusiasm to identify with other people, including regarding the fact that suffering is individual and unique. Many questions beg answers. For one, can the elites manage to steer the emotions of people toward becoming interested in staying with them and to letting them have more powers than others after they allowed the impulses of their charioteers (i.e., critical thinkers and servants) to direct the entire chariot/soul of people to prioritize irrational passions and appetites instead of supplying positive vibes that guide the soul to truth? In other words, can the elites prevent their collapse after they permit that their charioteers (i.e., critical thinkers and servants) make the two horses that reside in human nature (i.e., good and evil) become unbalanced, each one appearing to be pulling differently instead of pulling in the same direction?

Once again, I have no way of knowing if the decision of the elites to let their critical thinkers and servants make people around the world lose compassion and sympathy as the apathetic reaction of people as of 2022 with the ongoing Ukrainian-Russian War is making it much easier for them (the elites) to make people want to stay in group with them and to let them have more powers than others, or if the spiritless attitude that people are exhibiting is turning them (people) away from them (the elites) as Jesus suggested happens when people turn away from faith. According to Jesus, when people start to turn away from

faith, hate and betrayal rise. In addition, Jesus states that many false prophets will appear and deceive many people when betrayal and hatred rise. Accordingly, the increase in wickedness, makes the love of most grow cold. [Matthew 24:10-12]

Indeed, the decision of the elites to be devoted to mass produce as of 1945 false teachers (i.e., continuously create new units of authorities, bodies, and institutions that its officials refuse to practice what it is that they are preaching as the constant wars that have struck the world support) means one of two things. The first is that the elites believe that the new units of authorities, bodies, and institutions that they are continuously creating to posit and enforce standards and norms, but without their officials practicing what they are preaching, they are not misguiding them and setting them up to endure, in the course of time and things, negative consequences, whose burdens could revert them to a simpler form. The second is if the elites believe that the stories that are suggested in biblical and philosophical books about the punishment that came on the people from where they did not perceive it when they prioritized irrational passions and appetites over wisdom, courage, justice, and goodness are legends.

I have no way of knowing which scenario between the aforementioned two could be persuading the elites into perceiving that orienting the emotions of their critical thinkers and servants toward regarding themselves exempt from observing the work program suggested in the UN Charter is better to rejuvenate their power than orienting those helpers to lead by example, so people have no reason to distrust them. What I do know is that no society, business, kingdom, or empire reaped any eternal reward when its executive, ruler, or king allowed heuristics or the emotions of their critical thinkers and servants to be used to weigh risks, drive change critical to conserve power, or create ordered relations while integrating elements of fear, force, uncertainty, etc. in the process. And so if throughout history people have shown that the pain of feeling deceived or the negative psychological impact of losing something is much more important than gaining something valuable or getting treated justly, how are the elites concluding that letting people learn that their critical thinkers and servants are not practicing what they are preaching can conserve their power better and not accelerate the opposite when no society, business, kingdom, or

empire managed to survive or gain when its executive, ruler, or king allowed their critical thinkers and servants to rely on confusion and disregard to protect them instead of on truth?

I have no way of knowing if heuristics give rise to cognitive bias, loss aversion, or mental shortcuts that make people prioritize irrational decisions or factors that increase uncertainty and ambiguity instead of increasing careful analysis. What I do know is that religion (philosophy) and science (mathematics) appear to be two problem-solving techniques that people depend on to make the weakest consider the opinion of the fittest, which are both rational and anti-rational at the same time. In other words, religion (philosophy) and science (mathematics) appear to be two concepts that describe two opposite but interconnected forces that it is not possible to prove wrong, just as it is not possible to prove that the Yin and Yang in Chinese philosophy are not interconnected or are wrong. If all the solutions to the questions that people posed and used religion (philosophy) and science (mathematics) to interpret through their power possibilities have failed until now to make the weakest consider the opinion of the fittest before taking action of their own, how are the elites concluding that the choices that their critical thinkers and servants are taking to rejuvenate their power would produce outcomes that would be different when we already know that all the decisions that we make besides truth are based on trial and error?

Put differently, if as of the date the fittest began to alter the truth and to appoint priests to make it easier to make the weak consider their opinion before taking action of their own till when the fittest appointed himself as the head of the church (just as the King in Great Britain is the head of the church of England) none of the solutions picked made the weak surrender freedom to the fittest voluntarily, how are the elites concluding that letting their critical thinkers and servants regard themselves exempt from observing the work program suggested in the UN Charter and the UDHR, would produce outcomes that would be any different from the state of affairs that they (the elites) reaped since 1945, and throughout history such a state served as a precursor to the collapse of the individuals involved? Likewise, the same can be said in as far as how the power, wealth, and status of the fittest changed from the date when the fittest began to rely on his bear hands or tools such

as knives to kill a person to when people began using science to produce weapons of mass destruction. For example, the possession of some industrialized nations of weapons of mass destruction in modern history did not deter the societies that lack access to such weapons from challenging the nations that possess such weapons or from considering their opinions before taking actions of their own.

If the reason for the failure of the elites to improve peace and security as of 1945 is because they are stumbling as of 1945 upon the same conjunction fallacies that prevented their predecessors to create meaningful ordered relations leading to WW2, this means that the more the elites fail to let risks weigh less than what is at stake if more people around the world distrust them, the more people's dispositions to regard the international rule-based order on which the elites began to depend on its principles to rejuvenate their power ineffective would be growing. As people's belief in the capacity of the international rule-based order on which the elites began to depend on its principles to rejuvenate their power starts to shrink, their search for new political views that could increase their happiness would be growing.

However, since everything appears to be relative, there is no difference between killing a person with a knife or a modern gun that directs energy, such as a laser, to kill. Those two means produce the same outcome. Likewise, there is no difference between believing that Zoroaster was the son of God and not Jesus, or vice versa. This is because those two individuals lived and taught the same metaphysical aspects of the world, including the importance of organizing relations based on absolute truth. That is also to say, if God chooses to have another son or prophet launch a new ministry, this new person would not be teaching anything that the founding fathers of the UN did not suggest already. Therefore, the more people's search for political views that could increase their happiness grows, the more their involvement in debates and in gathering followers will grow equally. When people's political motifs and methods to gather followers grow, this means that their reliance on totalitarian democracy to further political purposes will also grow. When totalitarian democracy around the world grows, as the case has been in Lebanon since 1975, on a microscale, the international rule-based order on which the elites began to depend on its principles in 1945 to rejuvenate their power

will start to lose its predominant role as the only cultural and political order that governments should rely on during any decision-making process because of the number of ethical ideas that are rivaling it or trying to displace it. Accordingly, when new ideas that prioritize social utility start to increase the happiness of people better than the standards and norms that the critical thinkers or servants of the elites are legitimizing and enforcing, the international rule-based order on which the elites depend on its principles to rejuvenate their power as of 1945 will stop to be regarded as the only inner measures to improve values, moralities, ethics, etc. When the international rule-based order on which the elites depend to rejuvenate their power stops to take absolute precedence over traditional values and articles of faith and becomes countered by many political and religious movements or organizations that are all vying and debating as Jesus was doing with fellow Jews on how to best follow God or gather followers, there is no guarantee that the elites will not be resized, as the families/dynasties that were controlling the Roman Empire were resized when they allowed their critical thinkers and servants to let Christianity be used as a tool to rejuvenate their power instead of a movement to improve absolute truth.

Many questions beg answers. For one, how are the elites concluding that their wealth and military superiority could prevent their collapse and resizing just as happened to Cyrus the Great, Pharaoh, Augustus Caesar, etc. when we already know that the collapse of those powerful kings was not due to the political and educational thought that was competing with their empirical ideas reverting them to a simpler form, but the real reason is due to those kings being their own worse enemies? In other words, those powerful kings chose to not do the right thing at the right time and allowed their critical thinkers and servants (i.e., rulers, political class, judges, and law enforcement agents) to destroy the compassion of people in their realm to the point of making them unprepared to respond to hate, greed, and violence. When those powerful kings decided to make the right choices to defeat and overcome all their adversaries, it was unfortunately too late. The obstacles were much bigger than the power of the words those kings were depending on to convince their servants (i.e., rulers, political class, judges, law enforcement agents) to surrender freedom to them or the weapons that they were counting on its superiority to protect them.

In retrospect, hence this abnormal rise in intolerance that swept the world in recent years, it is due in theory to the elites refusing to control their emotions and doing the right thing, and not necessarily to how their critical thinkers and servants (i.e., financial institutions, rulers, political class, judges, law enforcement agents) are letting their emotions control them, then the more the elites prioritize processes, structures, and mechanisms that influence the control and direction of the international order, the more people's compliance with the standards and norms that the elites believe are capable to rejuvenate their power would be shrinking. This is because only a few people have been able to monitor their own adherence to legal or ethical standards since the day mankind began to rely on mechanisms to improve ethical behavior. Most governments and businesses eliminate the appearance of unethical behavior rather than the behavior itself.

If governments and businesses keep ethical breaches hidden due to the impact that exposing the breach can have on the personal interests of the individuals or entities who are committing violations, then the more elites let their critical thinkers and servants set up structures that influence the control and direction of the international order, the more the number of people who would be finding themselves occupying two social roles simultaneously, which generate opposing benefits or loyalties, would be growing. For example, the United Nations is both an economic operator and a global platform that is building and maintaining post-conflict peace and stability.

In antiquity, the families/dynasties that were controlling the Roman Empire allowed the Christian movement to grow and to let its popularity or incentives overlay on political considerations for heavenly reward. The families/dynasties that were controlling the Roman Empire thought that Christianity could be a safe means to help them conserve their power, but history shows that this was not the case. Many questions beg answers. For one, how are the elites concluding that letting their critical thinkers and servants become economic operators and at the same time be responsible for eliminating unethical behavior is not setting them up to face the same fate that the families/dynasties that were controlling the Roman Empire endured when they refused to let the truth supersede or control

their emotions, or that financial gain does not influence their ethical responsibilities?

Then again, the question that begs answers is: why are the elites taking all the excuses that their critical thinkers and servants are giving to justify why they are not observing the work program that was suggested in the UN Charter and the UDHR lightly and with an open heart when they (the elites) know very well that their apathy or unwillingness to react can have drastic negative consequences on their ability to continue to get their ways despite the resistance of others? Said differently, humans know how to say no, and they do it all the time when they are raising their children. Why do the elites know to tell their children no when they see them doing something wrong but refuse to stop their critical thinkers and servants from regarding themselves exempt from observing the work program that was suggested in the UN Charter and the UDHR when they know that their apathy is not helping them to rejuvenate their power but is damaging and weakening it terribly instead?

In my opinion, two reasons could be propelling the elites into regarding the excuses that their critical thinkers and servants regularly give to justify why they are not observing the work program that was suggested in the UN Charter and the UDHR as not posing any serious threats to the continuity of their power, wealth, and status. The first is if the elites believe that the advances that were made in technology in recent years can now help them to decide better who they want to be put to death, spared, humbled, or promoted, including controlling how any one of us would react toward any decision they take better than the case was for them before 1945. The second is if the elites stopped to regard their wealth, power, and status as important to them.

I have no way of knowing which scenario between the aforementioned two could be propelling the elites into perceiving that whoever controls the past or the present could also control the future. What I do know is that there are two ways to control people's actions or reactions. The first is through deceit, force, truth, and so on. The second is through adopting the same strategy that God employed when the Israelites in antiquity refused to observe the laws that he gave to Moses to keep his dominant role over them after he decided to deliver

them from Egyptian bondage into a land “flowing with milk and honey [Exodus 3:8]. According to the Bible, God devoured the people who were refusing to observe the laws that he gave to Moses to keep his dominant role over them by making them wander until the unbelieving generation died off. [Numbers 14:34] That is to say, the elites could count on the elements of time to help them wipe out this existing generation that has been refusing to observe the work program suggested in the UN Charter and the UDHR, in the hope of the time that they would be gaining or the new policies (standards and norms) that they would be introducing making the children of this current generation be ready to surrender more freedom to them in exchange for protection of their remaining rights or maintenance of the social order.

Once again, I have no way of knowing which scenario between the aforementioned two could be propelling the elites into regarding the excuses that their critical thinkers and servants are regularly giving to justify why they are not observing the work program that was suggested in the UN Charter and the UDHR not posing serious threats to the continuity of their power, wealth, and status. What I do know is that the Bible reports that after that whole generation, which was refusing to observe the laws that God gave to Moses, had been gathered to their ancestors, the new generation, who grew up and who knew neither the Lord nor what he had done for Israel, continued to forsake the laws that Moses claimed God suggested to him and to the Israelites to observe to avoid becoming resized and raiders plundering them even after they reached the promised land. In fact, the Bible states that it was God who guided the children of the Israelites, whose fathers died in the wilderness and were denied the right to enter the land God promised to take their fathers to it and swore with an uplifted hand to make their home. [Numbers 14:30] And so if according to the Bible it was God who helped the Israelites to restore friendly relations (end their disputes over who could make the weakest consider the opinion of the fittest before taking action on his own), how are the elites concluding that they would be capable to stabilize the international order (make people around the world be ready to stay in group with them or to let them have more powers than others), when the reconciliation which the Israelites achieved thus permitting them to continue to go on with their plan to take possession of the land that

God was taking them to it from Egypt was not an outcome which they arrived at securing thanks to their own efforts but was the result of the efforts that God, i.e., a third party, exhausted to secure this endeavor? In other words, had it not been for God interfering in the anarchy that was waging between the Israelites, perhaps the descendants of those people would have been to this day still wandering and would not have taken possession of the land that God was taking them to from Egypt to live in? And so if there is no guarantee that God could interfere to help mankind start to behave wise, and specifically the elites to secure the goals that the founding fathers of the UN laid out in the UN Charter and the UDHR to avoid becoming resized, how are the elites concluding that it would be possible for them to keep their dominant role intact, thus regarding all the disregard that their critical thinkers and servants propelling in the international order immaterial not having any bearing on the continuity of their power, wealth, and status?

To give an example, the Lebanese have been wandering since 1975 (the year when the Lebanese Civil War broke out), just as the twelve Israelites families who were on their way to the promised land from Egypt were wandering in antiquity till God meddled in their relations, thus making it possible for them to be able to speak the same language and consequently be capable of understanding each other afterwards. The families/dynasties that control the Lebanese people refuse to let the hatred that each group upholds toward the other in their hearts shrink, so it could become possible for them to stabilize the political order in the country. As a result, the longer the families/dynasties that control the Lebanese people refuse to cooperate in accordance with the principles suggested in the constitution of this country or the UN Charter / UDHR and count on letting the existing generation gather to its ancestors as God did when he was taking the Israelites out of Egypt to take possession of new land, the more this strategy does not appear to beget newborns (new people) who are loving them or who are prepared to stay with them and to let them have more powers than others. If the longer the families/dynasties that control the Lebanese people refuse to cooperate in accordance with the principles suggested in the constitution of this country or the UN Charter / UDHR, the newborns (new people) who are emerging are defying them, grumbling against them, rebelling against them, and talking about

stoning them, then there is a good chance that the instability that the international order is increasingly knowing as of 1945 could be subjecting the elites to similar challenges. If the families/dynasties that control Lebanon continue to fail to make citizens surrender freedom to them, they will need to pick between two scenarios to keep their dominant role. The first is to prioritize truth, which means making concessions. The second is to engulf Lebanon in a new civil war so the victor creates a new balance. There is no guarantee that the fittest today will be the victor if the country spirals into a civil war.

If the Lebanese people continue to treat the families/dynasties that control Lebanon with the same contempt that the Israelites were manifesting when they were on their way from Egypt to the promised land, and God or the elites do not come to their aid and help them figure out a way to control the people and to make them surrender freedom to them, then the choices that the families/dynasties that control Lebanon have to keep their dominant role could boil down to two options. The first is to rely on force or an elimination methods to eliminate the weakest. The second is to parcel the country into several geographical territories that each one of the families/dynasties that control Lebanon exercises power over. Under either case, there is no guarantee that the families/dynasties that control Lebanon could stabilize the country because the people who would be forming different groups would not be observing the same rules or ordinances that they would be legitimizing.

If for as long as the Lebanese refuse to observe the rules or ordinances that they are legitimizing, it would not be possible for them to stop the political and economic dynamism that they are knowing from keeping their power or making people be ready to voluntarily surrender freedom to them, how are the elites concluding that it would be possible for them to keep their dominant role after they divided the world into distinct geographical boundaries and allowed each group within each category to be ordained by different laws, rules, or regulations? That is to say, if the elites believe that they could let their critical thinkers and servants be economic operators and count on the readiness of people to surrender to them or to love them at the same time, then either the elites believe that their wealth and military superiority (i.e., technology) could preserve their power wealth and

status, or the elites believe that their power can now override the human mind and not just the human body?

Be that as it may, it looks as if the elites need to ensure that their critical thinkers and servants come up with better methods to control people's sentiments if they want to continue to get their way despite the resistance of others. That is to say, if the elites want to continue to search for a better work program to put the world together than the plan that the founding fathers of the UN suggested in the UN Charter / UDHR, or the plan that the natural world (or God) designed, they (the elites) would need to put a stop (i.e., an end) to this blame game or arrogance that their critical thinkers and servants are always depending on to justify why the strategies that they are adopting are not producing the results anticipated or why they refusing to practice why they are preaching. This also means that the longer the elites wait to stop their critical thinkers and servants from regarding themselves exempt from observing the work program suggested in the UN Charter and the UDHR, or to accelerate death rates (wars, famine, epidemics) to reduce desires, the longer the duration in which the elites would be administering in it the international order under a context whereby they are in it a hostage of their own emotions. The longer the elites stretch (i.e., prolong) the duration in which the international order is in it being taken as a hostage of their emotions, the harder it would be getting for them (the elites) to know how to decide between what is right and what is wrong. The more the elites become confused and unable to pick between what is right and what is wrong, the more their critical thinkers and servants would be perceiving them (the elites) to be weak. The more the critical thinkers and servants perceive the elites to be weak, the more the rumors that those helpers would be spreading about the elites managing to stabilize the international order anytime soon would be making the number of people who would be perceiving that this view is true would also be reciprocally growing. The more the number of people who would be losing confidence in the political order that the elites are adopting being capable of stabilizing the international order grow, the harder things would be getting for the elites to rejuvenate their power from the political order that they are legitimizing and enforcing. The more the elites look for new legal and natural rights that can preserve their power, the more their adversaries will be trying to take advantage of the ongoing confusion and

disregard by conquering people's minds and convincing them that they are more apt to stabilize the international order.

If the adversaries of the elites manage to make the critical thinkers and servants who they are involved with them in a close web of allies and alliance to trust them and to be ready to lay their own lives as martyr's or soldiers do to protect them, then those rivaling factions would not be stumbling on the same challenges that the United States and the western European monarchs and republics are stumbling upon to find enough people who are ready to trust them to defeat Russia after the political dismay that those aforementioned countries created in Iraq and Afghanistan, when they supposed that they can ransack two countries and people around the world would still be trusting them or hailing them as heroes.

If the number of people who are not finding the policies that the critical thinkers and servants of the elites are picking is increasing their happiness as per the way they hope, then the number of people who would be ready to lay their own lives as martyrs or soldiers do to protect them would shrink. When the number of people who are not ready to lay their own lives as martyrs or soldiers do to protect them shrinks, this means that the number of people who are plotting to defeat them (the elites) is growing. When the number of people who are plotting to defeat the elites grows, it will not be possible for them (the elites) to continue to convince people to stay with them and to let them have more powers than others in the group. When people stop to consider that the elites are the right individuals to play the role of the deputy of God on earth, then it would not be possible to stop that the world become divided between those who would be in favor of the international order being ruled by liberal principles, and those who would be in favor of the world being ruled based on illiberal principles. Throughout history, when societies became divided between those who were in favor of having their social order ruled by liberal principles and those who were in favor of having their social order ruled based on illiberal principles, this gridlock never ended without the fittest making a compromise to keep his power or becoming ultimately resized.

The old powers (i.e., the founding fathers of the UN) succeeded in uniting all the people of the world at the end of WW2. In addition, their successors (i.e., their children or the elites) were not inheriting control of the international order and the money supply of the world only from them but the readiness of all the people of the world to place at their disposal their structures and architectures to secure the UN goals. Most importantly, just as God asked Adam and Eve to be the stewards over everything that He (God) has made but on condition of not eating from the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, the old powers asked their successors (the elites) to be the stewards over the international order and the money supply of the world but on condition of observing the work program suggested in the UN Charter and the UDHR to keep their dominant role. In other words, the old powers (the founding fathers of the UN) did not counsel their heirs (the elites) to increase the role of government in the world in the aftermath of WW2 but to decrease it. That is to say, the founding fathers of the UN (i.e., the old powers) knew that governments are the obstacles to peace and security in the world and not the intermediary or the mean. Likewise, the founding fathers of the UN did not counsel their heirs (the elites) to let large financial institutions own and control the means of production when conditions to make governments own such assets or goods is not an option. Likewise, the old powers (the founding fathers of the UN) did not counsel the elites to let non-state actors and international institutions compete with government and financial institutions. The old powers (the founding fathers of the UN) counselled the elites to let people in UN member states own the means of production and did not counsel them to let their critical thinkers and servants (i.e., governments, financial institutions, etc.) be its rightful owners. That is to say, the founding fathers of the UN counselled the elites to let their critical thinkers and servants (i.e., governments, financial institutions, etc.) defend the principles and institutions of democracy and open societies and not to own them or to own its means of production. Most importantly, the old powers (founding fathers of the UN) counselled their heirs (the elites) to let people in UN member states cultivate a culture that its members would be prepared to cooperate in accordance with the UN Charter and the UDHR, and not to cultivate a culture based on might makes right, as the case has been since 1945. And so, can the elites prevent their collapse after they have disobeyed every

rule that their fathers (the founding fathers of the UN) counselled them to observe to keep their dominant role in the aftermath of WW2 intact?

In fact, since it is not possible to expect that the elites succeed at creating any type (or form) of ordered relations in the future (i.e., for as long as they permit their critical thinkers and servants regard themselves exempt from observing the work program suggested in the UN Charter and the UDHR, and keep those helpers devoted to re-saying what the founding fathers of the UN already said and sought but differently), then the longer the elites extend this existing disordered global order (i.e., hanged parliaments, division, blame game, wars, etc.), the more the social fabric of our different societies with all its elements (individuals involved) and institutions would be losing consistency and would be transformed into becoming a complex order like a shuffled deck of cards, or water that becomes turbid.

3

When the mind goes mad and corrupt the land

Gautam Buddha suggested that there are three things that cannot be long hidden: the sun, the moon, and the truth. I have no way of knowing if the unpreparedness of the elites to stop their critical thinkers and servants from spreading corruption and disregard in the land after their fathers (the old powers) succeeded at uniting all the people and arranging to make them be ready to stay with them and to let them have greater say than others is because they believe that technology (computers, artificial intelligence) could ultimately overpower truth, or if this apathy is because they do not believe that there is a natural force that has the power to hold back their reins. What I do know is that in the 4th century BC, Euclid, a Greek mathematician and logician, suggested a handful of statements (axioms) that, perhaps, without them, the world could have been totally different today. Euclid observed that two parallel lines do not meet. Most importantly, Euclid suggested that “for any given point not on a given line, there is exactly one line through the point that does not meet the given line.”

It looks as if all the conflicts and wars that the world knew before Euclid made this aforementioned statement and all the conflicts and wars that the world knew from the date when Euclid made this statement in question to the present day occurred because mankind (the fittest) was trying to prove Euclid wrong. That is to say, mankind (the fittest) is trying to prove that it is possible to find another line that would be parallel to the original line.

I have no way of knowing if the elites, Joe Biden, or all the rulers and kings in the world today, with all their critical thinkers and servants, are capable of disproving Euclid's statements, so it would be possible for them to put the world (i.e., reorder people) in any different shape or form than the shape (architecture) or form (structure) that their correct but wrongfully enforced policies (standards and norms) have produced so far. What I do know is that this statement has caused mathematicians, physicists, and chemists lots of confusion since Euclid suggested it in the 4th century, and until today, the majority ignores it and goes around it. And so if since the date mankind began to rely on the brain (human ingenuity) to disprove Euclid's axiom no person managed to disprove his statement or work his way around it, can the elites, Joe Biden, or all the rulers and kings in the world today with all their critical thinkers and servants "put the world together" when it is the political and economic decisions that each one of those executives has taken since the date he (she) was appointed in his (her) role is the principal reason why "the world is not together today"?

Said differently, there is only one way to put the world together. This way is to observe the truth included in the Mosaic Laws (i.e., standards and norms), the Confucius laws, Buddhist laws, Christian laws, Islamic laws, the laws that are included in constitutions, and since 1945, the laws that are included in the UN Charter and the UDHR. Presently, and generally speaking, there are only two categories of people who are observing any one of those aforementioned truths. Those two categories are infants to young teens and monks who abandoned mainstream society. Actually, a good number of the people who are dying, including those who are told that they are going to die soon, are also observing the aforesaid laws (i.e., praying, not plotting wicked acts to strip their neighbor from his wealth, status, and power), but this stewardship is only because of their conditions. Everyone else (i.e., generally speaking) is rivaling, racing, and devoted to nothing else but building attachments to material things, including how to resize his neighbor. In the Dhammapada (Buddhist scripture) traditional ascribed to Gautam Buddha, it is suggested that Buddha said: "There is no fire like passion, there is no shark like hatred, there is no snare like folly, there is no torrent like greed." The constant wars that have engulfed the world as of 1945 are principally due to most rulers and political class around the world refusing to give up the

emotions that Buddha believed were the source of all evil and to replace them with observing the laws (standards and norms) that are suggested in the UN Charter and the UDHR so mankind can finally “put the world together.” And so if the elites, Joe Biden or all the rulers and kings in the world today with all their critical thinkers and servants continue to be unable to disprove Euclid’s statement (i.e., show that it is possible to find more than one line that can be parallel to the original line), then the only benefit that we can expect from the solutions that those executives who are appointing themselves responsible for the world and humanity as of 1945 are designing and implementing is nothing but extending this period of the reconciliation of the UN Charter with democracy just as the people who subscribe to the Christian (or Islamic, Jewish, Buddhist, etc.) faith started to reconcile Catholicism with democracy since 2000 years ago.

Christian ethics (or Islamic, Jewish, Buddhist, etc.) is a “virtue ethic that focuses on building moral character, and a deontological ethic that emphasizes duty.” The families/dynasties that profit from Christian ethics (or Islamic, Jewish, Buddhist, etc. ethics) have been trying since 2000 years to build or sustain their power, wealth, and status on the basis of teaching newborns (new people) to prioritize morality, cooperation, rationality, discernment, and so on, but without wanting to lead by example. So far, the families/dynasties that profit from Christian ethics (or Islamic, Jewish, Buddhist, etc. ethics) failed to groom new people who are capable of prioritizing good behaviors or good habits such as empathy, courage, fortitude, honesty, loyalty, etc. over greed, jealousy, envy, and so forth.

The ethics that are suggested in the UN Charter and the UDHR aim to build the same moral character that is suggested in religious ethics. Can the elites prepare newborns (new people) to show moral character that would be any different than the patterns that the families/dynasties that profit from Christian ethics (or Islamic, Jewish, Buddhist, etc. ethics) reaped when they appointed critical thinkers and servants to inform about how life should be lived who were not practicing what they were preaching? The Ship of State is “an ancient metaphor, famously expounded by Plato in the Republic (Book 6, 488a–489d), which likens the governance of a city-state to the command of a vessel.” Can the elites steer the “ship of State” toward the port of their

own choice when their critical thinkers and servants are on board quarreling and rivaling to determine who is fit to be the captain of the ship instead of quarreling and rivaling to repair the ship navigation system so they avoid sailing on the same course that the families/dynasties that control the different religions have been sailing on since antiquity?

Indeed, the earth has been a vast wrestling ring or stage on which people of all weight classes have been wrestling with life and each other to determine who could make the weakest consider the opinion of the fittest before taking action on their own. Throughout history, lots of charismatic and relentless leaders managed to daze people either through rhetoric or force, thus creating a state of obedience, including controlling a vast contiguous land mass. However, in my opinion, mankind managed only twice in the last two thousand years to put people's interpersonal relationships in a framework that was capable of distributing power, ethical values, support, and solidarity, etc. in a context that we could say was aiding people to thrive on equitable and reciprocal compromises. The first specific social context happened when Islam managed to show from 662 AD to 750 AD that it is possible for mankind to put distinction (race, religion, sex, color, etc.) on the side and to embrace one religion so that the values included in this single religion increase happiness or create a community (a unified culture). The second specific social context happened when the Americans managed from 1776 to 1945 to show that it is possible to reproduce the same orderly results that Islam was capable of achieving through the US Constitution experiment, which include the right to not profess any religion or belief (i.e., religious freedom).

As the above shows, the statements that are included in the Quran and the statements that are included in the US Constitution have provided evidence-based conclusions supporting that they are capable of creating a community (a unified culture) when rulers and political class practice what they preach.

It is important that readers keep in mind that the statements that are included in Judaism, Buddhism, Taoism, Christianity, etc., and the statements that are included in the UN Charter or the UDHR can create

the same community (unified culture) that Islam and the US Constitution managed to create in the intervals suggested above. The only reason why those aforementioned religions and doctrines did not create the same community (unified culture) that Islam and the US Constitution managed to create in the intervals suggested is because the people who have been controlling those religions or doctrines have not been prioritizing affiliative (positive) social interactions but agonistic (negative) interactions.

To give an example, the critical thinkers and servants who the elites are relying on for their wisdom to keep their dominant role have failed to let the provisions that are included in the UN Charter and the UDHR stand between them and their hearts since 1945. In other words, the elites refuse to accept that if they let their critical thinkers and servants dispute and practice what they do not preach, people would become discouraged with them (the elites), and they (the elites) would ultimately become weakened. Since 1945, all the deeds or results that the critical thinkers and servants of the elites achieved produced proximate outcomes and not the outcomes anticipated, just as Zeno of Elea suggested in the Dichotomy Paradox, which happens when two objects do not thrive on equitable and reciprocal compromises. And so if for as long as the elites permit their critical thinkers and servants to dispute and to practice what they do not preach (i.e., belittle the statements that Euclid, Moses, Jesus, Buddha, Confucius, Mohammad, the founding fathers of the US and last but not least the axioms that the founding fathers of the UN suggested in the UN Charter and the UDHR) it would be very difficult to suppose how they could reap a fate that would be any different from the reward that rulers and kings who were devoted to making people discontinue their faith in the ability of mankind to build the same solidarity and support that the rulers who observed the Bible, Quran, The Tripitakas, the US constitution, etc. achieved; can the elites expect any other reward when they have no way of knowing if the people who they are counting on their wisdom to protect them will not turn their back on them?

To put it differently, if we have no way of knowing if whenever a person rivals for power, wealth, or status fairly or unfairly and wins, if it is his own ingenuity that secured such a victory or another force, how are the elites concluding that granting their critical thinkers and

servants right to violate the truth included in religious and political dogmas could be of benefit to them when none of the novel ways that people tested with to get their ways despite the resistance of others produced long-lasting orderly relations for those who tested with new methods, but only relations that are temporaries? In fact, can Joe Biden, the individual who is regarded by many people as the leader of the free world, make the Americans surrender voluntarily freedom to him or to the elites in the same way that the founding fathers of the US managed to make citizens do it in antiquity, when he has been since 2020 (i.e., the year when he was elected in it president) relying on different evidential epistemologies to make citizens surrender freedom to him than the ones that are suggested in the US constitution, religious scriptures, or the UN Charter/UDHR? And so if the only volition or novel solution that Joe Biden can bring to his country or to the elites if he happens to be elected for a second term is none other than to roll his sleeves and to make his critical thinkers and servants stop to regard themselves exempt from observing the work program suggested in the US constitution or the UN Charter and the UDHR in the same way his predecessors did during the progressive era that ensued following the American Civil war, can the elites count on any one of their critical thinkers and servants putting the United States or any other UN member states on the right reformed or orderly track so peace and security improve around the world, when the person who was sensed to be doing it as of the date he was elected president in 2020, he did not find the courage to do it yet?

Many questions beg answers. The widespread disregard and division that exist between UN member states does not support the idea that the individuals who regard themselves as responsible for the world or humanity are going to be instituting a progressive era in the near future that would be focused on defeating corruption, monopolies, waste, and inefficiency, as the Americans did during the Progressive Era that followed the American Civil War. What if the new novel ways (ideas) which the elites would be permitting their critical thinkers and servants to test with to help them rejuvenate their power fail to put the world together, just as the new and novel ways (ideas) that the elites tested with when they decided to let their critical thinkers and servants deviate away from the work program suggested in the UN Charter and the UDHR failed to produce the outcomes that they expected from

1945 until now? And since we have no way of knowing if the disregard and division that exists between UN member states is weakening or strengthening the power, wealth and status of the elites, what if the challenges of contemporary society and politics fail to make people stay in favor of the elites continuing to have greater power than others? In other words, what if the military coups, which appear to be a regular occurrence in parts of Africa in recent years, plague the societies that use the principles of democracy and open societies as a tool to keep their dominant role but without practicing what they are preaching, such as the western European republics and monarchs? Can the families/dynasties that control the western European republics and “constitutional” monarchs stand up for the norms included in the UN Charter and the UDHR when coups are generally programmed to get rid of the families/dynasties that are supposedly defending the rule of law the most within any group?

Once again, I have no way of knowing what implications the constant new and novel ideas that the elites are finding the courage to let their critical thinkers and servants test with to find out if their outcome would contribute to preserving their power, wealth, and status are having on people around the world. That is to say, if those new and novel ideas are making people disillusioned with them or if they are addressing the problems caused by political corruption and by the enormous concentration of technological and industrial ownership in monopolies. What I do know is that if the elites do not start to find the courage to stop their critical thinkers and servants from refraining from surrendering freedom to them, in the same way they have been finding the courage to regard themselves exempt from observing the work program suggested in the UN Charter and the UDHR, it would not be possible for them to let the constant wars that have swept the world run their course.

When the number of people who would be conspiring to determine who could make the weakest consider the opinion of the fittest before taking action of their own grows, the number of people whose deeds would be appealing to them would be reciprocally expanding. When the number of people who believe that their own deeds are improving peace and security grows, this means that the number of false teachers who are motivating and frustrating people to make them surrender

their freedom to them will also grow. When the number of people who would be depending on corruption and disregard to settle their affairs grows, the number of people who would be putting their trust in the natural and legal rights on which the elites are depending to rejuvenate their power will also shrink. This is because the false teachers and the elites use the same truth to attract people to stay with them.

For example, the number of wars that the elites have entangled the United States in fighting since 1945 and the consequent double standards that this country was obliged to adopt to maintain its strength and stability makes it very difficult to trust its moral character or to perceive that its rulers and political class have the capacity to provide effective leadership.

In fact, if the elites continue to entangle the United States in future tit for tat games as they have been doing since 1945 instead of orienting the leaders and political class in this country to rival to determine who could be the first to surrender freedom to the principles included in the US constitution or the UN Charter and the UDHR it would not be possible for them (the elites) to bind the Americans in a social network that will interconnect their relations in the same way lattice of wires make the energy grid function as one body, but rather their interpersonal relationship could develop in the same way different candles illuminate or provide light but at the same time their heat source is melting or being consumed.

To put it differently, if the elites want the interpersonal relationships of people (societies, businesses, nations, kingdom) to be similar to the way candles in a church on a candle holder are placed and burned, it would be necessary that the elites be constantly mass producing newborns (new people) who are ready to embrace the political order or natural and legal rights they are legitimizing, and most importantly, be ready to let them have more powers than others, just as the people who live under a monarchial political order accept that one family/dynasty constantly has more powers than others or be the candle holder.

At the same time, when a candle is lit in a candle holder, there is usually a self-sustaining chain of events that needs to be naturally or by design met; otherwise, the wax (the fuel) will not combine with

oxygen in the atmosphere and form a constant flame. For example, when the wax (the fuel) in a candle melts, the liquid flows into the wick via a natural process that works in opposition to any external forces like gravity (i.e., capillary action). Most importantly, when the heat from the lit candle melts the wax (the fuel), it is the liquified wax (the fuel) that is located at the top of the mass of solid fuel that burns, not the portion of the wax or wick that is located below this top surface.

If we compare the policies (i.e., the fuel) that the elites are legitimizing as of 1945 to melt and burn people (societies, businesses, nations, kingdoms) through their provision so no person or legal entity rises above them, we find that this process is not weakening and destabilizing the maintenance of their power and security in the same way a lit candle forms a constant flame.

For example, if we take the political solutions that the elites granted right to the United States (their global policemen) to take as of the fall of the Soviet Union in the second half of the 20th century, we find that none of the solutions that this country implemented has been melting and burning people (societies, businesses, nations, kingdoms) in the same natural, simple way that a lit (ignited) candle melts and burns.

The puzzling part in the political solutions that the elites are granting rights to the United States (their global policemen) to take as of the fall of the Soviet Union in the second half of the 20th century and the disastrous outcomes that those strategies are reaping (i.e., degree of distrust) at the international order can be compared to how a poorly made candle or a lit candle who is subjected to unstable environmental conditions behave.

Many questions beg answers. First, it is not possible to suppose that the families/dynasties that control the United States (i.e., the elites) are unaware that the political decisions that the rulers and political class of this country are taking, especially since the fall of the Soviet Union, are wrong. Similarly, it is not possible to suppose that the families/dynasties that control the United States (i.e., the elites) do not know that letting the rulers and political class in this country regard themselves exempt from observing the work program suggested in the

US Constitution or the UN Charter and the UDHR does not make people around the world be ready to stay with them and to let them have more powers than others. Likewise, it is not possible to suppose that the families/dynasties that control the United States (i.e., the elites) do not know that letting the rulers and political class of this country sideline with Ukraine and giving this country weapons in its ongoing war with Russia as compared to assuming their responsibilities as leaders of the free world and putting a stop to this masquerade that has been on-going between those two UN member states since 2022 does not make people around the world want to stay with them and to let them have more powers than others. Most importantly, it is not possible to suppose that the families/dynasties that control the United States (i.e., the elites) do not know that the country that is supposed to be the city on the hill or the global policemen of the world to secure the goals set forth in the UN Charter (i.e., preserve the idea of freedom) cannot be giving openly weapons to two societies that are fighting to determine who could make the weakest consider the opinion of the fittest before taking action of their own, when the purpose of the coming together of people in the aftermath of WW2 is mainly to disarm people and nations and not to teach that access to weapons or force can increase their happiness. Why are the families/dynasties that control the United States (i.e., the elites) letting people mock the idea of freedom as of 1945 when they know very well that this unicellular idea is the only seed that can help them to continue to rejuvenate their power perpetually?

It looks as if the elites are not paying attention whatsoever to what the founding fathers of the UN (the old powers) counselled them to constantly keep in mind to avoid experiencing the same challenges their fathers endured to keep their dominant role or were obliged to make the same compromises their fathers made during WW2 to keep their dominant role. There has to be a reason or a rule that is prompting the elites to take political solutions that make people repel away from the idea of freedom instead of feeling drawn to or attracted to it.

I have no way of knowing the motives that are propelling the elites into taking political solutions that its aim is to make people consider that illiberal dogmas are perhaps a better ideal to preserve the

international order than liberal ideas. At the same time, it is not possible to suppose that the elites are letting their critical thinkers and servants abuse the idea of freedom, so people's preparedness to defend it shrinks without discounting that their harmful attitude cannot have any impact on the continuity of their strength and stability.

Once again, I have no way of knowing if this disregard and contempt of the work program suggested in the UN Charter and the UDHR by the elites as of 1945 is by design or by chance. What I do know is that in the epistle of James, it is suggested that "Anyone who listens to the word but does not do what it says is like someone who looks at his face in a mirror and, after looking at himself, goes away and immediately forgets what he looks like. But whoever looks intently into the perfect law that gives freedom and continues in it—not forgetting what they have heard but doing it—they will be blessed in what they do. [James 1: 23-25]

I have no way of knowing if the political solutions that the elites are taking as of 1945 is helping people to act like someone who looks at his face in a mirror and, after looking at himself, goes away and immediately forgets what he looks like, or if the natural and legal rights (standards and norms) that they are constantly cranking (legitimizing and enforcing) are deepening peoples conviction about the importance of defending the idea of freedom so they (the elites) do not have to experience the same challenges that their fathers (the old powers) endured to keep their dominant role, or be obliged to make compromises as their fathers (the old powers) did during WW2 to keep their dominant role. What I do know is that the political solutions that the elites started taking, especially after the fall of the Soviet Union (or the launch of the world wide web) in the second half of the 20th century, do not appear to support that the elites are still in favor of relying on unicellular ideas such as the idea of freedom, equal rights, social justice, etc. to rejuvenate their power (i.e., to make people ready to stay with them in groups) or to continue to want that the United States play the role of the city on the hill and the principal custodian of the idea of freedom during this process as well.

If the perception suggested so far in this work about how the laid-back attitude of the elites is weakening the idea of freedom and preventing

the United States from maintaining the poise that this country is supposed to constantly uphold contains any elements of truth, this means that this unorthodox and placid attitude that the elites are depending on its provisions to rejuvenate their power integrates two principal convictions. The first is that it is no longer necessary for the elites to rely on the natural instruments that the human mind is capable of manipulating to keep their dominant role or to secure the ends suggested in constitutions, or the UN Charter, and the UDHR. The second is if God is blinding the vision of the elites, and subsequently, creating this political decline that the international order is knowing in its different ranks.

As far as the second conviction is concerned, physicists do not know till today if all that exists in the universe is controlled by a natural force or if the universe came about in the manner cosmologists postulate or subsequent to a big bang. God could be meddling as he was doing in antiquity and blinding the vision of the elites because of their refusal to prioritize the work program, which the founding fathers of the UN counselled them to stay faithful to its principles or to observe to keep their dominant role.

Then again, the political decline that the United States began to know as of the start of the 21st century, when in theory this country is supposed to be serving as the culture that the elites mix in UN member states to make people around the world transform, just as a yogurt culture transforms milk into a different culture, does not support that this drop in strength or quality is due to God blinding the vision of the rulers and political class of this country, but rather to their impatience. This is because a blind man stops to become able to distinguish between what is safe and unsafe. The actions and statements that the American rulers and political class have been saying and taking since the end of WW2 do not support that their motives are programmed to serve demonic goals (i.e., reinstitute slavery, domination, etc.). For example, Joe Biden wants to run for a second term to “put the world together.” The goals that Joe Biden wants to run for a second term to secure or fix are not goals that a blind person would say, but those of a person who has lots of vision.

It is important that readers keep in mind that it is not possible to classify which specific social and political action from among all the deeds that the United States rulers and political class exhaust is contributing to preserving the provisions suggested in the UN Charter and the UDHR and which one is weakening those two documents. Furthermore, since the fall of the Soviet Union, the United States appears to have shifted its focus away from serving the idea of freedom and toward serving corporate power and extreme wealth. This apparent shift from political governance to economic governance that the United States rulers and political class are manifesting as of the fall of the Soviet Union is a polity that the families/dynasties that control the United States or the financial and military complex in the country are deciding and not the political rulers who serve those powerful families/dynasties. In this work, it is the social and political actions that US rulers and political class are taking to secure the UN goals what is being put forth, not the actions that extend neocolonialism.

In this context, hence the reason why Joe Biden wants to run to be elected president for a second term and the reason why his predecessors ran before are one and the same (i.e., to put the world together), this clears God from being involved in meddling on earth and putting obstacles and hurdles ahead of people to prevent mankind from improving peace and security. This is because if God were meddling on earth and putting obstacles ahead of mankind to secure the UN goals, he would not have been in favor of Joe Biden, for example, seeking to be reelected to secure the same end he ran for president the first time. This is because this action means that God is divided against himself, and according to Jesus, “every kingdom divided against itself is brought to desolation” [Matthew 12: 25].

Hence God does not appear to be responsible for the political decline that the United States and the rest of the UN member states are knowing as of 1945, then if demonic forces have not captured the mind of rulers and political class around the world and started to prevent them from speaking the same language, the dynamism that the world is knowing can only be due to the elites perceiving that taking away this privilege that the human mind was fulfilling in helping them to get their ways despite the resistance of others until the fall of the Soviet Union or the launch of the world wide web in the second half of

the 20th century and to hand this task to tools such as technology and artificial intelligence that they would be able to control the free will of people easily and hence appoint themselves deputy of God on earth for life.

I have no way of knowing if technology would be capable of controlling the free will of people, thus stopping people from continuing to be unprepared to surrender freedom to whoever is above them in the hierarchy. Likewise, I have no way of knowing if the on-going process of collecting and locking up all the know-how that exists in books and other sources will help the elites control the free will of people when it is over. What I do know is that, whereas most physicists agree that the universe is deterministic and measurable, quantum mechanics has been, until now, governed by total randomness. If the mind behaves in the same random way that tiny particles in quantum mechanics work, then there is a good chance that the on-going downsize of the role of the mind by the elites may not result in the arrangements that those families/dynasties are ultimately seeking if the new role that the elites want people to be devoted to fulfilling is one that is not exactly what the natural world (or God) programmed or designed for the mind to be dedicated to doing to preserve its best interests.

Likewise, I have no way of knowing if the unrecognizable and unpredictable way that people are behaving with one another in recent years is due to the decision of the elites to depend on technology more to reconfigure how people interact with the natural world and with each other or not. What I do know is that if a sailor changes his bearing by a tiny variation, this change would take him to a location that is different from his original destination. In fact, if we compare how the international order transformed after the elites decided to let their critical thinkers and servants deviate away from the seemingly logical steps that the founding fathers of the UN counselled them in 1945 to stay faithful to their principles to keep their dominant role and ensure lasting peace, we find that this political order is becoming increasingly random and unpredictable.

For example, if we rewind time to 1945, we find that all the members of the human family were onboard with the idea of cooperating to

secure the UN goals. However, after the elites decided to let their critical thinkers and servants deviate away from the seemingly logical steps that the founding fathers of the UN counselled them in 1945 to stay faithful to their principles to keep their dominant role and ensure lasting peace, we find that the international order consists of nothing but rulers and political class in different UN member states going mad and dividing themselves into groups that fight each other to determine who could make the weakest consider the opinion of the fittest before taking action on his own. This is very serious and worrisome. This is because if the elites continue to let their critical thinkers and servants play out the same conditions that their predecessors played out in the world until 1945 into the future (i.e., claiming that they are peace-makers but in reality they are spreading corruption and disregard), then the chaos that exists today could be worse in the future. This also means that there is no guarantee that the elites could continue to preserve their power, wealth, and status if they do not take steps today to make their critical thinkers and servants stop to regard themselves exempt from observing the work program suggested in constitutions, the UN Charter, and the UDHR, and therefore, could be the biggest losers in the course of time and things.

To put it differently, if the elites believe that because they control the international order and the money supply of the world, they can equally control the free will of all the people as well in the Ship of State, this conviction may not be totally true. This is because if the people who are compartmentalized in the vessel are all forming their own political order and are constantly vying with one another to determine who could be the captain of the ship, then there is no guarantee that the vessel would not sink, because ships sink from fatigue in the vessel hull and not the part that stays float.

For example, in antiquity, the teachers of the law accused Jesus of being “the chief of the demons” [Mark 3: 22] and that they were the ones who were truly guided. The teachers of the law managed to blind rulers and chiefs into believing that they were truly guided and that Jesus was corrupting the land. However, in the course of time and things, it was the families/dynasties that were controlling the Roman Empire, and their mockery of Jesus cost them dearly. If the elites continue to believe that technology or the economic solutions that their

critical thinkers and servants are proposing to them to keep their dominant role are better than the solutions the founding fathers of the UN proposed to them, then there is a good chance that their trade-off may not be as profitable as the families/dynasties that were controlling the Roman Empire later found out.

In fact, if we compare how the critical thinkers and servants of the elites in UN member states have been organizing round tables since 1945 that supposedly are designed to secure the UN goals or to make pledges to observe the principles set forth in constitutions, the UN Charter, and the UDHR, but then when they are alone, they become enemies and devoted to rivaling to find out who could make the weakest consider the opinion of the fittest before taking action on his own, we find that the behavior of the critical thinkers and servants of the elites has been totally different from the behaviors of the first followers, companions, or disciples of Moses, Buddha, Confucius, Jesus, Muhammad, etc.

For example, when Moses, Buddha, Confucius, Jesus, Muhammad, etc. were trying to get their ways despite the resistance of others, we do not find in the literature information that suggests that their first followers, companions, or disciples were fighting among each other on how power should be divided between them in the same way the critical thinkers and servants of the elites are divided into groups as of 1945 and are fighting each other to determine who could make the weakest consider the opinion of the fittest before taking action on his own.

Since 1945, the critical thinkers and servants of the elites have been preaching about righteousness, human rights, social justice, and democracy while refusing to practice what they are preaching. All the religious and philosophical books warn those who say one thing and another. For example, in the Gospel of Mark, Jesus said that if a country or family divides itself into groups that fight each other, that country will fall apart. [Mark 3:24-25] In addition, Jesus said if Satan's kingdom divides into groups, it cannot last but will fall apart and come to an end. [Mark 3:26]

The word family is defined as “a group of one or more parents and their children living together as a unit.” The word country is defined as “an area of land that forms an independent political unit with its own government.” The word kingdom is defined as a “country, state, or territory ruled by a king or queen.”

At the end of WW2, the elites (the old powers) invited people to develop friendly relations to secure common standards, which they said could reduce fear and want. In addition, the elites asked people to achieve, in cooperation with the United Nations, the promotion of universal respect for and observance of human rights and fundamental freedoms.

The United Nations is an international intergovernmental organization that the elites created to help them coordinate their work to secure UN goals (i.e., build and maintain peace and stability). Indeed, the decision of the elites to accept that membership in the UN (i.e., the General Assembly) is based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all its members (i.e., each member in this organization has one vote) affirms the determination of the families/dynasties who control this international intergovernmental organization to promote social progress and better standards of life in larger freedom.

On the other hand, if no society is observing faithfully and strictly the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations or the provisions of the UDHR and the majority of people are ungrateful and discounting the freedom and bliss that they are enjoying thanks only to the elites for ending domination in 1945, then one of two scenarios could be instigating this pointless bickering and powerlessness to exhibit self-control by most people in recent years. The first is if people’s love of money, of themselves, of pleasure, of boasting, of being abusive, disobedient, ungrateful, unforgiving, slanderous, without self-control, brutal, treacherous, rash, etc. is making them not be lovers of good. The second is if the world is reliving the same circumstances that occurred in antiquity when Moses and Aaron asked Pharaoh to let them take the Israelites out of Egypt, and Pharaoh's heart hardened and he refused to let them go.

In my opinion, the ungratefulness that people are demonstrating cannot be the motive why people are increasingly opposing the truth, because human nature has not changed from before and after WW2. I strongly believe that the dynamism that the world is experiencing as of 1945 is due to mankind relieving the same circumstances that occurred in antiquity when Moses and Aaron asked Pharaoh to let them take the Israelites out of Egypt, and Pharaoh's heart hardened and he refused to let them go.

In the book of Exodus, it is suggested that Pharaoh and the Egyptians were capable of enduring through the ten harmful plagues that Moses and Aaron put them through before the disasters, economic damages, loss of life, etc. that they started knowing at the hands of Moses and Aaron made it not worth it for them to refuse their request to leave. Most importantly, the book of Exodus states that each time Pharaoh and his critical thinkers and servants saw relief from a plague, the recovery was hardening his heart and making him unwilling to heed Moses and the Israelites. [Exodus 8:15]

There is no difference between the plea that Moses and Aaron were making to Pharaoh to improve human rights and the plea that the founding fathers of the League of Nations, or the founding fathers of the UN, made to the families/dynasties that were the principal victors during WW1 and WW2, to reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights. Likewise, there is no difference between the plagues that Moses and Aaron performed to let Pharaoh accept to let them leave with the rest of the Israelites Egypt, but then as soon as relief was assured, he (Pharaoh) and his critical thinkers and servants backed out of their promise to have them leave, and whenever the elites happen to brush with crises that could have challenged the continuity of their leading role in the world since 1945 and promised to improve human rights, but then as soon as relief was assured, they (the elites) backed out of their promise to have their critical thinkers and servants observe the principles suggested in the UN Charter and the UDHR. And so if the defiance or arrogance that the Bible states Pharaoh demonstrated each time Moses and Aaron heeded him and his critical thinkers and servants to agree to let them leave Egypt is not any different from the defiance or arrogance that the elites and their critical thinkers and servants are demonstrating when they are refusing to observe the

principles suggested in the UN Charter and the UDHR as of 1945, then the more the elites and their critical thinkers and servants manifest the same hardened behavior, the more the number of people who would be behaving ungratefully, who would be lovers of themselves, lovers of money, etc. would be growing. Likewise, the more the number of people who would be behaving like Moses and the Israelites in antiquity ungratefully and who would be lovers of themselves, lovers of money, and lovers of social justice, equal rights, freedom, etc. grows, the more the chances of the elites stumbling on the same circumstances that Pharaoh and his critical thinkers and servants tasted stand a good chance of occurring if human nature has not changed.

In the Bible, it is suggested that when the number of people who “know how to discern the face of the sky but not know how to discern the signs of the times [Matthew 16:3] or “have a form of godliness but deny its power” [2 Timothy 3:5] grows, people will oppose the truth, just as Jannes and Jambres opposed Moses in antiquity. [2Timothy 3:8].

Jannes and Jambres are magicians who were undoing the miracles and disasters that Moses was bringing against Egypt so Pharaoh could let him and his people go out of Egypt. The Bible suggests that each time the magicians, wise men, and sorcerers were undoing the miracles and disasters that Moses and Aaron were bringing against Egypt to let Pharaoh heed them, Pharaoh's heart was getting harder and refusing to let them go. [Exodus 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12] In other words, when Pharaoh and his critical thinkers and servants were reproducing the same miracles and disasters that Moses and Aaron were capable of bringing against Egypt, this power was strengthening their conviction that they were as powerful and propping them into believing that they were invincible when what was happening was the opposite. That is to say, Pharaoh and his critical thinkers and servants were multiplying their suffering and the suffering of everyone involved.

As of 1945, the elites, their critical thinkers, and their servants are perceiving that because technology can help them control and prevent consequences that can impact the continuity of their strength and stability negatively, they are safe and could prevent their resizing, just

as Pharaoh was interpreting when he was managing to find relief after a plague that danger was over.

On the other hand, I have no way of knowing if the magic that Moses and Aaron, or Pharaoh's magicians, wise men, sorcerers, etc., were performing in antiquity, such as converting a rod into a serpent, water into blood, frogs jumping from rivers into people's homes, etc., to determine who could make the weakest surrender freedom to the fittest, were transformations that could be regarded as more powerful to invoke and manipulate than the outcomes that people are capable in our modern times to conjure through science or not. What I do know is that science can make magic real, but not truth. This is because truth does not kill or destroy, but our own creativity and the instruments we create do.

For example, when a crowd gathered around Jesus in Capernaum to listen to him and to profit from his healing power, many people present, including the teachers of the law, rejected his sermons and used their creativity to derail his growing spiritual movement and popularity, including persecuting him to stop him from threatening their power, wealth, and status by going as far as accusing him of being possessed by an evil spirit. [Mark 3:22, 30]

Throughout history, any time a person lived a godly life, he was persecuted when he was winning, as the apostle Paul suggested in his second letter to Timothy [2 Timothy 3:12]. But at the same time, those who treated others unfairly went from bad to worse. The people who used empty words and treated others unfairly were deceiving and being deceived. Most importantly, in the second letter that the apostle Paul wrote to Timothy, Paul suggests to Timothy to "continue in what he has learned and has become convinced of, because you know those from whom you learned it." [2Timothy 3:14].

If the attitude that every person possesses to stand firm comes from the people who were doing the teaching, then are the elites being wise and doing the right thing when they are refusing to let their critical thinkers and servants not lead by example or say one thing and do another? In other words, if the truth is both a tool that makes people wise and equipped to do the right thing [2 Timothy 3:17], and a tool that people

depend on to get their ways despite the resistance of others, can the elites manage to make people stay with them and to let them have more power than others when their critical thinkers and servants are not observing the principles included in the UN Charter and the UDHR, which the founding fathers of the UN specifically suggested to the elites to be devoted to teaching people, giving that from those principles the elites rejuvenate their power?

Throughout history, many rulers and political class did not find the material blessing that they were gaining for being faithful to their constitutions or truth sufficient and decided to supplement what they felt was still missing in their lives to feel accomplished by keeping watch over what they needed to be doing to widen their wealth, power, and status instead of keeping watch over how to improve accountability or enhance transparency.

In the epistle to the Hebrews, it is suggested that all angels are ministering spirits sent to serve those who will inherit salvation. [Hebrews 1:14] Since the elites have been against their critical thinkers and servants being scepters of justice, as the founding fathers of the UN suggested using them as such and want them to be ministers to help them increase their wealth and keep their dominant role, it is not possible to expect that people have confidence in them (elites, critical thinkers and servants) or to submit to their authority as the poor state of peace and security in the world supports.

In the Bible, it is suggested that when leaders stop to keep watch over the truth, they will perish. The Bible says that the leaders who sell empty words and rely on deceit to get their ways despite the resistance of others will all become worn out like a garment. The truth will roll them up like a robe; like a garment, they will be changed. [Hebrews 1:11-12]

I have no way of knowing if the constant wars and the intolerance that people of all ages and sexes are increasingly showing are incidents that are helping the elites and their critical thinkers and servants to rejuvenate their power and keep their dominant role, or if the insecurity that swept the world and its outcome appear to be disrupting the world's unity and would be a burden on the elites or their heirs in

the future. What I do know is that in the Bible, it is suggested that Jesus was sitting among the crowd, and some said to him that his mother and brothers and sisters were looking for him. Jesus answered: “Who is my mother? Who are my brothers?” He looked at the people sitting around him and said, “Look! Here are my mother and my brothers! [Mark 3:31-34]

Once again, I have no way of knowing if part of the challenges that are preventing the elites and their critical thinkers and servants from getting their ways despite the resistance of others is tangled in their unpreparedness to accept others in the same way the Bible states that Jesus was capable of doing when he was told that his mother and brothers and sisters were looking for him. What I do know is that when Jesus refused to prioritize his mother and brothers and sisters over the rest of the people he was staying with, this means that Jesus refused to break or partition the whole that he was forming with them.

I have no way of knowing what Jesus was trying to avoid occurring when he refused to break or partition the whole that he was forming with the people he was staying with. What I do know is that when a whole is partitioned, this process can create transformations that could alter the quantity, structure, or form of an object, and there are lots of cases in which the partition leads to irreparable consequences.

For example, newborns (new people) are taught and told that the different types of numbers that exist in the world of math are composed of categories or sets that include fractions, decimals, and percentages, when such abstract quantities, structures, forms, etc. do not appear to carry the signature of the natural world (or God) but of mankind only. In other words, reality appears to revolve around classifications that embroil the numbers 0 and 1, or true and false, and do not express objects in fractions, decimals, and percentages.

Accordingly, since people want that there exist in the world of math lots of numbers that the natural world (or God) does not seem to have wanted that people know about them, it is not possible to avoid the complex consequences that ensue from people’s decisions to venture into their world.

For example, it looks as if after our ancestors learned to count beyond 0 and 1 and decided to take the integers that they were coming across and divide them to see what they could get, they stumbled on ratios that gave them a finite terminating representation and others that produced complex representations. If we take the number 8, for instance, and divide it by other integers, we find that only when the divisor of this dividend is the number 2, 4, or 8, does this operation give us a uniform finite distribution (i.e., with a 0 terminating sequence). However, when we take the same natural number eight (8) and divide it into the number 3, the quotient is $2\frac{2}{3} = 2.66666\dots$ (a finite number with a non-terminating and recurrent decimal). This repeating pattern of the same digit (i.e., .66666....) that results whenever the ratio of two integers is proportionally expressed and their operation does not produce a finite terminating quantity, form, or structure generates a complex phenomenon that is in opposition to any natural logical representation. The same can be said about the class of operations that do not give the same repeating pattern or integer, such as the quotient that results when the ratio of the circumference to the diameter of a circle (i.e., pi) is expressed proportionally. The non-terminating and non-recurring digits that repeat after the decimal do not respect any pattern. This is because in mathematics, a sequence is “an enumerated collection of objects in which repetitions are allowed and order matters.” When we took the number eight (8) and used the numbers 2, 4, and 8 as divisors to partition this quantity, structure, form, etc., order stopped to perceptually matter. That is to say, when the length of each element became the same length and appeared the same multiple times, the position of the object in the sequence stopped to matter perceptually as much. Put differently, if we take a whole pie of pizza and partition it into eight equal slices, the order of each slice in the pie stops to matter much, even though some slices may have more melted cheese than others or tomatoes. However, when we took the same natural number eight (8) and divided it into the number 3, the non-terminating and repeating decimal that we obtained with the quotient was complex. The answer produced a complex phenomenon that is in opposition to any natural logical representation.

In my opinion, the unending finite numbers (or recurring fragments) that get generated whenever we take whole numbers and produce from them new expressions or numbers (i.e., fractions, decimals, percents,

etc.), quantities, structures, or space is analogous to a person cutting a piece of wood with his own bare hands versus using a saw to do the cutting. When a person partitions a piece of wood with his own bare hands, this process does not generate any swarf. However, when a piece of wood is cut using a saw, this process generates debris or waste that would not have been created if the cut were done without the involvement of a tool in this process.

Accordingly, the only way to avoid this complex phenomenon that occurs whenever a quantity, structure, form, etc. is divided into factors that are other than 1 and themselves (i.e., prime numbers) or integers that produce terminating finite answers (i.e., composite numbers) is to minimize creating change that can give rise to this non-ending string. Jesus's reluctance to break the whole that he was forming with the people he was staying with could be to avoid giving rise to such non-ending strings from occurring. In other words, Jesus knew that if he would go ahead and break the whole that he was forming with the people he was staying with, that what he would be doing is assigning a bunch of zeros to the non-ending change that he was creating in the minds of those people who were listening to him, just as occurs whenever people carry mathematical manipulation that generates non-terminating repeating patterns or non-recurring digits, and then go ahead and assign a bunch of zeros to the digits they dropped, on count of such an approximation bringing to a terminating end the change they were creating, when in reality its impact goes on forever.

To give an example, the rational and logical unicellular ideas that people trickle from one generation to the next in constitutions and religious scriptures such as the Mosaic laws and depend on to make people stay or form a whole with them, and the subsequent backing away from staying faithful to the principle being thought, could be creating phenomena that work no differently than what happens whenever two integers are divided into each other and their operation generates non-determining decimals. That is to say, most people underestimate the impact of teaching people to not kill, not steal, etc., but then violating those principles and supposing that such conduct does not influence distrust that stays forever with the person just as repeating integers extend till infinity when the operation does not produce finite terminating quantities or works as in the case of

capillary action in a lit candle makes the liquified wax flow in opposition to any external force like gravity.

That is to say, when Jesus terminated the discussion he was having with the people he was staying with, he put a bunch of zeros on how his statements were impacting the people who were listening to him, but he did not put an end to how the impact of his statements was affecting the people who listened to what he had to say. As far as those people who were in the audience are concerned, the ideas he influenced them with stayed with them forever, just as repeating integers extend till infinity when the operation does not produce finite terminating quantities. Said differently, the impact of the ideas that Jesus taught stayed constant with some of his audience (as in the case of how non-terminating and recurring digits form in certain quotients), and in the case of other people who were in the audience, the impact of his ideas stayed affecting them to varying degrees in the same way quotients produce non-terminating and non-recurring answers.

If the above analysis on what could have motivated Jesus to be against ending the whole he was forming with the crowd he was staying with contains any elements of truth, this means that people's constant toil or exploration (i.e., use of their human ingenuity) to break whole to come up with new ideas could be creating the same complex sequence that gets created when they use natural numbers to create new expressions or numbers (i.e., fractions, decimals, percents, etc.), quantities, structures, or space, or to generate debris or waste. In other words, the decision of the elites to let their critical thinkers and servants posit and legitimize ideas and then back away from observing what they are preaching may not be helping them (the elites) to keep their dominant role, but instead, it is perhaps weakening their power. This is because the more the elites allow their critical thinkers and servants to legitimize laws (standards and norms) and to regard themselves exempt from observing them, the more this operation would produce a finite terminating sequence or a complex non-terminating and recurrent or non-recurrent sequence. The more people produce finitely terminating and non-terminating sequences, the more the rivalry that exists between people will deepen. This is because each time an object is partitioned, its space and structure change. Hence, people stay in groups to increase their space and profit from the structure that they

form part of, and not necessarily to improve equality, freedom, social justice, etc. This means that the more people come up with ideas that divide them in the same way they divide whole numbers to create new expressions or numbers (i.e., fractions, decimals, percents, etc.), quantities, structures, or space and generate debris or waste, the more the rivalry that would be ensuing would be fragmenting people relations (crumbling the international order) in the same way force crush objects to produce roughages (wastes) or turn objects into rubbles.

Once again, I have no way of knowing if this abnormal rise in roughages (wastes) or corruption, disregard, indecency, immorality, etc., in the world in recent years is because the elites decided to let their critical thinkers and servants diversify the political and economic products (policies) that they were supposed to be acting on or delivering on in the aftermath of WW2, or if this dynamism is because the new people who are becoming among the living are more corrupted than the corrupted people of today. I have no way of knowing which scenario between the aforementioned two could be making people unprepared to observe the political order suggested in the UN Charter or the UDHR to reduce far and want. What I do know is that the constant wars that have engulfed the world as of 1945 can only be due to the elites refusing to be doing their fiduciary job of ensuring that their critical thinkers and servants observe the political order suggested in the UN Charter and the UDHR and are letting those helpers (critical thinkers and servants) regard themselves exempt from observing the provisions included in the aforementioned work program, including letting them diversify and practice political dogmas just as investment companies diversify their portfolio and allocate capital in a way that reduces its exposure to any one particular asset or risk.

I have no way of knowing if the truth included in the political order that the founding fathers of the UN suggested in the UN Charter and the UDHR is a work program that can be diversified in the same way investment companies reduce risk or volatility by investing in a variety of assets. In other words, I have no way of knowing if the decision of the elites to let that the political order in certain UN member states be organized and composed of a handful of political parties (i.e., case of

western European monarchs and republics, China, the United States, etc.) whereby the individuals involved are not observing the work program suggested in the UN Charter and the UDHR, and in others to be disorganized and composed of a limitless number (i.e., case of Lebanon, Iraq, Libya, Yemen, etc.), and with the individuals involved doing the same (i.e. being bound by their personal power and conscience), is a strategy that is reducing the risks that can harm the wealth, power, and status of the elites, or if this strategy is benefiting them (the elites) and rejuvenating their power. What I do know is that the proverb "don't put all your eggs in one basket" suggests placing each egg in a different basket to ensure that if the basket drops, one egg will break and not all the eggs.

4

Is Aristotelian science for moral guidance creating an existential crisis?

The constant wars that have swept the world in recent years do not support the idea that the different political orders in which the elites are operating in UN member states are yielding the higher long-term returns they (the elites) were expecting from adopting such a diversified political and economic strategy.

If this abnormal rise in corruption, disregard, indecency, immorality, etc., that have swept the world in recent years due mainly to the elites choosing to preserve the maintenance of their power, wealth, and status in the aftermath of WW2 by adopting different political orders in UN member states than the work program suggested in the UN Charter or the UDHR continues to fail in limiting the hatred that people are developing or cultivating, it would be necessary that the elites humble those who are refusing to consider their opinion before taking action of their own in order to keep their dominant role.

I have no way of knowing how the elites plan to turn people away from falsehood so they can keep their dominant role, knowing that all what the solutions that their critical thinkers and servants are positing and enforcing are doing nothing other than increasing the number of people who are lying or breaking their promises, including betraying the people who are promising to be loyal to them. This is because it is not possible for governments, or non-state actors, and international institutions to adhere to righteousness or improve freedom, democracy, and human rights while those legal entities are economic operators at the same time.

If the elites choose to continue to rejuvenate their power by wanting that each UN member state adopt a different political order as the case is today (each egg or society is kept in a separate basket) and remain in favor of exempting their critical thinkers and servants from observing the work program suggested in the UN charter or the UDHR, including granting them privileges and immunities to kill with impunity, they (the elites) will have no choice but to increase death rates (i.e., wars, famine and epidemics) to reduce desires, or to wager on the element of time being on their side to keep their dominant role. In other words, count on the new people who would be replacing the existing generation being more obedient than the cohort that would be exiting. That is to say, hence, the know-how of the new people who replace the generation that exits is usually less than the knowledge and awareness of the cohort who they succeeded, due mainly to how people are constantly modernizing and delegating their knowledge to tools (as they are now placing their knowledge in digital form), this means that the more people delegate to technology their role and the number of people who would become illiterate grow, the more the ability of the elites to get their ways despite the resistance of others soars.

In the Quran, in Surah al-Kahf, it is suggested that Dhu al Qarnayn (The Two-Horned one) was an extremely powerful king who was nicknamed The Two-Horned, either because he used to wear a hat that had two horns or because each horn referred to the extent of his realm (one horn pointing to sunrise and the other to sunset). Some scholars believe that this king was nicknamed The Two-Horned man because the word Qarn in Arabic means era, and therefore, he was called the man with two horns because he ruled or lived during two eras.

Indeed, the world appears to be passing through a similar transition from one era to another. In other words, the elites are living or ruling during a phase in world history in which people are transitioning from doing things in one way to another. That is to say, people are switching from continuing to rely on human ingenuity to create change in order to delegate this task to tools (technology). Consequently, this situation is creating a phenomenon that is analogous to what in the Quran, in Surah al-Kahf, is suggested Dhu al Qarnayn dealt with.

In Surah Al Kahf, it is suggested that Dhu al Qarnayn was traveling in the land and came across “people who could hardly understand ‘his’ language”. [Surah Al-Kahf 18-93]. The Quran suggests that those people who Dhu al Qarnayn could not understand their speech complained to him about a neighboring tribe (i.e., Gog from the land of Magog) who was spreading corruption or mischief in the land. The Quran suggests that those people questioned if they should continue to pay Dhu al Qarnayn tribute and asked him to help them build a wall (barrier) to stop the people who live in the Magog land (i.e., the Gog tribe) from continuing to deny them the right to live in peace with one another. [Surah Al-Kahf 18-94]

Indeed, the formal language used to communicate with computers is a communication language that only a few people know. Likewise, as of the date, computers and the world wide web were introduced in the second half of the 20th century and started to be used as tools to improve political, economic, and social relations, and people never stopped complaining about how the people who use such tools to get their ways despite the resistance of others spreading corruption or mischief in the land. Similarly, many people have been questioning in recent years their social contract model, including the tribute they are paying to governments to fund essential services that benefit all citizens, such as the justice system, police, etc. Most importantly, many people are in recent years looking for ways that can help them build a wall or barrier between them and technology, or between them and the people who depend on computer languages to get their ways despite the resistance of others.

It looks as if the narratives (political, economic, and social challenges) that were mentioned in the Quran when Dhu al Qarnayn was controlling vast land (expansive empire) and the challenges that the elites are confronting as of the date when WW2 was regarded having ended to keep their dominant role are identical.

I have no way of knowing how Dhu al Qarnayn dealt with the pessimistic views and threats that the Quran suggests existed during his reign. The Quran does not give a clear depiction of how the expansive empire that Dhu al Qarnayn controlled collapsed or how the people who Dhu al Qarnayn came across and was hardly

understanding them when they were speaking to him and were complaining to him about how the people who were living in the land of Magog were harassing them resolved their differences. What I do know is that, since antiquity, when people are not busy building walls between each other to control and reduce the rampant social injustice and violence that they depend on to determine who could make the weakest consider the opinion of the fittest before taking action on their own (as history books suggest), they keep busy forming subgroups and channeling their efforts to exploring how to defeat each other and how to avoid that the people who stay with them and who do not mind that they have more powers than others do not break their allegiance or withdraw their pledge to obey them.

Unfortunately, this ongoing strategy, which people have been relying on from one generation to the next to determine who could make the weakest consider the opinion of the fittest before taking action on their own, has proved daunting till today. This is because people depend on the same psyche or narrative framework to transform the conditions and outcomes that matter to them. In other words, people keep the playing field leveled by dividing themselves into two groups that rely on the same belief to defeat each other, except that each group uses the ideas that he is postulating to stay the strongest in an inversely proportional fashion to the other. That is to say, one group refuses to admit that the world is controlled by spiritual truths as suggested in religious scriptures and spends their time exploring or making change in the hope that the ideas that they posit make people ready to stay with them and to let them have more powers than others. The other group carries out the same change as the people who refuse to admit that the world is controlled by spiritual truths, but under the pretext that God tasked them to dominate, subdue, and subjugate each other to create ordered relations in order to win eternal life.

I have no way of knowing how the elites concluded that if they let people stay divided in the aftermath of WW2 and were devoted to denying each other rights, that they would stay popular and that it would be possible for them to continue to keep people unified under the auspices of the United Nations and unwilling to reject them, as happened after the death of Alexander the Great to the pan-Hellenic project that the League of Corinth was implementing under his

authority. What I do know is that if the elites want that people stay divided and entangled in civil wars and conflicts, but without the military and mercantile campaigns that they would be propelling, eventually leading them to withdraw their obligation to obey, as happened when the generals, families, and friends of Alexander the Great started rivaling and fighting for control of the Macedonian empire after his death, leading to its disintegration, it would be necessary that they stay the strongest. In other words, the elites need to combine strength, force, and contrivances in all their work.

To put it differently, when Alexander the Great was waging extensive military campaigns to expand his dominance over vast areas of land in Asia, he was relying on political or ideological principles or frameworks to make the people (societies) he was conquering ready to import Greek culture and language to these new realms. I have no way of knowing how Alexander the Great was diffusing and syncretizing the people (societies) that he was conquering to make them embrace or adopt the Greek culture despite the rampant social injustice and violence that his conquests were engendering, but the Hellenistic period that ensued following his military conquests lasted from the date of his death in 323 BC to the emergence of the Roman Empire around 30 BC. What I do know is that from 1945 (i.e., the date when the elites defeated the families/dynasties or societies that rivaled them during WW2, thus expanding their control over the international order and money supply of the world) until today, the cultural influence and power that the elites are reaping from all the disregard, wars, and corruption that they are implicitly or explicitly sponsoring appear to be growing their financial and military reach but not their political or ideological reach. In other words, all the different political orders that the elites are allowing their critical thinkers and servants to adopt in the hope of the prosperity and progress (or hardship and regression) that each society achieves do not have any bearing on their fusion, which does not seem to be influencing them to adopt the same cultures and practices but, to the contrary, increasing their fission.

If the more the elites allow their critical thinkers and servants to regard themselves exempt from observing the work program suggested in the UN Charter and the UDHR, the more the readiness of people to observe the provisions included in such agreements declines, then the

more the critical thinkers and servants of the elites attempt to establish power bases to stay in control, the more the rivalry and enmity that would be ensuing between the critical thinkers and servants of the elites is bound to rise. When the rivalry and enmity that would be ensuing between the critical thinkers and servants of the elites rise, the ability of those helpers to abide by the common peace enshrined in the UN charter shrinks. When the ability of the critical thinkers and servants of the elites to abide by the common peace enshrined in the UN charter shrinks, it will not be possible for those helpers to refrain from breaking their agreement to observe the UN charter or to take up arms. When the critical thinkers and servants of the elites take up arms to determine who has more control, it will not be possible for the elites to stay neutral or not take sides. The more the individuals involved become divided over who could have greater power deepens, the more betrayal, mutiny, etc. between the rivaling powers would rise. Most kingdoms collapsed when the individuals who controlled the extant of the realm failed to agree on the power-sharing agreement formula among themselves. Can the elites prevent their critical thinkers and servants from dividing the international order and money supply of the world that their fathers (the old powers) built for them after they decided to rejuvenate their power, contrary to the suggestion they (the old powers) made for them (the elites) in the UN Charter and the UDHR?

Once again, I have no way of knowing if the decision of the elites to let the critical thinkers and servants in UN member states adopt a political order that contradicts with the political order that the old powers suggested is helping them to develop a unified ideological or cultural reality or if this strategy is accelerating their reversal to a simpler form. What I do know is that ever since people began to rely on religion to dominate each other, the biggest sin in certain religions has been polytheism and the association of God with other deities. In fact, even in polytheistic religions, not all the gods are portrayed as having the same power, and some gods are considered above other gods but without one attaining overall supremacy.

I have no way of knowing if the decision of the elites to let their critical thinkers and servants in UN member states associate political orders or ideological dogmas that differ from the ones that their fathers

(the old powers) counselled them to observe in the aftermath of WW2 is helping them to develop a unified ideological or cultural reality or if this strategy is making people prioritize distinction or tribalism such as religion, color, nationalism, etc. as a means to increase their happiness, which can all have a drastic effect on the maintenance of the security and stability of the elites. What I do know is that throughout history, whenever people gave allegiance to different gods, rulers, leaders, standards, norms, etc., this association led to rampant social injustice and violence that hurt the individuals who were the strongest the most. For example, people's trust in the national and foreign policies of Great Britain, France, the United States, etc. has been in constant decline since 1945, despite those countries being regarded as the victors of WW2.

If there is no guarantee that the elites could avoid becoming reverted to a simpler form if they continue to refuse to listen to what people are telling them over stopping their critical thinkers and servants from denying people right to cooperate in accordance with the UN Charter and the UDHR, how are they (the elites) concluding that it would be possible for them to avoid that people reject them or plot against them as the generals, families, and friends of Alexander the Great started doing to control the Macedonian empire after his (Alexander) death?

Once again, I have no way of knowing how the elites are concluding that if they grant their critical thinkers and servants rights and privileges to regard themselves exempt from observing the work program suggested in the UN Charter and the UDHR, such strategy could help them to avoid becoming resized, as happened to all the rulers and kings who let their dependent people distrust them. In other words, I have no way of knowing how the elites are concluding that if they keep certain nations politically and economically stable and others chaotic, such a strategy could help them define right and wrong. What I do know is that if the elites do not manage to find a way to make people around the world live in a relationship of love with them, or with their governments and with each other, the threat (corruption, betrayal, disregard, etc.) that would be rampant in all nations would make it impossible for people to understand each other or to speak the same language, just as the Quran suggests Dhu al Qarnayn dealt with when he was touring in the kingdom. When people stop to understand

each other or to speak the same language, it would make no difference having societies where its members are divided into two political factions and all the individuals involved are at all times disagreeing and rivaling to determine who could make the weakest consider the opinion of the fittest, and a society where its members are divided into many smaller groups and each group is disagreeing with the other and using cross-purpose ideas such as human rights, social justice, freedom, democracy, etc. to advance the propensity of the members involved instead of creating unity or universal truth. This is because under each one of the aforementioned scenarios, the individuals involved are not observing the political order. The elites preserve their power, wealth, and status when people observing the political order legitimized and not when they are fighting to determine who could make the weakest consider the opinion of the fittest before taking action on their own.

In fact, if we factor the work of Al-Ghazali (1058 -1111), was a Persian polymath, who is known as one of the most prominent and influential legal theoretician, philosopher, theologian, logician, and mystic in Islamic history, in his book *The Incoherence of the Philosophers* on the impact of Aristotelian sciences on the revival (ihay) of the whole, we find that the decision of the families/dynasties who began to control the international order as of the start of the second millennium (i.e., western European monarchs) to rely on Aristotelian sciences for moral guidance created an existential crisis that is now in contemporary history causing mankind to completely re-examine this way of living and its approach to how it could be used to establish relations.

Put differently, people use the Aristotelian sciences to help them dominate each other better (create ordered relations) and not necessarily to revive truth. If the other way around, the world would have been safer as of the date the Hellenic philosophy was introduced. The problem that exists in the world as of the start of the second millennium, or the date when the families/dynasties that control the western European monarchs began to rely on Aristotelian sciences for moral guidance or to control the international order, is that Aristotelian sciences expound that time stretches infinitely both into the future and into the past, whereas people want that time (wealth, power, status) to

have exact boundaries, thus enabling them to dominate each other or create ordered relations. Religions can create such delineation and set boundaries, hence, our predecessors used this concept to dominate each other from the start of time until the start of the second millennium.

Accordingly, if the worldly life of humanity will continue to consist of people who are refusing to accept the standards and norms that the fittest legitimize and enforce to control the economic activity of people or their tradition (religion, language, etc.), then the more people refuse to accept each other and rely on division and their self-help to increase their happiness or gains, the more this tactic will lead people to become not interested in the truth or in staying together, but in finding out who could attract more attention to himself better and to deny the weakest right. This means that there is a good chance that all the controversy that the elites are permitting will cause serious divisions in the world if division can go up to infinity. Until now, no kingdom managed to find ultimate value in division or to prevent its collapse when its citizens became each other's enemies (i.e., worked against each other). Only the Word (religion) and tradition managed to create moderation or equilibrium in every aspect of man's exploration. How are the elites concluding that it would be possible for them to prevent their collapse when their critical thinkers and servants are not teaching people to love them but are teaching people to love themselves and the material things that satiate their earthly desires? Can the elites prevent brothers from betraying each other (i.e., partners, neighbors, etc.) when hate, jealousy, controversy, and divisions deepen in the world? Most importantly, can the elites prevent their fall and collapse, as most religious and philosophical books suggest happened to rulers and kings who allowed their critical thinkers and servants to teach citizens to be disgruntled and divided into groups that fight each other to achieve what they (the fittest) wanted the idea of family, religion, race, color, etc. to yield for them instead of what the truth or what the provisions included in constitutions call for?

Evidently, hence, the elites decided not to build the kingdom that the founding fathers of the UN sketched its blueprint for them in the UN Charter and the UDHR to create ordered relations and are as of 1945 with their critical thinkers and servants using different assumptions to

achieve the sane end; this means that the elites must be convinced that it is possible to make people stay with them either voluntary or by force, even if people are not obeying them or refusing to cooperate on the basis of the laws (standards and norms) they are legitimizing. In other words, the elites believe that if they use their wealth and military superiority to set up elaborate intelligence systems, that its role is to discredit the international rule-based world order they depend on to preserve their power, this strategy can help them preserve their power because it shoots two birds with one stone. The first is to enable them (the elites) to rely on divide and rule to dominate and exploit effectively. The second is to enable them (the elites) to create cells that oppose each other, thus becoming capable of quantifying their adversaries.

I have no way of knowing how the elites are concluding that it would be possible for them to keep the people content and under control while the critical thinkers and servants that are supposed to be defending the international rule based world order they depend on to preserve their power (such as United States, United Nations, NATO, EU, etc.) are as of 1945 behaving like the critical thinkers and servants who they grant them wide power to keep people divided (such as ISIS, terrorist groups, private military companies, drug cartels, arm dealers, Hezbollah, Iran, mafia, etc.) not observing the values that they are preaching and are devoted to prioritizing or privileging their mothers, brothers, and sisters before privileging the people who they do not know just as Jesus did in antiquity. What I do know is that if the elites believe that it would be possible for them to secure the changes that they anticipate in the world without people observing faithfully and strictly the provisions stipulated in the UN Charter and the UDHR, this means that the elites must believe that the work program that they have been working on since 1945 to rejuvenate their power is a plan that is capable of keeping their dominant control intact while people are rivaling, competing, plotting, and betraying each other to secure the ends that are included in the UN Charter and the UDHR.

Skepticism is defined as “the questioning attitude or doubt towards knowledge claims that are seen as mere belief or dogma.” I have no way of knowing if cold and hot, light or dark, good or evil, the number one or the number ten, etc. are equal to each other or not. What I do

know is that duality appears to be a concept that manifests an inseparable oneness in the universe in many physical manifestations. At the same time, as much as natural dualities appear to be unbreakable and needed to create balance, there seem to be lots of physical manifestations that can create balance irrespective of any duality. For example, cold water and hot water are not able to create an interface or preserve their energy, but oil and water do.

To date, people have no way of knowing if good and evil are two dualities that are perceptual moral judgments or real. The dichotomy that this situation presents leads people to perceive that it is possible to create balance between good and evil in the same way oil and water can exist, for example, next to each other. For one reason or another, good and evil have shown that they are not a duality that can be regarded as complementary. In other words, good or evil do not manifest the duality that is observable in physical changes, but the one that is observable in chemical changes. To give an example, it is possible to reuse a piece of paper with a pencil annotation on it, but when the annotation is done with ink, the piece of paper becomes none-reusable. Likewise, it is not possible to add a culture of yogurt to a pot of milk and expect that only half of the milk becomes yogurt and the rest stays as milk. In addition, when yogurt goes bad, it is not possible to fix it and can only be cast out.

If truth and false do not appear to behave in the same way probabilistic functions do or whenever a person throws a dice, but appear to be two moral dimensions that take the value of zero (0) and one (1) only and are not divisible, this means that it would not be possible for the elites to avoid the implications that the families/dynasties who let their critical thinkers and servants regard themselves before 1945 exempt from observing the work program suggested in constitutions, and later learned the hard way.

Accordingly, since the only reason why the elites are not doing enough to stop their critical thinkers and servants from regarding themselves exempt from observing the work program suggested in the UN Charter and the UDHR since 1945 can only be due to them (the elites) regarding good and evil as two dualities or two monistic forces that self-right just as capsized boats do or motorcycles that self-balance are

now capable of doing using technology, and therefore, is not an attitude that carries any genuine consequences, I plan to investigate if indeed their apparent apathy could be posing a real threat to the continuity of their power, wealth, and status or not.

To put it differently, when Moses and the Israelites left Egypt to go to the promised land, they started the journey united. Half way, Moses and the Israelites became divided into twelve tribes. When the twelve tribes arrived in the promised land, they divided this territory among the twelve tribes [Joshua 13:8]. The Bible states that in the course of time and things (i.e., after another generation grew up who knew neither the Lord nor what he had done for Israel), the twelve tribes became hostile toward one another, and they started to form alliances and coalitions and to engage in battles. [Judges 2:10-15 and 20:1-46]. Most importantly, the Bible states that the poor cultural practices of the twelve families became so disordered and chaotic that the people involved concluded that only if they became united and appointed a king could they stop this carnage of everyone doing what was right in their own eyes. [1 Samuel 8:4-5] Unfortunately, the moral chaos that the twelve families were supporting did not help them preserve their power, wealth, and status even after they united and formed a unified kingdom. In the course of time and things, the families/dynasties that had more powers than others were resized, and new families/dynasties started to play their roles.

As of 1945, the events that the Israelites underwent from the day when they left Egypt to the date when they became divided into tribes seem to be circumstances that are being played out in the present day in the same way. The new generation who replaced the one who became mindful about the importance of reaffirming faith in fundamental human rights to avoid the barbarous acts that have outraged their conscience, do not want to practice tolerance and to live together in peace with one another as good neighbours, to reduce fear and want. This drawback makes it impossible to maintain international peace and security and to suppress acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace. The more people fail to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace, the more the disregard and contempt that people exercise increase division and disorder. In antiquity, the families/dynasties that were controlling the

twelve Israelite tribes failed to prevent the moral chaos that they were knowing from preventing their collapse. Can the elites let their critical thinkers and servants continue to regard themselves exempt from observing the work program suggested in the UN Charter and the UDHR and avoid stumbling on the same tragic downfall?

As I said before, there are only two ways to make people not work against each other or to put the world together. The first requires that the elites stop their critical thinkers and servants from regarding themselves exempt from observing the statements suggested by Euclid, Moses, Jesus, Buddha, Confucius, Mohammad, the founding fathers of the US, and last but not least, the statements (work program) suggested in the UN Charter and the UDHR. In other words, the elites need to get their critical thinkers and servants to get into their heads (i.e., recognize) that this appeal to observe universal standards and norms concerns them as well. The second is if the elites seek to preserve their power within the state of disequilibrium that the international order is knowing by creating an equilibrium state that would be sufficient enough to prevent their fall.

The changes that the elites need to introduce under each one of the aforementioned scenarios are one and the same. The only difference is that in the first option, the elites would be creating systemic change, whereas in the second, the elites would be creating punctual changes.

As of 1945, the elites are working on creating punctual changes in the hope of the transformations that are taking place leading to a systemic change. In other words, the elites are bringing down (i.e., weathering down) the exacerbated level of intolerance, disregard, betrayal, jealousy, pride, etc. that people are exhibiting (i.e., disequilibrium state) into tolerable levels (i.e., equilibrium state) only. This tactic, which the elites are adopting, is very complex. This is because the elites are converting something that is temporary into something fixed. As I said before, according to the statements of Euclid, Moses, Jesus, Buddha, Confucius, Mohammad, the founding fathers of the US, and last but not least, the statements (work programs) suggested in the UN Charter and the UDHR, there is no shade of gray between truth and falsehood. In other words, there is no difference between a person stealing one dollar or stealing one million dollars. Anytime a person

steals something, he would have violated the truth, and therefore, according to those ancestors (i.e., Moses and others), he would be judged. In other words, the changes that the violation of the truth perpetrates pollinate evil (disregard, corruption, betrayal) that its yield deepens dynamism that the person who perpetrated have to deal with or live with.

In this context, since the elites decided to not keep constantly in mind the common standards that the founding fathers of the UN counselled them to always observe and do not want to stay away from the practices that those founding fathers also warned them against putting into practice to avoid that they would be put to the test, this means that we cannot say that the elites and their critical thinkers and servants are living in accordance with the will of the founding fathers of the UN as of 1945. This also means that hence we have no way of knowing if the reason why people are not observing the provisions included in the UN Charter or the UDHR is because the elites and their critical thinkers and servants are not leading by example or if this defiance is because people are by nature uncontrollable, then we can never count on people ever arriving at observing the laws (standards and norms) that the critical thinkers and servants of the elites have legitimized already, nor can we expect that there will be an inflection point in time in the future in which this constant act of adding new laws which the fittest always resort to its instruments and is observing to preserve his power coming to an end.

It is important that readers keep in mind that this constant law-adding act that the fittest is always resorting to its instruments and is observing in the hope of the new rights (standards and norms) that are constantly added, succeeding at making people ready to want to stay voluntary in groups with him (the fittest) or to let him (the fittest) have with his critical thinkers and servants more powers than others is not done solely to regulate and deny the weak right from the exploration that people are constantly making-but for another reason.

Hence there can never be any peace between people for as long as the fittest and his critical thinkers and servants are not observing the social contract (the political and economic solutions) that they legitimize and enforce; and hence the weak can never develop the potential to

observe the work program that the fittest legitimize and enforce for as long as the fittest is not practicing what he is preaching; then for as long as this status quo stays prevalent, people's sole preoccupation cannot convert into becoming about how to profit from the laws (standards and norms) that already legitimized, but would stay as the case has been like since antiquity an act of constant self-absorption into cranking new laws that people do not observe anyway.

Indeed, the critical thinkers and servants of the elites have been adding ideas (standards, norms, rules, laws, etc.) to reduce disregard and improve democratic control in the same way people count numbers. There is no end to counting. A person can always add a number to the number he is thinking of.

In the epistle to the Hebrews, the apostle Paul suggests that the new Jewish Christians he was writing to were becoming "dull of hearing." [Hebrews 5:11] The apostle Paul then adds: "For though by this time you ought to be teachers, you have need again for someone to teach you the elementary principles of the actual words of God, and you have come to need milk and not solid food." [Hebrews 5:12]

Since 1945, no ruler or political class demonstrated any readiness to cooperate in accordance with the work program set forth in the UN Charter or the UDHR. All the rulers and political class that the world has known since 1945 speak about the importance of improving democratic control, but without any rulers or political class leading by example.

Pedagogues suggest that children who are 5 years old and older may be able to count to 100. The UN Charter and the UDHR was drafted more than seventy-five years ago. I have no way of knowing if the elites are relying on mediators (i.e., critical thinkers and servants) between them and the people who are not comprehending their exact role, and therefore, this confusion is creating the same challenges that Paul the apostle perceived were happening in antiquity when he compared the teachers of the Christian laws to acting like infants. What I do know is that this slow-moving and lazy attitude that the leaders of the Christian church were adopting could not prevent apostasy. Apostasy means dispersion.

As I said before, the UN Charter, or UDHR, was drafted more than seventy-five years ago. The elites could be perceiving that keeping their critical thinkers and servants stuck in this state of rhetoric restoration of the international order to make it more friendlier but without such good intention materializing into tangible results means that they (the elites) could go on relying on might to make right or on adding new laws, standards and norms but without people's patience running out or leading them to start to distrust them (the elites). In other words, the elites believe that when people turn the page on all the disregard that critical thinkers and servants are propelling to prevent people right to cooperate in accordance with the provisions suggested in the UN Charter or the UDHR, that every matter that their critical thinkers and servants deter is settling things out and preventing their resizing or taking them to be engulfed in confusion and uncertainty that they would regret. Put differently, the elites believe that the stories of kingdoms that were destroyed when their rules and critical thinkers and servants did not practice what they were preaching are not warnings or of any benefit to them.

The paradox of free will “contends that omniscience and free will are incompatible and that any conception of God (or the force that controls the world) that incorporates both properties is therefore inconceivable”. For example, if all the people of the world gathered their strength and tried to make a person learn a skill that God (or the force that controls the world) has not decreed or willed, they would never be able to bring this benefit to the individual. Likewise, if all the people of the world gathered their strength and tried to prevent a person from learning a skill, they would not be able to prevent it. If we have no way of knowing if the elites could get any good out of all the laws (norms and standards), or political structures, associations, etc., that they are with their critical thinkers and servants as of 1945 cranking but without practicing the ones that are already legitimized and enforced first in the UN charter or the UDHR, then the decision of the elites to discount their obligations to observe the laws (norms and standards) that are already legitimized in the UN charter or the UDHR before adding new ones may not produce the outcomes they anticipate but to succumb them to feebleness.

To put it differently, people or plants cannot live without water, but too much water can also suffocate a person or a plant. The problem with adding ideas (standards, norms, rules, laws, etc.) to create ordered relations and improve human rights or democratic control is that without practicing the ones that are already legitimized, it is impossible to enumerate the happiness that all people are gaining or benefiting from having so many democratic ideas that are constantly being posited because the happiness of all people is different. In other words, we cannot pair the ideas with happiness.

If ideas (standards, norms, rules, laws, etc.) are like numbers infinite (i.e., can go on forever), and as Georg Cantor showed exist in mathematical set theory whereby some infinities are bigger than others, then this means that the more ideas people inject to supposedly improve human rights and democratic control, the more the happiness of people would become disproportional and impossible to pair with the changes that people expect to reap from such mindfulness.

For example, since mankind began to believe in the existence of a God, or let's say, God began to meddle on earth, we find that God passed only ten (10) commands to humans. The person who claimed to be God's only son (i.e., Jesus) did not pass any command (law), nor did the person who gave us Islam, and people regard him as a prophet (i.e., Muhammad) based on verse 40 in Surah Al-Ahzab in the Quran, despite this document containing approximately 500 verses of legal content. In verse 256 of Surah al-Baraqrh, it is suggested that "there shall be no compulsion in [acceptance of] the religion." In other words, it is a personal choice to observe the 500 verses of legal content that are included in the Quran. In contrast, when we compare how the business of cranking laws that people run operates to regulate each other's behavior, we find that it differs a lot from the way God assumed could help him keep his dominant role. For example, in the United States alone, this country has more than 30,000 laws dispensed today. This number is dynamic because it is a function of exploration, morals, and practical conduct. That is to say, as people's morality in the country changes, so do the laws. For example, marijuana was illegal in the United States until the start of the 21st century; now, marijuana is legal in most US states. In other words, all the people who were incarcerated for possession of marijuana before this drug

was legalized were penalized to fulfill the wishes of the individuals who were gaining from such prohibition.

As the above shows, there is a big difference between the small number of laws that God thought is wise that people observe or to unify people based on their premise, and the opposite way people think this action should be done. In fact, if we take all the laws that all people (businesses, societies) around the world are constantly 24/7 dispensing and abrogating off the top of their heads and based on circumstances, profit, etc., this number should be countless.

On the other hand, it would be naive to suppose that God did not know that laws (standards, norms, rules, etc.) are useful to make people connect with one another, get along, and even create ordered relations (i.e., make the weakest consider the opinion of the fittest before taking action of his own). He (God) passed over to people ten laws himself. But if God did not care about how the changes (explorations) that people effect or the constant population growth require that the number of laws increase as conditions change, this means that either He (i.e., God) believed that scaling up laws (standards, norms, rules, etc.) in function of changes in population size or exploration is useless, or God was careless and blundered. In other words, God's decision to keep the number of laws ten (10) fixed and not relatively pairable in any shape or form with the size of the world population or the explorations that people effect was wrong. Actually, in my opinion, the set of laws (standards, norms, rules, etc.) that God suggested that people pay attention to or place limits on and the large number set of laws (standards, norms, rules, etc.) that people believe are necessary are analogous quantitatively to comparing the weight of an atom to that of man or the length of a line that is 1 centimeter long versus a line that is 1 meter long.

I have no way of knowing why God did not want people to observe more than ten laws when he knew very well that all what people do is explore (create change) and are selfish by nature. If God did not believe that it was important to have many laws to regulate people's behavior despite the majority perceiving that what is best for one often is not what is best for everyone, then only two scenarios could have propelled, in my opinion, this difference between the way God wants

people's transformations and relationships to be done and the way humans (i.e., the fittest) contrarily think. The first is if God did not want humans to act together and wanted that every person act individually or stay discrete, like whole or natural numbers. The second is if God was aware of Aristotle's wheel paradox and wanted people and laws to be two circular wheels that behave like time, always flowing toward the future but never the past. In other words, God was aware that people would be using their minds and adding laws to use their outcomes to dominate each other instead of being devoted to building relations based on the ten laws that he (God) suggested to Moses, and therefore stumble on the same challenges that Galileo stumbled upon when he took Aristotle's wheels and converted them into a polygon. When Galileo rolled the two polygons (hexagons) on the surface, he noticed that the inner hexagon was jumping a little space with each roll of the outer onto a new face. Many mathematicians and philosophers have explained this skipping phenomenon to be due to sliding or dragging.

I do not think that God wanted that people act individually or stay discrete, because if he wanted that people stay alone, he would not have asked people to be fruitful and increase in number [Genesis 1:28] or created the natural numbers with all the whole numbers, integers, rational numbers, irrational numbers, and transcendental numbers so together they form the real numbers. This is because reproduction forms a line that projects into the future, like numbers. Likewise, when we add, for example, all the numbers that exist between 0 and 10, including all the fractions, decimals, rational numbers, irrational numbers, and transcendental numbers, so as to create no gap, we form a line as well.

Could the reason for the inability of the elites to keep the international order less dynamic in the aftermath of WW2 be due to God (or the natural force that control the world) letting death purge people, and thus purge along the people who deny others right to practice the truth or the good that is included in religious scriptures or constitutions from extending their exploitation, but then the new people who are taking over from those who were denying other rights before they passed away refusing to not adopt the same assumptions that those who were purged adopted thus preventing people relations from improving or

from avoiding to let the international order not have skips or gaps just as Galileo found when he changed the circle to a hexagon in Aristotle's wheel paradox? In other words, the more the elites allow their critical thinkers and servants to legitimize laws (standards, norms, etc.) without practicing what they are preaching, the bigger the skip or gap between the lines (the continuity of their power) would be getting. The bigger or wider the skip or gap between the line would be getting (i.e., dynamism), the more malleable the line or the rock (i.e., the people) that the elites and their critical thinkers and servants would be standing on to get their ways despite the resistance of others would be getting. When the gap or skip between the two lines widens, it becomes impossible to cross the gap or the river because the flow would also be getting reciprocally vastly dynamic. Accordingly, the more people's distrust with the elites and their critical thinkers and servants rise, the more the preparedness of the people on whom the elites are relying to protect them (i.e., the segment of line or rock that would be standing on) from drowning or the people who they want to jump over into their turf (i.e., the new line segment or rock) so they start to have them offer them this protection would be equally shrinking. In other words, the more the elites crank new laws to make people surrender freedom to them, the harder it would be getting for them (the elites) to convince people to stay with them and to let them have greater say in governance than others. The more people refuse to let them (the elites) have more powers than others, the harder it will be getting them to stay balanced or to avoid their collapse.

I will never know why God was against suggesting more than ten laws when he was meddling on earth or why the elites have been devoted since 1945 to letting their critical thinkers and servants legitimize and enforce new laws instead of orienting those two subordinates to observe the ones that are already legitimized in the UN Charter and the UDHR. Surely, God and the elites must have each their own reasons for adopting different strategies. However, what I do know is that the successors of the Islamic prophet built one of the most successful empires the world has known before their collapse. According to historians, this Muslim state focused only on expanding the borders of the Islamic world and in collecting taxes. This state left the question of the law to the people (i.e., the elders in each village, town, and city) to develop and resolve.

The individuals who built the Islamic world after the death of the Islamic prophet Muhammad are known as the Rashidun Caliph (i.e., the wise rulers). The successors of the Rashidun Caliph thought differently. The successors began to insist that it was important to create a judicial complex, just as the case is in modern history. From this point on, the Islamic world started to collapse and has remained decayed to this day. Al-Jathiyah is the 45th chapter in the Quran. Verse 17 in Surah Al-Jathiyah states that when knowledge comes to people, they differ out of mutual envy.

People are constantly creating change, which makes the laws that they are constantly creating dynamic as well. For example, all the laws (standards, norms, rules, etc.) that people came up with on how typewriters should be designed and built are no longer being used as much today. This is because few people are still using typewriters, and the majority are using personal computers running word processing software. Today, people are drafting laws on the raw materials that are used in the fabrication of computers in the same way they were doing when typewriters were being used to store people's ideas. People are also drafting laws on how the material interests that resulted from this new invention (i.e., computers) should be protected, just as they were doing when typewriters were invented. People want that the material interests of each invention be protected, including letting the author of the material interest decide how this interest should be managed and distributed. Is knowledge making people differ out of mutual envy, and can the elites prevent their fall when their critical thinkers and servants are not using knowledge to make people love them (the elites) but to envy them (the elites)?

Accordingly, could God's reasons for wanting to keep the number of laws minimal be because he (God) knew that the laws of physics do not change with space and time, and even though humans are objects, which means that their bodies obey the laws of physics in space and time but their minds do not, that if he comes up with laws that are greater than a handful, he (God) would stumble on the same challenges that the successors of the Rashidun Caliph stumbled upon in antiquity, and now the elites are passing through the same events? In other words, if we cannot pair minds whenever wealth, power, and status are

not distributed on equal rights, can the elites pair minds (souls) with laws when one (i.e., the mind or the soul) is natural or discrete and the other (i.e., laws) are human creations and continuous? Humans use laws as a means toward an end – to benefit the individuals involved – and not to improve the truth.

In addition, since it is the mind (i.e., the soul) that sets the body in motion and not the laws that people depend on to dominate each other, and one (i.e., the mind) is constantly changing in space and time and the other (i.e., the laws) is constantly fixed in space and time, it makes no sense to create many laws to control it (i.e., the mind), especially since the mind is an aptitude that is constantly changing based on how certain natural objects were programmed to change (work or behave) naturally in space or time to fit reality according to one's own convictions (naive realism).

But again, the advances that have been made in technology in recent years show that it is possible to connect electronically objects to form a collective mind. For example, scientists are capable today of making objects such as cars to pace their speed to establish equilibrium. When a person is changing his position in space and time in a driverless car, his mind and his human body become constant. In this state, technology overrides the human body and makes this mass obey the laws of physics in space and time. Are the elites wagering on the power of technology to override the mind by virtue of overriding the body? But the mind is not made of matter. Can technology override something that is not made of Matter? If technology can override the capacity of the mind (i.e., the soul) to stop it from changing, why then is technology not overriding the mind of prisoners and stopping them from revolting against their jailers when they (the prisoners) become dissatisfied with the way their jailers treat them?

Evidently, if the elites want to maintain their control over people's minds in the same way God is capable of maintaining the natural world braced and in equilibrium despite the disequilibrium setbacks that are constantly trying to upset the prevailing state, such as ozone depletion, sea level rise, climate change, etc., it would be necessary that the elites rely on instruments (institutions or machinery) whose mechanisms could quantify or measure the ordered relations of

people's minds in real time in the same way this process is possible in the physical system up to a certain extent. For example, scientists are currently capable of taking an aerial photo of a town and coming up with a fair idea in real time about how people are distributed within the boundaries of the aerial photo in question. Likewise, the elites are now capable of knowing what every individual was thinking or is thinking in real time by tracking the information that an individual is redacting on social media. If so, why is the world not safer yet if most governments are monitoring people's communication and relying on closed-circuit television cameras that give them in real time information on their behavior and location?

I have no way of knowing why governments are not able to improve peace and security despite all the laws and technological advances that are at their disposal. Nonetheless, I believe there are two scenarios that could be propelling this setback. The first is if natural equilibrium tends to move systems toward their natural equilibrium constantly. The second is if the information that governments are depending on to keep their dominant role or deny people right to cooperate in accordance with the provisions suggested in the UN Charter and the UDHR is drowning them instead of helping them to keep floating.

I have no way of knowing which premise between the aforementioned two scenarios could be making the critical thinkers and servants of the elites unable to improve peace and security between the two. But if the natural system tends to move things back to their natural equilibrium constantly and more information isn't always better, then there is a good chance that the elites harvest wind in the course of time and things if people around the world continue to be unprepared to withdraw their obligation to obey or their distrust with each other does not more or less level out over time.

Put differently, the numbers 1,2,3,4,5.... are natural numbers that people use to carry out arithmetic operations with them. People reorder numbers the way they want, but it is not possible to make them (the natural numbers) establish their natural equilibrium except when they are organized in their natural order. Humans refuse to let relations be established naturally or according to religious scriptures or philosophical dogmas such as those included in constitutions, the UN

Charter, and the UDHR, and most of the time, the fittest expect the weak to be ordered based on the relations or equilibrium that they regard as most suitable to maintain their strength and security. This means that the fittest and the weakest must constantly be reordering each other based on the arrangement that each perceives to be most suitable or satisfactory to create the adequate equilibrium or stability that each element is after or is seeking.

This constant reordering that people are obliged to be entangled in dealing with to determine who could make the weakest consider the opinion of the weakest before taking action of his own (i.e., disregard, plot, betrayal, etc.), keeps people unable to speak the same language or to have the right lucidity. That is to say, all the information that people would be withholding from each other in an attempt to paint that all lines are straight makes it impossible to establish a trend. The problem with creating change in an environment that is without any clear sense of general direction of change in it is that it makes it impossible for the individuals involved to have a rhythm.

Rhythm is the force that people depend on to propel forward (have a sense of direction) and to structure time. In other words, when people are creating change without a rhythm, they become incapable of knowing when they need to be giving it all and when they should be slowing down. Sports athletes (or music artists) avoid becoming trapped in this aforementioned quandrum and consider its drawbacks to be among the worst handicaps that could hit them during a race or a competition. This is because when athletes in any sport lose rhythm and become unable to know when they need to be giving it all and when they should be slowing down, they become obliged to pick between two choices: reestablishing control or finding the right flow. The first is to rely on their imagination and own reasoning for the right opportunity to overtake if the competition involves a race, for example. The second is to put pressure on others to push them into making mistakes. Either one of those two options is dangerous because, in a race, for example, the closer the runners are getting to the finish line, the harder it gets to overtake, hence everyone would be running at 100%. Likewise, when an athlete puts pressure on another athlete to make mistakes, both become obliged to accelerate, and therefore, because everything would be happening quickly, it is easy

for the athlete who is doing the pushing to commit a mistake and be outplayed at his own game.

I have no way of knowing if the elites are finding, as of 1945, their rhythm to distance all the people that their critical thinkers and servants have been teaching them to stop at nothing until outcomes are shared on equal rights instead of how to keep them away from them,, or if the elites are preventing their rivals from developing the opposite strength. What I do know is that the constant wars that the elites have been obliged to live with since 1945 do not support the idea that they are keeping people at a safe distance from them. In fact, the decision of the elites to deviate away from the work program that the founding fathers suggested that they stay faithful to its principles to keep their dominant role does not appear to be helping people to develop positive attributes and good personal characteristics, but to deepen corruption, confusion, and discord. In addition, instead of the elites stopping their critical thinkers and servants from denying people right to cooperate in accordance with the principles suggested in the UN Charter and the UDHR so mankind can live in constant security and ever wish for their power to continue, the elites believe that if they convert their political activism so the international order becomes a wooden hammer-pounding toy whereby the role of their critical thinkers and servants would be to use their power to pound on the head of any person who expresses grievances on any legal and political issue, such a strategy helps them to keep their dominant role intact.

A wooden hammer pounding toy is a toy in which the child pounds or strikes with a hammer on the head of a popping object to return the popping object back to its initial position. The benefits of hammering and pounding toys include hand-eye coordination, concentration, and focus.

Until now, no ruler or king managed to be on constant alert so that whenever citizens popped their heads in order to have their rights recognized he or she was quickly there to pound on the heads of citizens to return them back to their initial position or to prevent them from taking part in the political life of the social order.

If all the people (businesses, nations, kingdoms and empires) who were resized suffered such an adverse fate because the individuals involved were either not fast enough to pound their adversaries to return them to their initial position or they pounded the wrong adversaries (rivals), then if the elites do not start to make all the information that they are gathering about people start to make them obey better, it would not be possible for them to stop people from doubting their commitment to secure the UN goals. Doubt is an emotional state that creates indecision. Doubt keeps the mind suspended between disbelief and belief. When people become uncertain, doubt can prompt an individual “to delay or reject relevant actions out of concern for mistakes or missed opportunities.”

If “one can believe only what one has perceived to be true from reasonable grounds, why are the elites letting their critical thinkers and servants disobey the work program suggested in the UN charter and the UDHR when people’s perceptions of the world have not been equal? Most people believe that wealth, power, and status define happiness. This perception makes people have dual goals in life. The first is to strip their neighbor of his happiness. The second is not to give up on the first goal. And so, if people filter only the things that they think are important to increase their happiness, why are the elites not worried about letting their critical thinkers and servants disobey the work program suggested in the UN Charter and the UDHR, knowing that whenever a person’s doubts rise, the individual’s readiness to obey shrinks and his courage to find reliable grounds to satisfy his reasons widens?

I have no way of knowing why the elites have been indifferent since 1945 about letting their critical thinkers and servants regard themselves exempt from observing the work program suggested in the UN Charter and the UDHR, so people doubt their determination to secure the UN goals. What I do know is that Niels Bohr (a famous Danish Physicists) and Werner Heisenberg (a famous German Physicists) had two different views about reality in the series of lectures that those two were giving in the first half of the 20th century on quantum mechanics, which became known as the “Copenhagen interpretation”. Heisenberg believed that observation has no effect on

reality, while Bohr believed that the act of observation can change the way nature behaves.

I have no way of knowing if the advances that are constantly being made in science, and in particular in linking information technology to creating ordered relations, would improve in the future the capacity of the individuals who want others to consider their opinion before taking action of their own, thus reducing the changes that have the potential of repelling people away from them instead of being attracted and/or letting them have more powers than others. What I do know is that the founding fathers of the Islamic world (the Rashidun Caliphs) and the founding fathers of the United States (from 1776 to 1945) were not employing science to make people surrender freedom to them, but faith in action. In other words, the faith that those great leaders were depending on was converting people from being discrete into becoming continuous like real numbers are or as quantum objects like electrons, who physicists say have the power to switch between acting like particles and like waves.

In addition, I have no way of knowing if the elites are preserving their power by having people behave as particles, waves, or both, or which method is more effective. What I do know is that humans were not granted right to predict the future. This means that until the elites build a central intelligence system that is capable of reading people's mind in real time and alerting them to any irregular conduct, it will not be possible to sidestep people's ongoing experimentation with trial and error to get the weakest to surrender freedom to the fittest.

Finding out the best way to reach a desired result by trying out one or more ways and by noting and eliminating errors or causes of failure is a brilliant way to solve a puzzle, build a house, or do an experiment, but not when it comes to questions of power, wealth, and status. People decide their own ranking in the latter or how their results should look before starting to implement them. That is to say, no one wants to be number 2, and everyone wants to be number 1.

Unfortunately, the trial and error method is not an effective tool in a world in which no member of the human family wants to be number 2 and everyone wants to be number 1, because all whole numbers are

discrete and the only way to go from one level to the next is either by taking the short way (i.e., jumping) or the long way (overtaking all the incremental decimal numbers that are in between).

To put it differently, to become number 1 requires that a person decide first if he wants to rely on the power of force or truth to achieve this goal. Second, the person who wants to become number 1 needs to decide on the methods that he wants to follow to get to his objective.

To give an example, if we define a point 0 and place on each side of it an integer such as -1 or +1. Next, let the line segment from 0 to +1 be the reliance on truth as a mean to get from point 0 to point 1, and the line segment from 0 to -1 be the reliance on force as a mean to get from point 0 to point -1, there is no difference between going in the direction of + 1 (truth) or -1 (force) from 0 to get to either destination because all those three integers fall on the same line. The only difference is that when a person jumps from 0 to +1 or from 0 to -1, he avoids all the infinite numbers in between.

As of the appearance of man on earth, people refuse to kill their adversaries once and for all and in this way “jump” and get quickly to their goals, or accept to “jump” and cooperate in accordance with the laws or principles that Euclid, Moses, Jesus, Buddha, Confucius, Mohammad, the founding fathers of the US, and last but not least, the statements (work program) suggested in the UN Charter and the UDHR, and want to make the switch by going through the long way or through the infinite steps.

It is important that readers keep in mind that the founding fathers of the UN (the old powers) suggested to the elites at the end of WW2 to start to preserve their power by making a jump toward this ultimate end and not to rejuvenate their power through taking the long way (i.e., through the infinite steps). In other words, the founding fathers of the UN (the old powers) counselled the elites to regard all people in all nations as equal and to avoid making new people perceive that some are more privileged than others. That is to say, ensure that all observe the UN Charter and the UDHR.

When the people who are in position of power refuse to make a jump in either direction to quickly get to their goals and decide to take the long path, i.e., find their way in between the infinite numbers that are in between 0 to +1 or 0 to -1, and who they must overtake to reach their final destination or goal, it becomes impossible to make any progress without the individuals involved relying on measures that can create ordered relations by design.

Creating ordered relations by design means taking seven coins and arranging that two show tail and the other five show heads, or having one out of the seven coins show tail and the other six show heads, and so forth. This tactic is the opposite of taking all seven coins and flipping them to show heads.

As the above shows, when we take all seven coins and flip them to show heads, this process does not require more maneuvering because all the coins are showing the same face. As I just said, this is what the founding fathers of the UN (the old powers) suggested to the elites at the end of WW2 that their critical thinkers and servants do to preserve their power.

As of 1945, the elites and their critical thinkers appear to be relying on the power of force (divide and rule) to rejuvenate their power or to get their ways despite the resistance of others instead of truth. In other words, the decision of the elites to be against all existing and new people being treated equally, and in addition, being in favor of letting existing and new people settle disputes through wars, conflicts, betrayal, disregard, etc., signify that the elites decided to rejuvenate their power by taking incremental steps to keep on rejuvenating their power instead of taking the advice of the founding fathers of the UN (the old powers) and making a jump. This also means that for as long as the elites refuse to take the advice of the founding fathers of the UN (the old powers) and make a jump, they are obliged to create ordered relations by design.

To date, no ruler or king has managed to create ordered relations or establish equilibrium when he or she tried to design strategies that use truth or force as a tool to rejuvenate his power, wealth, and status while continuing to rely on his flip-flopping game or attitude at the

same time. All the rulers or kings who did not know what they wanted, were reversed to a simpler form in the course of time and things.

5

Is the United Nations destroying the cycle of life and development?

People are discrete, and the choices they make are discrete as well. If the elites believe that they can create the transformations they anticipate by harnessing the energy of people so as to make them first use wars, disregard, corruption, betrayal, distinction, etc. as a tool to surrender freedom to them next, this route is ultimately their prerogative by virtue of being the fittest. But, at the same time, when we try to compare the ordered relations that the elites have been reaping since 1945 or since they decided to deviate away from the work that the founding fathers of the UN (the old powers) counselled them to observe to rejuvenate their power and the ordered relations that older societies adopted and reaped, it is not possible to correlate the two patterns (i.e., superimpose them), thus giving us any evidence in support of the strategies that the elites are adopting that are indeed contributing to rejuvenating their power.

In my opinion, in the last two thousand years, mankind has found meaningful relationships only twice. The first happened when the founding fathers of the Islamic world died (from the death of the Islamic prophet Muhammad to the fall of the Umayyad Caliphate), and the second happened in the United States from 1776 to 1941. In each case, the rulers in question managed to make citizens surrender their freedom to them to create a community.

I have no way of knowing what the Rashidun Caliph (i.e., the founding fathers of Islam) and the founding fathers of the United States were doing to make people ready to voluntarily surrender freedom to them

that other rulers (societies) in other parts of the world were not equally able to do under the same circumstances but different time periods. What I do know is that what the founding fathers of the Islamic world and the founding fathers of the United States were doing to make people create meaningful relationships (i.e., a community) could not have been something that the elites and their critical thinkers and servants were using or testing with as of 1945. This is because if this were the case, then the elites should have by now obtained patterns that could support how this could be the case.

It is important that readers keep in mind that the reference in the paragraph above to the same circumstances does not mean the same environmental conditions, but rather opposite environmental conditions that cancel each other out. For example, a person who lives in Norway and a person who lives in Libya deal with oppositely harsh weather conditions.

For example, the Rashidun Caliph (i.e., the rulers who succeeded the Islamic prophet Muhammad) accepted that Muhammad's teaching was right and that the Quran was a work of God, and based on this admission, they harnessed their power. This admission helped the Rashidun Caliph create the largest community the world has known to date. As of 1945, the elites refuse to accept that the work program that the founding fathers of the UN suggested in the UN Charter and the UDHR was right and that the principles included in the UN Charter and the UDHR are a work of God. The unpreparedness of the elites to accept this suggested correlation has not resulted in the elites harnessing their power in the same way. To date, the elites (along with their critical thinkers and servants) have not created a single community yet and are all only listening to their own narratives.

Likewise, in the case of the United States, we find that the rulers who succeeded the founding fathers of this country accepted that it was important to refine their own behavior first before they focused on refining the behavior of citizens or people around the world. This admittance helped the rulers who succeeded the founding fathers of this country to make citizens accept surrendering freedom to whoever is above them in the hierarchy. This also helped the rulers who succeeded the founding fathers of this country to harness their power

and the citizens of the US to be the happiest that the world has known. As of 1945, the elites refused to let their critical thinkers and servants regard themselves exempt from observing the work program suggested in the UN Charter and the UDHR. The unpreparedness of the elites to accept that it is not possible to have citizens surrender freedom to leaders who are not leading by example has not produced conditions in which any leader can feel secure or that citizens are happy with his performance. To date, the elites (along with their critical thinkers and servants) have not created a single happy society yet.

If the elites have not been able to build any meaningful relationships as of 1945, whereas the founding fathers of the Islamic world and the founding fathers of the United States managed to show that the ordered relations they were creating by design were capable of showing patterns of meaningful relationships (i.e., a community), this means that those former rulers were harnessing their power through designs that are different than the designs that the elites and their critical thinkers and servants have been using so far.

As I said before, a person can harness his power and get his way despite the resistance of others by depending on designs that prioritize truth or force. I have no way of knowing what specific design the founding fathers of the Islamic world and the founding fathers of the United States relied on to persuade citizens to build the meaningful relationships they managed to temporarily produce during the two intervals in questions. In my opinion, the founding fathers of the Islamic world and the founding fathers of the United States could not have used force because whenever we start with a negative number and we add a negative number to it, we decrease values, and not the opposite we improve them. In other words, if the founding fathers of the Islamic world and the founding fathers of the United States used force to persuade their respective citizens to obey them, they would not have reaped the meaningful relationships or patterns they managed to temporarily produce during the intervals in questions and should have reaped the same poor relationships that the elites (along with their critical thinkers and servants) have been raping since 1945. For example, the elites and their critical thinkers and servants have been relying on force or double standards to get their ways despite the resistance of others since 1945, and as a result, they have produced no

meaningful relationship what so ever so far. Henceforth, this means that the founding fathers of the Islamic world and the founding fathers of the United States were harnessing their power by designing relations that rely on truth to create ordered relations and not force, if a person can only harness his power and get his way despite the resistance of others by depending on designs that prioritize truth or force.

In fact, when we evaluate historical material related to how the Rashidun Caliph (the founding fathers of the Islamic world) and the rulers who succeeded the founding fathers of the United States were rejuvenating their power during the periods in question to the approach the elites are adopting since 1945, we find that the Rashidun Caliph and the founding fathers of the United States relied on dogmatic ideas or principles that are totally different than the ones the elites and their critical thinkers and servants are adopting since 1945 to harness their power.

For example, the founding fathers of the Islamic world legitimized and enforced the political order based on strengthening religiosity. The rulers who succeeded the founding fathers of the United States relied on values. As of 1945, the elites and their thinkers and servants have been ignoring the plea of all the people (i.e., those who lived and existing ones) about the need to slowdown the financialization of the world and are only listening to their own narratives.

As I said before, the elites and their critical thinkers and servants can pick the design they deem adequate to rejuvenate their power. The question that begs answers is: how can we be sure that the heirs of the elites will ultimately reap what their fathers (the elites) are sowing, knowing that humans were not granted right to predict the future?

To put it differently, a person could be the mightiest man or the smartest man, but this person cannot prevent aging from humiliating him. That is to say, the elites cannot guarantee that their heirs (successors) will be as clever or fortunate as they are in making people be prepared to stay with them and to grant them more powers than others if people reap what they sow.

If the elites do not think it is important to implement the project that the founding fathers of the UN suggested they stay faithful to its principles in the aftermath of WW2 to reduce violence, disregard, betrayals and wars, in the same way the Rashidun Caliph stayed faithful to the Quran after the death of the Islamic prophet Muhammad and created the largest community the world has known, or the rulers who succeeded the founding fathers of the United States did when they stayed faithful to the US constitution from 1776 to 1939 (when WW2 was regarded to have started) thus converting this society into becoming the happiest (or freest), this then means that the elites must believe that we exist in a virtual world and that it would be possible for them to manipulate the experiences of people by design in the same way a person can take seven coins and flip them so two show tail and five show heads. In other words, the elites believe they have power over truth or will.

I have no way of knowing if accelerating the financialization of the world (i.e., rivalry) and shrinking the space that would make people foster an environment that focuses on friendship can make people love the elites more or not. Likewise, I have no way of knowing if, when religiosity is shrunk and the reliance of people on technology is enlarged if this strategy can make people live at a slower, more contemplative pace, thus enabling the elites to keep their dominant role or not. Similarly, I have no way of knowing if accelerating change can give the elites or their critical thinkers and servants the space to evaluate the policies to distinguish the principles and, in this way, determine which one needs to be discarded and which one is to be kept. What I do know is that people are not capable of telling if the universe was created by a force (i.e., a god) or a giant explosion (i.e., a big bang), as people are mostly divided over and are always making statements that are impossible to prove to support their convictions. What I also do know is that most people refuse to let what they wish for themselves or their children be what they wish for others, and the majority want others to always have less. This dilemma or conviction that people are entangled in its web makes mankind unable to make a genuine jump into this world of truth or good that people are always buying from each other or selling to each other. Henceforth, people have been since antiquity relying on force and truth to make the weak

be ready to stay with the fittest and to let the fittest have more powers than others.

Additionally because the elites (the fittest) do not want to take the counsel of Euclid, Moses, Jesus, Buddha, Confucius, Mohammad, the founding fathers of the US, and last but not least, the statements (work program) suggested in the UN Charter and the UDHR, on how to organize relations, and want to have relations progress based on the infinite steps that exist between 0 and 1 according to mathematicians instead of making the leap through one jump as the founding fathers of the UN suggested, this means that if the elites and their critical thinkers do not invent tools that can forecast what people are thinking, it would not be possible to establish relations that would be any better than the ones emerged since 1945. Furthermore, since it is not possible to make an individual form meaningful relations against his will, this means that the longer the elites delay entwining the world in a new global war to create a new reset or continue to structure the political order as has been the case since 1945, whereby some societies are kept stable, others going in circles, some going nowhere, then the harder things would be getting for them to keep their dominant role intact.

In fact, in 1970, John Horton Conway (1937 – 2020), an English mathematician who was active in the fields of finite group, number theory, and combinatorial game theory, invented a game called the Game of Life. The Game of Life is a “cellular automaton discrete model of computation studied in automata theory” that is a zero-player game. Automata theory is “the study of abstract machines and automata, as well as the computational problems that can be solved using them. It is a theory in theoretical computer science.” The word *automata* “comes from the Greek word αὐτόματος, which means self-acting, self-willed, self-moving”. A zero-player game (also known as a no-player game) is a “simulation game that has no sentient players.”

In the Game of Life that John Horton Conway devised in 1970, he generated a number of cellular patterns. Some patterns were “stable once they arise; they never change, others oscillated back and forth in a loop, a few traveled across the grid forever, many patterns just fizzled out, and a few kept on growing forever and kept on generating new cells.” Most importantly, John Horton Conway concluded that it

was impossible to answer the ultimate fate of a pattern. Actually, I find the observations that John Horton Conway made to resemble the observations that astronomers like Heinrich Wilhelm Olbers and Edwin Hubble made on how galaxies behave.

Accordingly, we can say that if the elites continue to be against wanting that rulers and political class in UN members stop to regard themselves exempt from the appeal included in the UN charter and the UHDR, their fate will be conditioned on how good or clever they would be at making people believe things that are not true. In other words, their fate will depend on how clever they (the elites) are at making people believe that they are eventually going to be willing to accept being the number 2 instead of always wanting to be the number 1.

I have no way of knowing how the elites plan to make people believe things that are not true when all people do not seem to be programmed with the same natural mental capability. What I do know is that the elites will need to simultaneously keep the power, wealth, and status of the societies that are rivaling them unstable without their ill actions becoming exposed. This is because only when the societies that are rivaling them stay unstable and without knowing who could be responsible for the disorder that they are knowing could they (the elites) manage to ensure that their power, wealth, and status keep on growing forever. For example, when a flood damages assets, it is not possible for people to take steps against nature or God. But if God or nature were a person, people would be resizing him or her, as they are constantly doing with each other.

At the same time, in the biblical scriptures, it is suggested that it is not possible to outrun truth or to bury it. Could the elites outrun the truth (i.e., awareness and knowledge of people) so that it would be possible for them to be going forward on this escalator (i.e., the international order) that is going in the wrong direction and taking everyone else backward along with it?

I have no way of knowing if the elites could continue to be as successful as they have been from 1945 until now at making some people (societies) live with rights and others with no rights

whatsoever, some who observe law and order and others who are lawless, some peaceful and others stateless. Most importantly, if the elites continue to be successful at dividing and classifying people into developed and undeveloped, rich and poor, industrial and non-industrial, Muslim and Christian, capitalist and socialist, European and African, etc., and still make all of them be ready to want them to have more powers than everyone else. What I do know is that until the elites manage to come up with a formal system that can override the will of people and make them ready to surrender freedom to whoever is above in the hierarchy voluntarily and irrespective of whether or not the person who is above in rank is prioritizing the work program set forth in the UDHR or not, it would not be possible for the elites to rejuvenate their power and avoid their resizing without relying on the famous thought experiment which James Clark Maxwell (1831-1879), a Scottish physicist who lived in the 19th century developed when he was studying heat and motion of gas, and is called Maxwells Demon, or on controlling the will (i.e., truth, emotions, jealousy, selfishness, etc.) of people through increasing death rates (wars, famines, epidemics, etc.).

In this fictitious thought experiment that Maxwell conceived, he imagined a demon that was sitting on top of a box that was divided into two chambers but which had a small window fitted in the center of the dividing wall that the demon could open and close. The demon was observing the motion of the gas molecules in the two chambers and would rely on the window that he was controlling to separate the gas until he put the one that was moving slowly in one chamber and the one whose motion was fast in the other. Based on this sorting information, the demon could sort, control, and create the ordered relationships that he wanted.

Indeed, the decision of the elites to be devoted to dividing and classifying people (societies) around the world in the aftermath of WW2 into societies who are each enjoying different rights and privileges, instead of being devoted to observing the work program included in the UN Charter and the UDHR after the founding fathers of the UN gathered (united) all the people in one chamber and handed them all to them (the elites), is analogous to the way James Clark

Maxwell dreamt up being capable one day of doing with gas in his thought experiment.

Incidentally, Jesus in the Good Shepherd and His Sheep parable [John 10:1-18] portrayed the kingdom of God as a pen (chamber) that is analogous to the thought experiment that James Clark Maxwell dreamt up in his mind. However, in the metaphor that Jesus gave about how the people who accept him benefit, we are told in this parable that the segregation (sieving) of people is not as important as the part of ensuring that the sheep naturally learn to respond only to the voice of "their" shepherd and not to others.

Indeed, the constant wars that have engulfed the world as of 1948 are due to the sheep (people) not naturally learning to respond only to the voice of "their" shepherd (i.e., rulers and political class). In this context, since the gatekeepers (the elites) decided to deviate away from the work program that the founding fathers of the UN counselled them to observe to keep their dominant role and ensure lasting peace and began to let their shepherds (their critical thinkers and servants) adopt policies that the founding fathers of the UN did not counsel them to legitimize and enforce, I want, as I said earlier, to examine if it would be possible for the families/dynasties that control UN member states (the elites) to establish equilibrium to prevent their fall or if their arrogance will cost them their power, wealth, and status ultimately.

To give an example, the founding fathers of the UN counselled the elites to have the international intergovernmental organization, which they created and named the United Nations, coordinate the work of UN member states. The elites decided to shift and expand the role of the United Nations, so this organization (and thousands upon thousands of international organizations and non-state actors) started to offer political, economic, and social solutions in UN member states just as governments do. Likewise, the founding fathers of the UN counselled the elites to achieve, in co-operation with the United Nations, the promotion of universal respect for and observance of human rights and fundamental freedoms. The founding fathers of the UN did not counsel the elites to create parallel new international intergovernmental organizations to the United Nations, such as NATO, EU, AU, ASEAN, Arab League, etc., and to begin to unleash them to

make people love the staffs of those organizations instead of their governments.

Therefore, since the majority of the political policies that the elites adopted since 1945 contradict the policies that the founding fathers of the UN counselled them to stay away from, I plan to understand if it would be possible for the elites to create the ordered relations that they anticipate or if they (the elites) would stumble on the challenges that Jesus said in the Good Shepherd and His Sheep parable gatekeepers encounter when the sheep become incapable of naturally learning to respond to the voice of "its" shepherd or when many shepherds rival to determine who could teach the sheep to naturally learn to respond to its voice.

In other words, I want to understand if the decision of the elites (i.e., the gatekeepers) to be in favor of adopting policies that does not regard the advice of the founding fathers of the UN of ensuring that all people equal in dignity and rights as Article 1 of the UDHR suggest, and to make matters worse, grant rights to their shepherd or subordinates (i.e., critical thinkers and servants) to regard themselves exempt from observing the appeal included in the UDHR and to segregate (sieve) people (the sheep) into flock that are privileged and others that are underprivileged, is a strategy that can make the gatekeepers (i.e., the elites) create the ordered relations they anticipate, or if as Jesus suggested, strangers and thieves would steal the sheep from them and leave them in the same state Jesus narrated a king once found himself confronted with in the Parable of the Banquet.

Currently, there are 193 sovereign states that are members of the intergovernmental international organization named the United Nations. Since 1945, no UN member state has observed the obligations contained in the UN charter or the work program suggested in the UDHR. In fact, the abnormal intolerance that most people have manifested in recent years gives the impression that only infants and people who abandoned mainstream society and live a life of prayer and contemplation are not rivaling and violating the UN Charter and the UDHR (i.e., trying to strip their neighbor of his wealth, status, and power). Accordingly, the UN member states appear to be divided into two virtual groups. The first group consists of nations such as the western European monarchs and republics, including nations that

rotate in their orbit, such as the United States, South Korea, Japan, etc. and who peddle that they are defending the principles and institutions of democracy and open societies, but in reality, they are disregarding the provisions included in the UN Charter and the UDHR the most. The second group consists of UN member states such as Russia, China, Turkey, Brazil, India, Egypt, Nigeria, Pakistan, Iran, etc. who are bluntly violating the purposes and principles contained in the UN charter or the UDHR despite membership in this organization, which is granted based on pledging to accept the obligations contained.

It is important that readers keep in mind that the nations who pretend to be defending the UN Charter and the UDHR, such as the western European monarchs and republics, including nations that rotate in their orbit, such as the United States, take such a posture in the hope of this tactic attracting the citizens of the UN member states whose rulers are bluntly violating the UN charter and the UDHR in the hope of those disenchanted citizens betraying their rulers, and in this way making it much easier to resize them. Likewise, the UN member states who are bluntly violating the purposes and principles contained in the UN charter or the UDHR, such as Russia, China, Turkey, Brazil, India, Egypt, Nigeria, Pakistan, Iran, etc., the rulers of those societies, rely on the false pretension that the UN member states who claim to be defending the principles and institutions of democracy and open societies, to justify how the right they are denying their citizens is not meant to improve their own propensity but to protect them against falling into the wicked plot of those who say one thing and do another.

In this context, since the partisanship that the international order appears to be in today is the result of some form of sorting, we can say that the state of the international order can be said to consist of two camps or two chambers similar to the ones James Clark Maxwell (1831-1879) suggested in his fictitious experiment.

Let us place in chamber number one the UN member states who are bunkering under the idea of being committed to defending the principles and institutions of democracy and open societies, and together I said form one group. Let the UN member states who are staying in chamber one refer to the nations that are presently members of NATO since the majority of the nations that claim to be defending

the principles and institutions of democracy and open societies are members of NATO, and the societies that rotate in the orbit of NATO. Let us place in chamber number two all the UN member states that I said, are bluntly violating the purposes and principles contained in the UN Charter or the UDHR, despite membership in this organization being granted based on pledging to accept the obligations contained. Let the UN member states that are staying in chamber number two refer to the nations that are presently not members of NATO.

When we take the way I sorted the UN member states into two groups and placed each group in one chamber, we find that this separation or sorting is analogous to what James Clark Maxwell was hoping to arrive at doing with gas if possible. In his case, Maxwell wanted to put the gas particles that were moving slowly in one chamber and the ones whose motion was fast in the other, thus enabling him to control each group better. I believe the sorting of the UN member that I made produces a scenario that is analogous to the one that Maxwell was dreaming about becoming one day capable of doing with gas.

For example, the societies that are staying in the chamber where I said its elements are composed of NATO members plus elements that rotate in the orbit of NATO appear to be moving faster on all fronts, unlike the societies that are staying in the chamber where its members are all non-NATO members. Similarly, we can say that the people (societies) who are staying in chamber one appear to enjoy social conditions that give the impression that they are more happy, privileged, obedient, passive, secure, etc. than the people (societies) who are staying in chamber two, whose that its members are all non-NATO members. In as far as the people (societies) who are not member of NATO and are staying in this second chamber, we find that the majority are living with no rights, privileges, security, etc. In addition, we can also say that the rulers and political class who are staying in the chamber that its citizens appear to be happy, privileged, obedient, passive, secure, etc. do not seem to be concerned as much about the impact of allowing that the world be divided into those who have and those who don't on the continuity of their strength and stability. Likewise, the rulers and political class who are denying citizens right to cooperate in accordance with the UN Charter and the

UDHR are not concerned about the impact that their disregard can have on the continuity of their strength and stability as well.

Most importantly, when we compare how the different elements (people) are behaving in each chamber, we find that the rule that makes some people observe the rule of law (standards and norms) and others disobey is the same. This rule is knowledge. For example, the majority of the people who live in the states that are NATO members or rotate in the orbit of NATO and observe the political order legitimized or the rule of law (standards or norms) do it because of the awareness and knowledge that those people gained of themselves. Likewise, the majority of the people who live in the states that are not NATO members and refuse to observe the political order legitimized or the rule of law (standards or norms) do it because of the awareness and knowledge that those people gained of themselves as well.

If awareness and knowledge are two parameters that makes people become prepared to observe the political order legitimized or to refuse, and we have no way of knowing if the reason why the people that are staying in chamber one and are observing the political order if they are doing it because they are afraid of the penalty they would have to pay if they break the law, or because they developed understanding of themselves, and in the case of the people that are staying in chamber two and are not observing the political order, if they are doing it because they are not afraid of the penalty at stakes, or because they did not develop understanding of themselves, then the elites could be tangled in a zero sum game.

If mankind is tangled in a zero-sum game for as long as the elites refuse to stop their critical thinkers and elites from regarding themselves exempt from observing the appeal included in the UN Charter and the UHDR, then if the elites do not manage to constantly keep people dazed to stop them from using the rise or decline in their awareness and knowledge to obey because of fear or defiance, it may not be possible to avoid their collapse in the course of time and things. This is because the elites preserve their power, wealth, and status when people love them, not when people fear them or defy them.

The expression “there's more than one way to skin a cat” means there are many ways to do something.” Similarly, the expression “all roads

lead to Rome” means that all choices, methods, or actions eventually lead to the same result. Those two expressions and many similar ones all indirectly mean that there is a dumb way to reach a goal and an intelligent one.

At the same time, if we consider that life is a maze made up of a collection of paths, typically from an entrance to a goal, one could suppose that the decision of the elites, at the end of WW2, to invite people to work for a world free of want and fear and to appoint themselves the deputy of God in this journey means that the elites decided to play the role of tour guide. The people who play the role of tour guides show their customers around in two ways. The first is if the tour guide keeps all his customers together and lead them through the maze in one batch. The second is if the tour guide divides his customers into groups and administers their transitions accordingly.

At the end of WW2, the founding fathers of the UN (the old powers) counselled the elites (their children) to not divide people into groups and to keep them all in one group to avoid becoming entangled in having to prepare an itinerary for each group, particularly since the tour is happening in a maze.

Most importantly, the founding fathers of the UN (the old powers) did not want people to be divided into groups to avoid that the individuals who would be playing the role of tour guides in each group (people, societies, businesses, nations, kingdoms) plan itineraries that would not suit the unique interests of the elites but the individuals involved. This is because if the individuals who would be playing the role of tour guides (people, societies, businesses, nations, kingdoms) start to make alterations in their itineraries, it would not be possible to avoid that some groups find their way in the maze better (faster) than others and reach the end. And since the goal of the decision of the founding fathers of the UN (the old powers) to invite people to work for a world free of want and fear did not include plans of having people (societies, businesses, nations, kingdoms) reach the end of the maze (i.e., become economically and militarily strong to rival their children), the decision of their children (the elites) to deviate away from the itinerary (or work plan) their fathers (i.e., the old powers) laid out for them in the UN charter and the UDHR, and to divide people into groups that each

works based on the itinerary that suits the unique interests of its members, could not be helping them to keep their dominant role. This is because it is not possible to know when people in a maze become divided into groups and separate where each group is from the other, or who is ahead of everyone else, who is going in circles, or who is hitting a dead end and needs to backtrack his steps. And since the elites are not gods that can be everywhere and are carrying their dazing acts from inside the maze, there is a good chance that all their customers are not finding the itinerary that they are depending on to rejuvenate their power entertaining and attracting people to stay with them. If the constant wars that the world knows are because people (societies, businesses, nations, kingdoms) are finding out that they are better off staying in groups that suit their own unique interests, then the elites could be chasing wind. This is because if we retake the fictitious demon experiment that Maxwell imagined, it was not Maxwell's own human power who was picking which gas molecules could go fast and which could go slow, or which gas molecules would stay in one chamber and not the other, but a much bigger force. I have no way of knowing if this shear force that was deciding in the Maxwell experiment which molecule to cross over and which molecule to stay behind is a real force (i.e., the invisible hand of God) or not. What I do know is that one of two scenarios could be making people around the world will not find the political and economic solutions that the critical thinkers and servants of the elites are picking entertaining and attractive enough to make them voluntarily surrender their freedom and stay with them. The first is if the reason is due to shear luck, and the second is if the elites are relying on the wrong tour guides (i.e., the wrong critical thinkers and servants).

I have no way of knowing which scenario between the aforementioned two could be making people find the political order that the critical thinkers and servants of the elites have been trying to daze people with not attractive since 1945. What I do know is that the work program that the founding fathers of the UN designed for the elites in 1945 is the same work program that Jesus suggested in the Good Shepherd and His Sheep parable. That is to say, all people live under a single formal political structure whereby individual shepherds (distinct rulers in UN member states) lead by example to secure the UN goals, and not as the case has been since 1945, whereby all people are united behind the

principles included in the UN Charter and the UDHR, but no one is observing faithfully the provisions included in such declarations, starting with the elites (i.e., the families/dynasties that control UN member states) or their global policemen (i.e., the United States).

Accordingly, since the elites and their critical thinkers believe that if they divide people in the same way mathematicians in the field of set theories divide numbers into sets such as natural, integer, rational, real, and complex, that such a strategy could be better for them to control people and keep their dominant role, this means that the elites must believe that they can transition the world from its actual partitioned state into a single formal political system where they would play the deputy of God role for life by just continuing on and proclaiming how they are determined to defend the principles suggested in the UN Charter and the UDHR. That is to say, the elites believe that they can continue with their critical thinkers and servants to kill and commit disregard in the name of preserving human rights, freedom, social justice, etc., without observing the work program suggested in the UN Charter and the UDHR, and still expect people to want to stay with them and to let them have more powers than others.

Once again, I have no way of knowing how the critical thinkers of the elites are reaching the conclusion that it would be possible for them to divide societies into sets or clusters where some have access to rights and security and others live with no rights or security and still be capable of avoiding being resized. What I do know is that in the 19th century, mathematicians set out to establish if mathematics could be regarded as a natural branch (i.e., a formal system) that is complete (i.e., if there is a way to prove every true statement in math), consistent (i.e., if math could be regarded as free of contradictions), and decidable (i.e., if there is an algorithm that can always determine whether a statement follows from the axioms in math). Mathematicians have concluded, so far, that mathematics is not complete (see work of Kurt Godel), its consistency is questionable (see the Kurt Godel second incompleteness theorem), and its decidability is an undecidable system (see the work of Alan Turing). Likewise, in religion or philosophy, no prophet or philosopher showed that it is possible for an authority to preserve its power without prioritizing reason over form.

If math cannot be used to prove every true statement, and if all the prophets or philosophers who tried to argue that force or disregard cannot build meaningful relationships, and if all the insecurity that the elites, their critical thinkers and servants have lived has not been sufficient to entice them to stop their own conjectures from confusing them and to admit that only observing the work program suggested in the UN Charter and the UDHR could make them succeed in what others tested and failed, then only two scenarios could be persuading the elites into believing that they could be luckier. The first is if the wealth, power, and status of the elites stopped being of paramount importance to them. The second is if the elites believe that the advances that were made in technology could make the human mind of people succumb to them by virtue of placing the human body under siege. In other words, the elites believe that because it is now possible to track people and collect information about their behavior or whereabouts, the technology (computers, artificial intelligence, etc.) that helps to provide this information is sufficient to help the elites and their critical thinkers and servants solve the governance challenges that range from picking the political, economic, and socially ordered relations that they see fit to controlling or sorting people out and making them do whatever they want.

Indeed, the advances that were made in technology (science or mathematics) in recent years make it possible. ahead of the fittest, to divide people into sets and to even take an object that is as small as a gas molecule and follow it, thus converting the demon-fictitious experiment that Maxwell dreamt of doing in the 19th century to being possible today. In fact, the advances that have been made in technology in recent years make it no longer necessary that people stay united under a formal system to secure collective goals. In other words, it is no longer necessary to continue to use the ideas of freedom, democracy, social justice, equal rights, etc. as a pretext to create ordered relations or to deepen truth.

For example, before WW1 erupted, the British Empire was obliged to compromise so that the nomads who were inhabiting the Arabian Peninsula would go along and not sabotage the oil refineries that the empire was building in this territory. Presently, the families/dynasties

that control Great Britain can, with the flip of a switch (to launch a bomb), return all the rulers and political class who are demanding respect in the Arabian Peninsula but without observing the work program stipulated in the UN Charter and the UDHR, go back to taking care of business while riding camels as they were doing in the first half of the 20th century, instead of in luxury cars as they are now doing, thanks to the families/dynasties who control Great Britain.

As the aforesaid shows, the elites (the families/dynasties that control the international order and the money supply of the world) do not need to control the sea as the British Empire was doing before WW2 to keep their dominant role. The elites can today use any country to launch from its territory ICBM's thus neutralizing any society that tries to threaten its strength and stability.

But again, rulers were before 1945 able to take the natural numbers (or people) and change their order from 1,2,3,4... to 1,4,3,2..., or to make $2+2 = 7$ instead of 4, just as the elites and their critical thinkers and servants are doing as of 1945. The challenge that rulers were stumbling upon before 1945 was not how to make the political order that they were legitimizing and enforcing establish equilibrium, but how to let the stability or equilibrium that they were able to achieve not resist change and stay stable (i.e., in equilibrium) for a long time instead of having a temporary consistency (balance) or a short life span. Many questions beg answers. For one, how are the elites and their critical thinkers concluding that technology could make people resist change when all what technology achieved so far was nothing but accelerate the reordering of natural objects such as people and not override the will of natural objects, which is what needs to be happening so everyone would be ready to surrender freedom to whoever is above in the hierarchy voluntarily and irrespective of whether or not the person who is above in rank is prioritizing the work program set forth in the UDHR or not?

Indeed, there seems to be a disconnect between the way natural objects such as humans work (i.e., either purely by random or by a deterministic process) and the opposite way the human mind of people works. As I said before, "there's more than one way to skin a cat," and there is a dumb way to do it and an intelligent way.

Obviously, if the elites and their critical thinkers and servants believe that they could, with the help of technology and their relative military superiority, organize or put the world together in the manner they see pertinent to maintain their strength and stability while people are divided into groups in the same way mathematicians in the field of set theories divide numbers into sets and are able to show that infinities are not all the same size (see the work of Georg Cantor), it confirms that the elites believe that size matters.

I have no way if size (i.e., wealth and military superiority) can stop people from wanting to establish meaningful relations or from becoming weary of the political and economic solutions that the fittest tries to impose to stay in his glory. What I do know is that the individuals who defeated the Byzantine Empires during the Muslim conquests were not experts in the fundamentals of politics and statecraft but in the fundamentals of courage, perseverance, and faith in action. In other words, the individuals who defeated the Byzantine Empires in the 7th century were fighters that were not any different than the fighters who were fighting the Americans and the rest of NATO nations in Afghanistan in the 21st century while wearing slippers and the American and NATO soldiers showered with armaments from head to toe. Likewise, the individuals who resized the families/dynasties that were controlling the Soviet Union in the second half of the 20th century were not “fighters” who resided in neighboring territories but were the same people that those families/dynasties indoctrinated with their own ideological dogmas to supposedly protect them.

If humans appear to be a mass that was programmed to be moving around doing its thing, and without each person knowing about what his neighbor is doing, and then when people by design (ideas, plans, etc.) make people bump into each other or interact, they become capable of working particularly well and to find the shortest path to establish equilibrium whenever their distrust rises or happiness shrinks, this means that the elites could be taking great risks by relying on technology to accelerate their bumping or interaction with objects that are by design intended to slow them down, because this forces people to be bumping into each other or interacting with each other more. And since people could be a mass that is capable of forming a

wave, a piece of string, or a rubber band when they become disenchanted in the same way a drop of water can form a wave when it falls into a body of water, then the elites and their critical thinkers may not be able to create the ordered relations that they expect technology to help them achieve. This is because when a rubber band or sting is under tension, its length becomes longer and its energy becomes higher than when it is at rest.

Most importantly, because the elites and their critical thinkers decided not to implement the work program that the founding fathers of the UN counselled them to stay faithful to its principles and decided to divide people into groups in the same way mathematicians divide numbers into sets such as natural, integer, rational, real, and complex, or tour guides divide people into groups, or different guitar string thicknesses produce different sounds, there is a good chance that the elites and their critical thinkers produce complex waves or supercharged fronts that may not be possible to control without forcing a solution.

For example, in 2020, Great Britain withdrew from the European Union for many reasons. One of them is that this monarch became incapable of avoiding that its power, wealth, and status would weaken when the number of people who were deciding in this group (i.e., the European Union) which laws (standards, norms and rules) be legitimized became large. This monarch did not begin to cooperate in accordance with the UN Charter and the UDHR after it withdrew from the European Union, but continued to organize relations in the same way it was doing it when it was a member of the European Union.

In chaos theory, if we have ten balls bouncing in a closed chamber and then we take two balls out and place them in a separate chamber, they do not stop going in all directions or behave differently, but they continue to behave in the same chaotic way. This is perhaps the reason why political stability in Great Britain did not improve as of 2020.

In fact, to keep the political order in Great Britain in its present equilibrium state, it is necessary that the rulers and political class in this monarchy continue on doing what they are now doing. This is because the initial conditions are sacramental in chaos theory. The

longer the initial conditions are maintained, the longer two bouncing balls stay together and do not go on totally different paths.

However, hence, it is not possible to control change or to keep the awareness and knowledge of citizens in this monarchy the same, and to make matters worse, the human imagination (the human mind) refuses to be controlled except when it is under fear or the matter involves surrendering freedom voluntarily to designated individuals, this means that it is not possible to keep the political order in Great Britain under equilibrium or a constant. If the British government continues to legitimize laws without improving democratic control, it would not be possible to make the weakest surrender freedom to whoever is above in the hierarchy in this monarchy. If the British government decides to become more involved in global affairs, this monarchy will stumble upon the same challenges its political order stumbled upon when this realm joined the European Union. In other words, Great Britain would not be capable of establishing equilibrium with any nation for as long as this monarchy (which is also the case for all the other nations) wants to be involved in global affairs because this society is motivated by the desire for increased happiness and not for the desire to secure the UN Charter or the UDHR. The decision of Great Britain to withdraw from the European Union is equivalent to this monarchy converting itself from continuing to be a subset within the rational numbers in number theory and opting to become an irrational number. In other words, the families/dynasties that control Great Britain believe that if they withdraw from being part of this group, which is called the European Union, and go back to controlling relations with citizens and the rest of the people around the world, such a strategy would prevent their resizing.

Irrational numbers are numbers that cannot be written as simple fraction. Pi (π) is the most famous irrational number. I have no way of knowing if Pi (π), which is renowned for going on forever, is a property that can be said to apply to humans as well. In other words, I have no way of knowing if certain tribes, societies, or kingdoms can exist independently of a larger group in the same way irrational numbers exist by choice or design. What I do know is that not even the families/dynasties that the Bible claim were God's chosen people

managed to keep their glory indefinite when the people who subscribed to this faith began to not stand firm on the Mosaic Laws.

If the decision of the families/dynasties that control Great Britain to withdraw from the European Union could not benefit their heirs if they did not stand firm on the principles suggested in the UN Charter and the UDHR in their relations with their dependent nationals and other sovereign societies, then the more people in the European Union and in other parts of the world continue to taste the power of money and the power of having double standards, the harder things would be getting for the families/dynasties that control Great Britain to avoid becoming resized or to improve their global dominance. This also means that if the families/dynasties that control Great Britain want this island to stay a monarchy, they have no other option but to increase authoritarianism internally under the pretext of defending the principles and institutions of democracy and open societies. Likewise, to wage wars explicitly or implicitly on neighboring societies in the name of freedom, human rights, and social justice in order to dismantle the human progress of the societies whose awareness and knowledge are advanced and pose a threat to the continuity of their wealth, power, and status. It is not possible to defend the principles and institutions of democracy and open societies through authoritarian regimes.

If the use of force is not useful for a person to make people love him or to want to develop friendly relations, then the longer the elites take to build a fair and inclusive political system or a rule-based economy, the weaker people's patience will be to tolerate the delays or to accept excuses. The more people perceive that the elites and their critical thinkers and servants are taking advantage of them to ultimately increase their happiness, the harder it would be for the elites making people want to stay with them or to voluntarily surrender freedom to them. When the elites begin to have a hard time to make people (societies) observe the laws (standards, norms and rules) that they are positing and legitimizing, this reciprocally makes it much harder for the elites to continue to tolerate the things or the disregard that they were prepared or ready to accept yesterday.

As I said before, chaos theory is very sensitive to the initial conditions. When the behavior of the people and the elites starts to become a contest in which each group is pulling in the opposite direction, the more each group pulls to obtain the same thing, the more the social order gets chaotic and dynamic. When dynamism rises (i.e., death, destruction, and exploitation rise), there is no guarantee that the elites or their heirs can avoid walking out intact and without becoming resized or weakened.

In addition, hence whenever the awareness and knowledge of the weakest (people) rise, the patience and tolerance of the fittest (rulers or rich) reciprocally shrink, then the longer the elites take to make their servants (rulers and political class) in UN member states stop to regard themselves exempt from observing the UN charter and the UDHR, the harder things would be getting for the elites to convince people to stay with them or to let them have greater say in governance without the need to rely on a forced solution (i.e., a global war, famine, or epidemic) or on the need to create new machinery whose stated purpose would be to improve universal respect for and observance of human rights and fundamental freedoms.

The use of force (i.e., global war, famine, or epidemic) or the creation of machinery (legal entity) to improve cooperation and build an inclusive political system and rule-based economy does not reduce the number of people who are not observing the laws (standards, norms and rules) or help to rejuvenate the power of the principal victors of WW2, but increases the number of people who would not be doing it.

For example, the allied powers did not defeat the central powers during WW1 because they were more powerful militarily or economically, but because they were better con artists. Hence, the Allied powers refused to observe the pledges made in the Charter of the League of Nations, and the victors of WW1 failed to prevent the entangling of the world in a new global war.

Likewise, the allied powers did not defeat the axis powers during WW2 because they were more powerful militarily or economically, but because they (the allied powers) were the first to detonate an atomic bomb, thus prompting the axis powers to submit involuntarily.

Again, because the Allied powers refused to observe the pledges made in the Charter of the United Nations and began to want to take advantage of people by creating new machinery, of which they declared that its stated purpose is to improve universal respect for and observance of human rights and fundamental freedoms, we find that in every single place that international institutions such as the United Nations, World Bank, IMF, USAID, EU, FCDO, JIKA, NGOs, etc. have gone, death, destruction, and exploitation have followed.

If none of the efforts that the elites are exhausting to rejuvenate their power could guarantee that the critical thinkers and servants who are depending on their wisdom to protect them would be there for them when the going gets tough, then if servants think that they can be above their masters, there is a good chance that the heirs of the elites could be doomed. This is because if the elites do not stop their servants (rulers and political class) in UN members from continuing to regard themselves exempt from observing the UN charter and the UDHR, they could not be grooming servants (rulers and political class) who would be loyal to their heirs, but servants (rulers and political class) who are better con artists than them.

In conclusion, the dynamism that the world has known since 1948 (the year when the first war was fought post-1945 when WW2 was regarded as having ended) is not new. This dynamism existed throughout history and appeared to be functioning like a continuous wave. When the fittest prioritized economic solutions over political solutions, the amplitude of the world's dynamism rose and its wavelength shrank.

The political entanglement that exists in the world as of 1945 could be due to the elites prioritizing economic solutions (i.e., the financialization of the world) over political solutions. Most importantly, the dynamism that the world is knowing could also be due to the elites supposing that technology could help them control the complex capillary waves or the Doppler effect that occur in waves – water wave, sound wave, light wave, etc., when “an apparent change in the frequency of a wave caused by relative motion between the source of the wave and an observer” occurs.

I have no way of knowing if technology can calm storms and waves, as the Bible narrates that Jesus possessed power over [Mark 4:35-41]. Likewise, I have no way of knowing if technology can control the complex waves that form when a Doppler effect occurs. Physicists suggest that when a Doppler effect occurs, it becomes very difficult to measure the wavelength or amplitude of the waves because the Doppler effect changes the waves from being regular sinusoidal types to patterns where we have trailing wavelengths that are much longer than the leading wavelengths, which would become much shorter and bunched up together.

If the financialization of the world (i.e., the economic solutions which the elites are prioritizing to rejuvenate their power) is creating complex waves that functions similar to the ones that result when the wind causes the sea to form rough waves, or when The Doppler effect occurs bunches up together the leading waves thus making it very difficult to know which is which, then the longer the elites take to make their servants (rulers and political class) in UN member states stop to regard themselves exempt from observing the UN charter and the UDHR, the harder it should be getting for them (the elites) to quantify if the dynamism that the world is knowing is weakening their power, wealth and status or rejuvenating it. All the kingdoms that collapsed happened because their rulers perceived things that were not true.

But again, technology has come a long way since the start of the 21st century, and it is now possible to make AI solve some problems and work toward a goal just as humans do. And so, since we have no way of knowing if the ideas that we manipulate in our mind are our own interpretation of reality or if there is a force (i.e., a God) that decides each lot, then if technology can help the elites to make people surrender freedom to the political order that they are legitimizing, it would be very difficult to justify why they (the elites) should continue to rely on the readiness of human behavior to make this switch when this aptitude has never shown this willingness since antiquity.

Then again, many questions beg answers. For one, can a machine with the intelligence of humans make real humans surrender their freedom to it? Likewise, if a real human can surrender freedom to a machine

with the intelligence of humans, then why are people not surrendering freedom to each other?

I do not know the answer to the aforementioned question. What I do know is that Zuhayr bin Abī Sulmā, was a pre-Islamic Arabian poet who lived in the 6th & 7th centuries AD and who was considered one of the greatest writers of Arabic poetry in pre-Islamic times. In one of his most famous odes, Zuhayr bin Abī Sulmā suggests that life's burdens are tiresome and that whoever does not act with kindness in life is crushed by fangs and trod by camel feet. He then added that whoever has the means to do good yet refuses to defend the truth and treats others unjustly, will be utterly disregarded and demeaned, even if he manages to construct a ladder that can ascend him to the sky. In addition, Zuhayr bin Abī Sulmā suggests in the same poem that the people who disobey the truth groom mischievous blood-stained murderous urchins that would be weaning all the time and nothing satiates them.

I have no way of knowing if what Zuhayr bin Abī Sulmā suggests happens when people refuse to observe the truth is true or false. What I do know is that the elites appear to be stuck in a dilemma. If they wager on the power of technology to help them keep their dominant role and technology fails to make their servants (rulers and political class) in UN member states stop to regard themselves exempt from observing the UN charter and the UDHR, it would not be possible for them to make newborns (new people) be prepared to consider their opinion before taking action on their own. Likewise, if human nature is not redesigned so newborns (new people) do not continue to be ungracious and wicked, it would not be possible for the elites to keep their dominant role and avoid becoming resized.

The good news is that no one needs to worry about how the international order will change in the future but the elites. This is because if the elites continue to let their critical thinkers and servants regard themselves exempt from observing the UN charter and the UDHR; and let that wherever the international institutions such as the United Nations, World Bank, IMF, USAID, EU, FCDO, JICA, NGOs, etc. work, death, destruction and exploitation follow; and let a handful of private corporations collect all the books that people own thus

stripping people from knowhow and knowledge; and let a handful of private corporations convert physical tangible money into digital money; and most importantly, convert every person into becoming preoccupied with what his neighbor is doing instead of being preoccupied with observing the laws (standards, norms and rules) legitimized, it is them (the elites) who must be sure that when all those changes continue to expand that newborns (new people) would not turn out to be as Zuhayr bin Abī Sulmā suggest happens when people prioritize form over reason.

It looks as if the choices ahead of the elites to continue to get their ways despite the resistance of others in the future are clear and simple. The elites can wager on the power of technology and the wisdom of their critical thinkers and servants to help preserve their power, wealth, and status, or wager on the work program that the founding fathers of the UN laid out in the UN Charter and the UDHR.

Evidently, if the elites choose to be on the side of continuing to let rulers and political class in UN member states regard themselves exempt from observing the UN charter and the UDHR, and on the side of letting wherever international institutions such as the United Nations, World Bank, IMF, USAID, EU, FCDO, JIKA, NGOs, etc. work to improve justice and rights, death, destruction, and exploitation follow them, it would be important that technology helps them to control entropy.

Entropy is a term that refers to the degree of disorder or randomness in a system. No one knows how the changes that people constantly effect (i.e., the explorations) or the changes that the natural system is similarly constantly undergoing on its own varies entropy. Physicists suggest that entropy is always increasing until it reaches equilibrium, at which point it no longer changes. However, we can say that the natural and manmade changes will be proportional to the way the entropy is changing. If the entropy is high, the likelihood of the elites requiring to rely on authoritarianism to keep their dominant role will rise, and when the entropy is low, this then means that people are pleased with how the rulers and political class who are controlling the political order in UN member states on behalf of the elites are managing disregard and contempt or increasing people's happiness.

Evidently, the cleverness in making the entropy that people generate work in favor of their own advantage depends on the series of actions that the individuals who want others to consider their opinion before taking action of their own pick to achieve their goals. This is not an easy job at all because this task requires that a person become capable of listing first the things that an individual wants reordered to achieve his goal. Till now, as I said before, only Jesus, according to the Bible, managed to demonstrate authority over the five elements of nature. [Mark 6:47-50; Matt. 14:22-33; John 6:16-20; Mark 4:35-41; Matt. 8:23-27; Luke 8:22-25]. For example, if a politician wants to calm a “water wave” (political wave) so its damage does not persuade an electorate during the next election to support another candidate, the politician needs to first make a list of all the things that are creating the wave. People cannot see the wind or control the wind, and therefore, we cannot reorder things that its reordering requires from us to list first the things we see and not see.

Hence, the world entropy is a phenomenon that behaves in the same way: when we look at a cup of water, we do not see the individual molecules, but we see that everything looks the same (i.e., isotropic), or when we look at the sea, we cannot see the currents or the fish that exist under the surface of the sea. This means that it is not possible to quantify the world entropy and, most importantly, predict with certainty how it could change and when. The only thing we have control over is the entropy (actions) that we created in our own sphere, which we can trace back.

Considering the difficulty in quantifying the world entropy (at the macro scale) or the handicap in detecting the malignant entropy from the benign one at the micro-scale (i.e., human behavior), one could think that the elites would be inclined as of 1945 toward minimizing the risks that have the potential to create upsets in their strength and stability low. But, to the contrary, we find that the elites decided to disregard the counsel that the founding fathers of the UN suggested to them to control entropy in the aftermath of WW2, and in recent years, they are more and more behaving as if they are the measures of all things.

I have no way of knowing why the elites are refusing to prioritize the work program for which the founding fathers of the UN counselled them to stay faithful to its principles to keep their dominant role. To put it differently, there must be a reason why the founding fathers of the UN counselled the elites to lift all the borders and to get rid of all the laws (standards, norms, rules) they had built and to replace them with the work plan suggested in the UN Charter and the UDHR, but did not counsel them to continue to rejuvenate their power by extending the same ordered relations that they were using before WW2 erupted, which consisted of keeping societies segregated in the same way people who are incarcerated are organized in a prison system.

I have no way of knowing why the founding fathers of the UN believed that segregating people in the aftermath of WW2 into subsystems as per the way they were doing before 1945, or in the same way prisoners are incarcerated and organized in a prison system, was not suitable for their children (the elites) to rejuvenate their power and preferred that they form one group as suggested in the UN Charter and the UDHR, which is also the way Jesus suggested in the Good Shepherd and His Sheep parable that the sheep were organized.

In my opinion, only two justifications could explain why the founding fathers of the UN (the old powers) believed that their children (i.e., the elites) could preserve their power, wealth, and status far better if they let all people mix and not stay as per the way the case is today where people are still divided into sets (i.e., Chinese, Lebanese, Taiwanese, Japanese, Indian, American, etc.), and only a select number of people can freely switch between sets without their race, color or sex playing a factor. In addition, within each set, not all the elements (people) are acting towards one another in a spirit of brotherhood, and some elements (people) are observing rules and others are completely disregarding rules. The first is if the founding fathers of the UN (i.e., their critical thinkers such as mathematicians and physicists) made all people in all the land form one set in 1945 instead of continuing to be divided into subsets. The second is if the founding fathers recognized in 1945 that what Arthur Eddington, an English astronomer, physicist, and mathematician, wrote in 1920 about science is true. Arthur Eddington wrote, "We have found that where science has progressed the farthest, the mind has but regained from nature that which the mind

put into nature. We have found a strange foot-print on the shores of the unknown. We have devised profound theories, one after another, to account for its origin. At last, we have succeeded in reconstructing the creature that made the foot-print. And Lo! it is our own.”

I have no way of knowing which scenario between the aforementioned two could have propelled the founding fathers of the UN (the old powers) to be in favor that their children (the elites) do not segregate people in the aftermath of WW2 into subsystems as per the way they were doing or in the same way prisoners are incarcerated and organized in a prison system and preferred that they rejuvenate their power as suggested in the UN Charter and the UDHR, which is also the way Jesus suggested in the Good Shepherd and His Sheep parable the sheep were organized. What I do know is that ever since the date, people have begun to rely on human ingenuity and science to improve peace and security instead of on religiosity, and the world’s evolution appears to be developing according to the expression one step forward, two steps back. In other words, people did not stop using the interests that human ingenuity and science produced to dominate, exploit, and create setbacks that put the international order and humanity further behind than initially was the case.

It would be naïve to suppose that the founding fathers of the UN did not know that people would continue to use human ingenuity and science in the aftermath of WW2 to dominate and exploit each other. There has to have been a reason that propelled the founding fathers of the UN into believing that even if their children (the elites) gave up relying on pre-1945 political relations and observed the work program they suggested in the UN Charter and the UDHR, people’s continuous reliance on violence (conflicts, wars, betrayal, etc.) would not shake their strength and stability.

Once again, I have no way of knowing what could have been exactly this particular thing that the founding fathers of the UN were counting on its power not resizing the wealth, power, and status of their heirs even if they started to rely more on pacifist-type ideas (the work program they suggested in the UN Charter and the UDHR) than on violence (conflicts, wars, betrayal, etc.), knowing that humans are backstabbers. What I do know is that this particular thing that the

founding fathers of the UN were counting on, its power, not resizing the wealth, power, and status of their heirs, even if they start to rely on pacifist-type ideas such as the ones suggested in the UN Charter and the UDHR, can only be a material promise or a human promise.

In my opinion, the founding fathers of the UN could have been counting on the promise of technology not disappointing them or on the promises that people were making about observing the work program included in the UN Charter and the UDHR.

Since man began to rely on tools, technology, etc., no instrument, apparatus, or machinery has backed on its promise of doing what it was designed or built to do. On the other hand, only a handful of humans have kept their promise since God supposedly created this natural object (i.e., men). Could the reason behind all the dynamism that swept the world in the aftermath of WW2 be due to people backing away from keeping their promises to observe the work program suggested in the UN Charter and the UDHR? If people are really backing away from keeping their promises to observe the work program suggested in the UN Charter and the UDHR, there must be an agent who is doing this repelling. For example, when Adam and Eve broke the promise to obey God's command, a snake lured them into breaking their promise. When Moses, Jesus, Muhammad, Confucius, Buddha, etc. decided to rebel against the political order or the social contract that they were born into, the Bible suggest that God commissioned them to revolt.

I have no way of knowing who could be propelling people to back away from their promise to observe the political order that the founding fathers of the elites designed in 1945 to attract people to stay with their heirs (the elites). What I do know is that when God asked Moses, Jesus, Muhammad, Confucius, Buddha, etc. to revolt against the political order, those five (i.e., Moses, Jesus, Muhammad, Confucius, Buddha, etc.) managed to increase the number of people around them.

If in 1945, the elites tasked the intergovernmental organization named the United Nations with coordinating activities between states on a global scale and providing political, economic, and social solutions to

accelerate the attainment of the same outcomes that Moses, Jesus, Muhammad, Confucius, Buddha, etc. were preaching on behalf of God, and instead of increasing the number of people around them, the number was shrinking, then one of the two was not doing what the other was doing.

I do not know what Moses, Jesus, Muhammad, Confucius, Buddha, etc. were doing to increase the number of people around them. What I do know is that the religious scriptures do not state that God asked Moses, Jesus, Muhammad, Confucius, Buddha, etc. to become economic operators, as the elites are now doing at the United Nations (UN member states and organizations).

I have no way of knowing if the reason why Moses, Jesus, Muhammad, Confucius, Buddha, etc. succeeded in increasing the number of people around them is because they were not buying and selling as the officials of the United Nations were doing as of 1945. What I do know is that in 2013-2017, a UN staff member tried to defend the principles included in the UN Charter and the UDHR, and he paid a big price when he opposed the decision of his senior managers to go along with allowing that the United Nations bank account be used to launder money in the Democratic Republic of the Congo to benefit the individuals involved or to accept the request of the office of international development of the government of Great Britain (i.e., DFID now FCDO) to violate the UN financial rules and regulations in Sudan. After the senior managers of the UN staff member, UN investigators, UN judges, and UN Secretary General ganged on him and distorted the truth so they look as righteous, they managed to trample on this UN staff member and throw him and the UN principles that he was defending in the basket of history.

Since antiquity, many people who were naive to the point of defending the truth, as this UN staff member was doing, were crushed and suffered drawbacks that were worse than what he endured. At the same time, I have no way of knowing if reality is a simulation or authentic. What I do know is that if reality is a simulation, then the elites need to ensure that world history does not repeat itself in the future. If reality is authentic, then the elites need to ensure that the transformations that their critical thinkers and servants are effecting in UN member states

do not stumble on actions that resemble the changes that have ensued in the world in the last two thousand years, excluding the events that happened during the rise of Islam or the creation of the United States. This is because only in those two intervals were people more ready than in others to voluntarily surrender freedom to whoever was above them in the hierarchy, as I said before.

Many questions beg answers. For one, can the elites manage to avoid their collapse when the number of laws (standards and norms) that their critical thinkers and servants are positing and enforcing as of 1945 to supposedly secure the UN goals and preserve the power of their masters (the elites) appears to be propagating exponentially instead of polynomially? Most importantly, can the elites manage to avoid their collapse when they allow hypocrites like the UN judges, UN chiefs, and the UN Secretary General, who are selling them for a few dollars, to teach people to love them and to be ready to lay their own lives for them?

Finally, I have no way of knowing if the elites will continue to mix truth with falsehood or allow their critical thinkers and servants to hide the truth knowingly so they can preserve their power. What I do know is that Lebanon is one of the smallest countries in the world (10,452 km²). Lebanon is roughly two-thirds the size of the state of Connecticut. As of 1975, the entropy in Lebanon is reaching new heights with every new year. This disorder is due to the elites permitting their critical thinkers and servants to daze the Lebanese with things that are not true.

If other parts of the world are not experiencing the same entropy presently, this means that the entropy that the Lebanese are experiencing is higher than the entropy that the international order is facing. However, there is a lot we can learn or draw from the entropy that the Lebanese are facing. For example, when we try to study very closely the entropy (the disorder) that exists in Lebanon, we find that it is more and more reaching equilibrium, or its limit. In other words, no matter what laws (norms and standards) or ideas the Lebanese or the critical thinkers and servants of the elites introduce to reduce disorder, no one will have an effect. That is to say, based on the increasing state of disorder (entropy) that this country has been facing since 1975 in

particular, there are only two ways to make the Lebanese go back to observing the rule of law (norms and standards). The first is if their state of equilibrium (i.e., disorder) is dismantled by an external force (i.e., by design). The second is whether this disorder is allowed to take its course.

If the entropy of the international order is not quantifiable, visible, or measurable, as I said before, then there is a good chance that the international order could confront the same political challenges that Lebanon is facing since the elites decided to let their critical thinkers and servants daze the Lebanese with things that are not true. Likewise, when the entropy of the international order reaches equilibrium or its limit, the choices that are confronting Lebanon will be confronting mankind.

I have no way of knowing if when the entropy of the world rises, the weapons of mass destruction that the elites control will make people around the world surrender their freedom to them, or AI can identify and disrupt how people might act in various situations. In other words, I have no way of knowing if AI will make humans like numbers ready to live in a world of their own, or a property that would be ready to be part of a group and willing to maintain the order assigned to them no matter how small the group gets. What I do know is that numbers and humans are not like certain fruits or objects that need specific environments to grow and survive. In addition, what differentiates humans and numbers is that when numbers are rivaling (i.e., being divided, multiplied, deduced, or added) to determine who could resize his neighbor and take his place, they do this operation quietly and they do not speak. In the case of humans, this essence relies on the power of the word to rival, resize a neighbor, or take his place.

In the 17th century, Leibniz suggested that the living force that is contained in the words that people speak does not behave in the same way Isaac Newton believed time is in the 17th century (i.e., a property that was not weaved into the fabric of our universe), but as the force that Jesus in the parable of the Good Shepherd and His Sheep is capable of making the sheep know the voice of the Shepherd and to follow him. [John 10:4]

I have no way of knowing if AI, or the critical thinkers and servants that the elites are depending on for their wisdom, can whisper in the ear of people the type of commands that would make them ready to consider their opinion before taking action on their own or not. What I do know is that since antiquity, the idea that Jesus suggested in the parable of the Good Shepherd and His Sheep, about how the force that controls the world has power over the sheep (i.e., the people) who refuse to listen to its laws [John 10:16], seems to be getting its way till today. Once again, there are events whose maturity takes days, and other takes years. We just have to wait to see if AI and the critical thinkers and servants of the elites could put the world together for their masters, or if the corruption that they are spreading in the land would revert their masters to a simpler form!