

March to Perdition

The UN's Threat to the Anglosphere

Know Your Enemy

Salim Maloof, Ph.D.

Copyright 2022 by Salim Maloof

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

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

Suggested Citation:

Maloof S., March to Perdition, The UN's Threat to the Anglosphere, 2022

This is a work of non-fiction.

Salim Maloof
March to Perdition:
The UN's Threat to the Anglosphere

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

To Mark, Nicholas and Matthew Maloof

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

Part ONE: Wicked As They Come

1. The Impact of Awareness on Global Order 25
2. Man's narcissistic personality disorder dilemma 66

Part TWO: Passport To Shame

1. The quantitative Threat posed by the United Nations 25
2. The qualitative Threat posed by the United Nations 62
3. Leader's Failure to Address the UN Threat 181

Part Three: Know Your Enemy

1. Godless Men 25
2. Dice of Destiny 66
3. The False Road 148
4. The Penalty 200

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 government of the Democratic Republic of the Congo deposits the money into the UN bank account, the United Nations will withdraw its administrative fee, and then it will use its procurement rules to justify waiving open competition and recruit a line ministry within the DRC government to implement the project, redepositing the remaining funds back into the DRC government's bank account 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 payment 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 reported the irregularities in this project to his supervisors, they informed him that the organization would review the situation and take appropriate 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, which was 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 Office for Project Services (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, interview him, or follow any of the UN rules and regulations in cases of misconduct while he was on administrative leave.

When the US national lost all hope of persuading his supervisors to reconsider, he filed an application in the United Nations courts seeking damages for libel, rather than for his termination. At the start of the legal proceeding, the UN judge asked the United Nations (UNOPS) to resolve this case with this 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 made 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 counsels and not use his legal right to put into question why the organization named United Nations was placing him on administrative leave; it cost him his right to any claim! That is to say, had this US national exercised his legal rights (practiced intolerance), his chances to secure them would have been higher! In other words, the United Nations requires individuals to abandon tolerance in order to have any rights and instead encourages them to be intolerant!

The victors of WW2 granted the United Nations privileges and immunities. UN staff and individuals victimized by the United Nations cannot have their cases heard in civilian courts. 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 2022, a corruption ring involving UN managers who exploited the UN as a facade for their malicious activities was exposed and dismantled; these managers had targeted this same UN staff member who refused to prioritize his self-interests over the values outlined in

the UN Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights before. UN member states chose not to request the imprisonment of those UN managers alongside the UN judges who protected them; instead, they accepted the UN's decision to end the contract of those managers while allowing them to keep 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 to ensure he is compensated for the suffering caused by his refusal to participate in their unethical schemes, they believe that allowing this intergovernmental organization to ignore the case will help preserve their own 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, however, is that this case once again confirms the elusiveness of seeking shared values by assigning a formal intergovernmental organization, like the United Nations, the role of custodian of morality and human rights while its administrators simultaneously pursue their own personal development. Throughout history, kings or kingdoms were reverted to a simpler form when they allowed false teachers to manipulate institutions or whenever those false teachers disliked the outcome.

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), the outcome 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 taking 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, in this way, it would be avoided 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, 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 everyday behavior only. The implications of letting the intergovernmental organization named United Nations promote that it was going to end poverty and injustice in all their 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 above 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 architectures do 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 the 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 is 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 to happen 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 does not consist of physical matter. Ideas are visualizations. However, an organization is a legal entity (an artificial person) that real humans operate.

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

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

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 (hereinafter, 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 ongoing 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 continuous 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 examining the impact of man's decision (i.e., human imagination) to diminish the role of religiosity as a tool for controlling behavior in the aftermath of World War II, allowing technology (machinery) to take on the majority of the responsibility. In this regard, and if we are to consider that in theory there is no difference between having a machine deny a person a right and having a real person do 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 World War II to undermine the values that are included in the religious

scriptures could help them get their way despite the resistance of others.

While reading this book, it is important to remember that the author's intention is not to discredit or criticize any religion or faith, to disprove any belief, to instruct readers on whether to have faith in a particular religion over another, or to question any facts presented in any religion or religious text. Likewise, I am not trying to tell you 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. I selected and analyzed all the biblical references solely because I believed they contained ideas that could help me better understand whether the decision made by the victors of World War II (i.e., the families and dynasties that control the international order and the global money supply) to act against the counsel of those chosen scriptures was wise for maintaining their strength and stability.

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.' Whenever I mention the name of the Prophet Muhammad (upon him be peace and blessings), I do not include this phrase in this work. 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 system that determines the value of money, ensuring that no transactions occur on any operating platforms except for the one controlled by its members. 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 that 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 through which 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. This work regards the role of the United States as the global policeman of the world, a functional role delegated to it by the families and 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 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, acting as the global policeman, is to ensure that the social model desired by the families and dynasties that won WW2 is adopted in various UN member states in the aftermath of the war. This social model was summarized in the work program stipulated in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

Leading by example: The phrase “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 that people do on earth is

create material things to improve basic social services (water, health, and 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 blueprint (technology) that can show them how to build tunnel boring machines, 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 the 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 American culture were 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 maintain 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

In 1945, the victors of WW2 assembled the societies they had vanquished and those they had dominated up to that point, expressing a resolve to combine efforts to bring about peace not only for the present but also for the future to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war. The victors of WW2 claim that the immense suffering, violence, and loss of life that they lived through during WW2 outraged their consciences. As a result, they pledged to work together with the United Nations (a new international intergovernmental organization they created) to secure common standards that they drafted, that most people agree can reduce fear and want, including improving peace and security. The UN Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR) outline the work plan that the victors of WW2 proposed for all people to recognize and follow in order to end the historical dynamics that have shaped the world.

Since the time when people worldwide began to effectively apply the work program suggested by the victors of WW2 in the UN Charter and the UDHR to governance issues aimed at achieving peace and security, global stability has been elusive. Since 1945, every year a UN member state has confronted tumultuous urban and rural unrest, crisis and conflicts, wars, economic instability, and electoral misconduct.

Additionally, the ongoing debate regarding the government's role in the economy and the expansion of political rights throughout society has made it increasingly difficult for the victors of WW2 (the heirs of the old powers) to effectively govern the international order or to prevent their authority from being questioned and undermined regularly. At the government level, all UN member states are increasingly becoming beset by internal squabbling among their political systems. The governments that are not relying on authoritarianism to stay in power have become infamous for their corruption and incompetence, leading to widespread public disillusionment and protests against their governance. Amid all the confusion, citizens struggle to understand complex issues such as the conflict between peace and national self-interest, the greater good versus collective security, the balance of power, self-determination,

nationalism, democracy, imperialism, and many others. Citizens are resisting the role of the government in the economy and are scrutinizing their public officials on all sorts of issues, such as corruption, transparency, and accountability in governance. People worldwide are demanding full political and social equality.

When corruption and conflicts of interest in government policy increase, reform is often a final attempt to alleviate tensions, enhance governance and political institutions, and foster international cooperation and national sovereignty. All the plans and talks that the critical thinkers and servants (governments and international institutions) of the victors of WW2 (the heirs of the old powers) have legitimized and enforced to reduce political corruption and improve governance have been ineffective. None of the proposed plans could create a doctrinal change in the public order or in people's attitudes worldwide; rather, they severed ties. In fact, when plans and talk are not being bogged down in procedures and frustration, they usually create a dispassionate space in the midst of the ongoing bloodthirstiness that the victors of WW2 (heirs of the old powers), their global policemen (the United States), and their critical thinkers and servants (governments and international institutions) are all engaged in to determine who could make the weakest consider the opinion of the fittest before taking action on their own.

The vicious and destructive wars and crises that the heirs of the old powers have been grappling with since 1945 are not events aimed at securing the goals outlined in the UN Charter or the UDHR. Rather, the heirs of the old powers forced them on themselves and on the world after they decided to deviate away from the work program that their fathers (the founding fathers of the UN) counselled them to stay faithful to its principles to rejuvenate their power, preferring instead to pursue a new work plan altogether. This new work program involves letting the United Nations and non-state actors such as the World Bank, IMF, NATO, and EU offer political and economic solutions in UN member states alongside governments while enjoying privileges and immunities, as compared to coordinating the work of governments. The heirs of the old powers' approach to achieving the goals outlined in the UN Charter and the UDHR raises many questions regarding the roles and influence of both state and non-state actors in

our societies, as well as the impact of science on these dynamics. Governments used to teach people about political and economic cooperation based on equal rights, even as they froze social spaces and accumulated wealth; now, non-state actors like the United Nations also do this.

If the heirs of the old powers continue to let their critical thinkers and servants (governments and international institutions) struggle with the complex and divided loyalties of their roles, the dynamic that the world has known since 1945 could continue to rise. When most people around the world start to reconcile the varied motivations, interests, speeches, debates, political tracts, and ideologies that state and non-state actors are all the time debating to determine who could make the weakest consider the opinion of the fittest before taking action on their own, the cultural, economic, and political relations that will emerge would encourage disregard and secession, rather than strengthening cooperation. When the international order faces constant, unprecedented, and intensely combustible events, this situation alters the political and military balance. This development can happen against a backdrop of the maintenance of the strength and stability of the heirs of the old powers.

The book *March to Perdition* examines how the heirs of the old powers, global policemen (the United States), critical thinkers and servants (governments and international institutions), and citizens interact with one another, creating a culture that challenges the legitimized political order and grapples with profound questions that have persisted throughout history: What is the proper role of state and non-state actors in economic and social life when public officials are carrying out their responsibility with no accountability and are doing as they choose in the name of peace and security?

The book argues that the United Nations has become a den of thieves after the heirs of the old powers expanded its responsibilities to include providing political and economic solutions in member states. The work argues that if the heirs of the WW2 victors don't disempower the UN and other intergovernmental organizations and return them to their original role of coordinating UN member states, the resulting political and economic crises could severely impact the power, wealth,

and status of the heirs of the old powers or their successors, the US and the Anglosphere.

The objective of the work is to warn the heirs of the old powers about the risks they may face by allowing the United Nations to continue providing political and economic solutions in member states, which could jeopardize their strength and stability. Extending the involvement of the United Nations and non-state actors in the political and economic solutions of nations would not only disrupt their plan to create a one-world government that they would exercise complete political authority over but also dismantle the Anglosphere that their forefathers spent the last 1000 years building. Only the pursuit of the work program that the founding fathers of the UN (the old powers) suggested in the UN Charter or the UDHR could prevent the power, wealth, and status of their heirs from being collateral damage in mankind's ongoing search to prevent or reduce the festering of corruption and distrust.

1

Forest Diplomacy

In 1941, Great Britain and the United States proposed that colonialism end so all people and nations begin to cooperate to achieve freedom. Those two countries defined freedom as a state in which all people and nations can freely determine their political status and pursue their economic, social, and cultural development to promote social progress and improve living standards. To reach this goal, Great Britain and the United States suggested that every person practice tolerance in order to achieve a complete understanding of themselves. Next, translate this gain into politics that would achieve practical results for the greater well-being of society. This work aimed to demonstrate that the existing nations chose not to prioritize exclusively the work program proposed by Great Britain and the United States in 1941 following World War II. Instead, the existing nations, along with the powerful special interests that significantly influence the economic and political life of each country, began to utilize the United Nations and international aid organizations, such as charities, foundations, and banks, to promote human rights and create an egalitarian world. We now have a situation that instead of the past 73 years being used to raise the capacity of governments to be able to possess a complete understanding of themselves, we have been building the capacity of the UN (along with that of the different charities, foundations, banks, etc.) in the different countries so this organization becomes a shadow government in each UN member state. Then again, the existing nations' failure to invest the past 73 years in teaching people tolerance creates a new challenge. The frustration that civil societies experience in managing the distribution of equal rights, along with the resources and means that governments expect to be handled civilly, is being exploited by those in power as a pretext to forfeit democratic legitimacy in order to ensure safety and stability.

For example, Egypt is considered one of the existing nations with the longest histories of any country, tracing its heritage back to the 6th–4th millennia BCE.¹ Historiographers claim that the term “democracy” first appeared in ancient Greek political thought in the city-state of Athens, starting in 507 BC.² In 2013, the head of the Egyptian interim government, who later became the president of Egypt, stated that the ability of the Egyptian people to begin to cooperate democratically or based on the principles of equal rights and material things “takes years” in a country like Egypt to be established.³ If from 507 BCE till 2013, the Egyptian rulers that this country has known have not managed to teach their dependent people to begin to cooperate civilly or based on the principle of equal rights in the same way younger nations managed to tame their own dependent people by getting them to perceive that everyone in the respective order is cooperating on such a principle, thus making them be ready to voluntarily surrender freedom to maintain peace and stability, this situation signifies that either the constant frustration is due to the agenda of the political rulers who ruled Egypt throughout all this time being one intended to keep the peace and security in the country dynamic to forfeit democratic legitimacy or the people that lived in Egypt until 2013 do not know how to distinguish between what is right or wrong. In other words, only the name of the country remained permanent from 507 BC to 2013, but the transient people were the ones who did not know how to distinguish between what is right or wrong throughout this entire time.

Hence, we cannot say that the insecurity that encumbered Egypt starting in 2011 by the new people who are inhabiting this geographical boundary currently is due to the incapability of this group to distinguish between what is right and what is wrong, because if the other way were the case, they would have been ready to continue to live under the auspices of the military rulers who were dominating them since this country obtained its independence principally; this situation signifies that the constant pressure that was preventing the people of Egypt from cooperating democratically until 2011 was the

1 <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Egypt>

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

3 <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Z27UzrhZHxc>

result of induced policies that were preventing the creation of this conversion much earlier.

Some commentators argue that people's increased frustration post-1945 is due to a rise in Islamization, population growth, knowledge, technology, communications, and commerce, as well as environmental degradation, with each factor playing a role either independently or in combination. There are commentators who claim that this rise in intolerance is due to the UN's lack of power to enforce rulings, equality of representation, and veto power. There are others who even claim that the UN failed to prevent conflicts between nations and make future wars impossible due to the role of elite countries, in particular the United States, or membership in the UN Security Council. This work tried to support the claim that none of the aforementioned arguments is the principal reason for the failure of the UN member states to make future wars impossible. Rather, the principal challenge lies in the decision of UN member states to transform the concept of democracy into a means for over 7.5 billion people to use it as a tool for securing their own interests, even when faced with opposition from others.

In other words, the reason why the political leaders in Egypt failed from 507 BCE till 2011 to tame their dependent people in the same way younger nations managed to condition their citizens into believing that everyone is cooperating civilly or based on the principle of equal rights so they would be ready to voluntarily surrender freedom to maintain peace and stability is due to the Egyptian rulers having considered the idea of democracy as a ladder that they could use as a tool to get their way. What those Egyptian rulers were doing as the head of the Egyptian interim government or actual president of Egypt, even claimed during a speech in 2013,⁴ and before him Adolf Hitler also used to attack the British government for,⁵ is that they were taking the ladder of democracy as an idea so they could use it to get their way despite the resistance of others to gain advantage. However, instead of those Egyptian rulers who were ruling this country till 2013 letting the

4 <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Z27UzrhZHxc>

5 https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=YfnAMNEGFAI&list=PLXv5D-9JuxddLMYPxVoRry1jXmwy_n3ZN&index=10

people who were also trying to climb onto this ladder to either ensure that this democratic idea succeed or to ensure their own self-gain also materialize, they were shaking the ladder so everyone else would fall.

If, from 1945 to now, the UN member states are not able to make progress on the idea that the founding fathers counselled that all people cooperate on its premise to ensure lasting peace, then if supernatural forces are not interfering in the social order to block people from cooperating on the basis of the work program proposed, then there must be a rule that is preventing people from cooperating with each other to keep the international order progressing toward the goals that were stipulated in the UN Charter faster.

Let us take this ladder/democratic idea that as of 1945 the UN and all UN member states claimed that all people should begin to use as a tool to either grant them the right to get their way despite the resistance of others to gain advantage and/or to ensure that this democratic idea succeed, and instead of imagining this piece of equipment, which people normally position vertically, assume that it is aligned horizontally on the ground. If so, we can say that the two parallel sidepieces onto which the crosspieces on which people step on any ladder or stair become resemble the way train tracks are aligned parallel to each other. On a train track all the wagons reach the end of the line one after the other. The wagons do not scramble to determine who reaches the end of the line first in the same way runners who are trying to bypass each other in a marathon do or when people on a highway with multiple carriageways also do it.

This signifies that the two choices ahead of humans to progress toward the end of this historical dynamic that the UN member states want the UN to coordinate its progress, including interfering in how to attain it, can be done in two ways. The first way is if UN member states begin to make people become tolerant and ready to reach the end of the line in the same way train wagons do it, one after the other, or in the same way runners in a marathon reach, one after the other, the end of the line. Alternatively, if the UN member states continue to let the UN prompt people to stop being content / tolerant and to begin to scramble to emphasize the importance of fostering human rights to create an egalitarian world, we can say that the path to reach the same end

would be identical to how runners flux at the start of a marathon instead of how they each arrive at the end of the marathon one after the other in the same way train wagons reach the end of the line.

The purpose of this work is not to suggest which approach member states of the UN should adopt between the aforementioned two to reach the end of the historical dynamic. Rather, the goal is to determine whether a rule exists that prevents people from cooperating based on the principles of equal rights, thereby hindering the international order's progress toward the goals stipulated in the UN Charter.

Mechanics is an area of physics concerned with the motions of macroscopic objects.⁶ Physicists suggest that the theory of classical mechanics accurately describes the motion of objects, provided they are much larger than atoms and moving at much less than the speed of light.⁷ Humans do not travel at the speed of light and are much larger than the size of an atom. Thanks to decades of scientific research, engineers are able to prove that any tracked object progresses from one point to the next if people strictly agree to be patient and align themselves in the same way train wagons reach the end of the line one after the other. This conclusion signifies that the work program that the founding fathers of the UN proposed UN member states be devoted to observing makes it possible for any member of the human family to ultimately increase his happiness. Most people had been on a queue, and they all saw that they were ultimately serviced no matter how much their wait ended up taking. However, for various reasons, the UN member states chose not to advance towards the goals outlined in the UN charter by adhering to the work program proposed by the UN's founding fathers. Instead, they allowed the path to reach these goals to resemble a highway with multiple lanes and no fixed speed limit, defining the point on this highway as the moment when people in all nations would be ready to cooperate with one another based on the principles of equal rights.

Most people have been on a highway with multiple carriageways, and they saw how drivers switch lanes to pass the drivers who are ahead of

6 <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mechanics>

7 <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mechanics>

them going slower. Likewise, most people have experienced highways becoming congested when drivers, feeling impatient, choose to exit in search of alternative routes. Drivers who become impatient and choose to seek an alternative route to reach their destination more quickly, rather than waiting for the traffic jam to clear, often find themselves needing to accelerate to justify the time saved and, importantly, driving through unfamiliar neighborhoods. Depending on how comfortable those drivers who look for shortcuts feel, they either drive recklessly or responsibly to reach areas they feel safe in.

As I mentioned earlier, the purpose of this work is not to propose a theory or specific method to UN member states that would help people become more patient, nor to identify ways to prevent impatience. Everyone on the road saw that they all reached their final destination, whether they were stuck in traffic or not. To the contrary, the purpose of this work is to understand the threat that the families/dynasties who won WW2 or the families/dynasties that post-1945 managed to own the companies that, through them, 80% of the world's trading is handled could be wagering on by allowing the UN to adopt a work program that is different than the one the founding fathers of the UN counselled that UN member states be devoted to observing. Specifically, I want to determine whether this select group would know how to maintain its strength and stability after allowing the UN to transform the concept of democracy into a system that enables more than 7.5 billion people to use it as a tool for securing their own interests, even against the resistance of others. Alternatively, this strategy would convert people into becoming impatient and confused in the same way they behave when they are gathered in a stadium and feel threatened. The stampede that occurs does not distinguish between rich and poor, and everyone present becomes threatened.

In other words, I said that most people have been stuck in traffic, but they all reached their destination, whether they waited for the obstacle to clear or took a different route. In fact, in modern times most vehicles are equipped with GPS navigation software (or a handheld one) that provides turn-by-turn navigation information and user-submitted travel times and route details so all those who decide to become tolerant and wait until the obstacle that is creating a traffic jam

is cleared or those who look for an alternative route become better informed.

The people that depend on the different GPS navigation software systems claim that this tool helps them to figure out routing and real-time traffic updates, aids them in reaching their destination faster, and most importantly, helps them to make decisions because of its impact on increasing their awareness. Evidently, the decision of the families/dynasties that won WW2 or the families/dynasties that post-1945 managed to own the companies through which 80% of the world's trading is handled to allow all people to enhance their geolocation and time information is an idea that is not any different than the one those powerful people took to allow the UN to enhance people's awareness about the need to be devoted to fostering human rights to create an egalitarian world. Those two means (i.e., the GPS and the UN workers) are increasing people's awareness. The GPS increases a person's awareness about his physical location in space and time, and the UN teaching increases a person's awareness about what one must do to increase his happiness. One tool is innate behavior (i.e., GPS), and the enhancement relationship occurs between the individual and the instrument. The other is a learned behavior (i.e., UN workers), and the enhancement relationship occurs from one person to another. In this final chapter, I want to verify the following specific detail:

The Global Positioning System (GPS) is a satellite-based radio navigation system owned and operated by the United States government.⁸ The United States government makes the GPS system freely accessible to anyone with a GPS receiver. Because the United States can selectively deny any nation access to the system, as happened to the Indian military in 1999 during the Kargil War,⁹ or degrade the service any time,¹⁰ powerful nations such as Russia,¹¹ China,¹² and other western European countries¹³ began to develop their own GPS systems due to the critical positioning capabilities that would be required by any country during wars. After a good number of

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

9 https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Kargil_War

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

11 <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/GLONASS>

12 <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/BeiDou>

13 [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Galileo_\(satellite_navigation\)](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Galileo_(satellite_navigation))

nations began to develop and maintain their own global navigation satellite systems, the ability of the United States government to weaken other nations by selectively denying them access to such technology. If the U.S. government denied access, people in Russia would find their way more easily than people in Egypt or Mexico. Most importantly, we can say that if the rulers in the United States government decide to selectively pause the GPS that they make freely accessible to all nationals in this country, all the people would go back to depending on regular maps and their wristwatches to obtain information about their geolocation with respect to space and time. When a driver finds himself stuck in traffic on the highway, he will reconsider taking an alternative route to reach his destination more quickly. First, everyone would face a fait accompli and be ready to move on. They would all be ready to continue to live with each other in the same way they were doing it when the GPS was not available. In other words, when the GPS system is gone, their relationship won't change, even though it made them happy.

In this final chapter, I want to check if the people in the United States (or in any nation) would be ready to move on and accept that some people might be better off than them if UN member states were to ask the UN to pause from continuing to increase the awareness of all people about the need to be devoted to fostering human rights to create an egalitarian world.

To put it differently, if the United States government is to selectively deny its nationals access to the GPS, the people in this country would be ready to tolerate that certain drivers know alternative roads that would get them to the same destination faster. The removal of the GPS navigation system would not affect the relationships that people in this country rely on to interact with one another, even when this geolocation tool is no longer available. However, we cannot expect the same relationship to occur when we ask people to go back to living without there being any organization teaching them to increase their awareness to foster human rights to create an egalitarian world; this situation is very serious and worrisome. People who are not ready to tolerate each other and accept that some will exploit the system for personal gain would be willing to do so if certain drivers knew faster alternative routes to the same destination. If we were to selectively

take from the hands of all the drivers the GPS that they all depend on, then people would not be ready to be tolerant. If the UN's awareness makes tolerance impossible, and 7.5 billion people are split between those using democracy to gain advantage and those climbing for their own happiness, the international order could collapse. The situation is very serious and worrisome. This is because people would not be able to organize themselves like runners finishing a marathon one after another; instead, they would be attempting to reach the end of the race while remaining positioned at the starting point as a continuum. This situation is again very serious and worrisome. This is because humans were not programmed to form a continuum like raindrops that amalgamate to create a body of water; instead, they remain physically independent. Humans compete over water supplies, food, and mates, and when these needs are met, people begin to betray, backstab, and crisscross each other to achieve wealth, power, prestige, and fame.

If the UN and UN member states want people to cooperate to foster human rights to create an egalitarian world, this signifies that they want humans to increase their interaction with one another to create this condition. When humans increase their interaction, they form a virtual continuum, but each person remains programmed with his own independent behavior, habits, values, beliefs, etc. If the UN and UN member states want people to increase their interaction to create an egalitarian world, they could be prompting this deep rivalry that emerged in the world post-1945.

To put it differently, if the rulers in the United States government selectively deny the people of this country access to the GPS, they would all stop to know in real time information on accidents, traffic jams, speed and police traps, routing alternatives, fuel stations, etc. People would begin to reconsider their decision to exit a highway when faced with a traffic jam, as they would believe it would enhance their chances of arriving faster at their destination and thereby increase their happiness, which in turn reduces rivalry. However, if every person in the US starts to possess a GPS, thus becoming aware that he can exit off a highway when he encounters a traffic jam to increase his chance of arriving faster to his destination to increase his happiness, which is a process that accelerates rivalry, then if the US and the rest of the UN member states, including the UN and the rest of the aid

agencies, continue to focus on increasing people's awareness to increase their happiness, they would be increasing rivalry in the world. Rivalry pushes people to behave irrationally based on what religious scriptures do report and what most living people can attest to, often leading to conflicts and misunderstandings that can escalate tensions between individuals and groups.

Once again, the purpose of this work is not to make recommendations for decreasing rivalry or preventing the potential collapse of the international order, as the founding fathers of the UN have already established the only known work program to avert such an event. The purpose of this work is to determine if the decision of the families/dynasties who won WW2 or the families/dynasties that post-1945 managed to own the companies through which 80% of the world's trading is handled to let the UN member states, the UN, and any person who feels generous to open an NGO, charity, foundation, etc. and to interfere in how natural and legal rights should be distributed and managed could aid those powerful families/dynasties to maintain their strength and stability. I want to specifically check, as I said, if this idea that those families/dynasties are supporting and financing to create an egalitarian world could disorient them and revert them to a simpler form so new families/dynasties would begin to exercise control of the money supply of the world. Alternatively, those powerful dynasties/families would be able to triumph over the unplanned event that has the potential to cause their disintegration. In other words, I want to determine whether their wealth, power, and military control would allow them to maintain their influence despite resistance from others, or if it would become ineffective as people's awareness continues to grow.

To put it differently, all the movements that people tested with till 1945 were combining three historical factors. Those three factors were organization, doctrine, and a will to make the doctrine succeed. Throughout this period, those who experimented with the new doctrine utilized a three-step flow approach to ensure the success of the ideas they aimed to test. In other words, the people who tested with the new doctrine spread their idea in the same way trees grow. Trees have an innate behavior whereby a tree root becomes buried in the ground and the tree trunk and branches extend towards the sky. If we position a

tree horizontally on the ground, we can say that its shape resembles exactly how runners who participate in a marathon start and end a race. The branches with the leaves are located at the starting point where runners are positioned, while the spot where the race ends represents the point where the main trunk enters the ground.

Throughout history, all the people who tested with new doctrine capacitated a percentage of the population (i.e., branches in the tree) to be responsible for organizing the common people (i.e., leaves in a tree) to make the new idea succeed. All the doctrines that were tested with and failed happened because there was a group of people who did not want to be patient and who decided to test with a new competing idea.

The concept that the families/dynasties who won WW2 or the families/dynasties that in 1945 owned the companies through which a large percentage of the world's trading is handled was proposed, and all the existing nations agreed with it, based on striving to arrange that all people observe tolerance to reach the goals stipulated in the UN charter and reject intolerance. For various reasons, the families or dynasties that emerged victorious in World War II, or those that managed to acquire ownership of the companies responsible for handling 80% of the world's trade post-1945, chose to experiment with a new concept in order to achieve the goals outlined by the founding fathers of the UN in the UN charter. As I said before, those powerful families/dynasties deemed that when every member of the human family becomes capacitated to play an active role in how to attain the goals that were stipulated in the UN charter and new ones, this philosophy should achieve practical results for the greater well-being of society. In other words, we now have a situation in which the families/dynasties who won WW2 or the families/dynasties that in 1945 owned the companies through which a large percentage of the world's trading is handled, plus the group of people whom those powerful people control (i.e., UN, charities, foundations, banks, etc.), plus the group of people who oppose those powerful families/dynasties who control so much in the economic and political life of any nation because they either want to thrust their own ideas to gain advantage or because they are regarded as ineffective, plus all the people whom the aforesaid groups control are all working cooperatively to make “supposedly” the idea that was proposed in 1945 succeed.

From 1945 to now, none of those aforementioned actors can allege that granting the right to every member of the human family to interfere in the social order to provide practical results for the greater well-being of society managed to reduce adversity, inequality, or prevent wars. From 1945 to now, all those actors are working on convincing themselves and each other that a rise in Islamization, population, knowledge, technology, communications, commerce, environmental degradation, etc. is what is preventing them from making progress on any of the goals that were set in the UN charter and the new ones that were later added.

Since 1945, no one among those actors wants to admit that humans could be an object or a species that may not have been programmed to dedicate themselves to delegating to tools the role that the human body was programmed to serve in the natural world. No one wants to admit that “increasing a person's awareness or choices could be a relation that does not result in increasing ultimate wisdom only but one that increases rivalry equally.”¹⁴ [Malooof 2005] In other words, all those actors reject the idea that humans may be objects that behave in the same way other natural objects behave. When an object's speed increases, so does the energy or force of a collision with another object. In other words, when an object that is going at high speed collides with another object, the energy that is released is a lot higher than if the collision occurs when the object is going at a slower velocity, since high-velocity objects collide with greater force. Since 1945, all those aforementioned actors have been trying to support that this basic law of physics is not always true. Since 1945, all those aforementioned actors are trying to prove, as Socrates pointed out, that people are motivated by the desire for happiness and that the more a person knows, the greater his ability to reason and make choices that will bring true happiness. In other words, all those aforementioned actors believe that humans would be able to prevail over the weakness of the will and begin to behave as Socrates pointed out, correcting the distortions that skew one's analyses of benefit and cost. In other words, people would be able to stop doing wrong at the moment when they perceive that the benefits outweigh the costs.

14 Salim Malooof, *Social Improvement and Human Security: Collateral Damage*, 2005

Evidently, any person who, since 1945, has been refusing to act on the ideas that the United States said in 1941 every person must be devoted to pursuing in the aftermath of WW2 and that is to simply increase his awareness to have the courage to be patient must be an individual who does not believe that when awareness increases, rivalry reciprocally increases as well.¹⁵ [Maloof 2005] In other words, any person who does not act on what the United States proposed in 1941 must be an individual who believes that when he surrenders freedom to verify if his neighbor is or is not behaving according to the rule of law versus letting the people who were recruited within a government verify this fact, that this interference would progress mankind to attain the goals that were fixed in the UN charter. Obviously, if this vigilante method works, our predecessors would have spared us from the burden of having to cooperate together based on the idea that the United States proposed, so ultimately everyone can finally live free from fear and want. Likewise, if increasing the awareness of every member of the human family, as per the way the UN and UN member states have been doing for the past 73 years, about why everyone should be devoted to stopping with being content with his way of life and to be devoted to helping his neighbor increase his access to material things and consequently increase his happiness can create a difference, the social order would have begun to show some sign by now.

As I said before, the purpose of this work is not to make recommendations to point to what people must do to achieve the goals that were stipulated in the UN charter; hence, the work program that was laid out by the United States in 1941 shows the way. The purpose of this work, as I said before, is to check if the families/dynasties who won WW2 or the families/dynasties that post-1945 managed to own the companies through which 80% of the world's trading is handled could stop this movement that UN member states and the UN seem to have set in motion, whose adherents seem to believe that if members devote their time to fostering human rights to create an egalitarian world, the UN goals would be attained, from reverting them to a simpler form so new families/dynasties start to exhibit their power.

15 Salim Maloof, *Social Improvement and Human Security: Collateral Damage*, 2005

If the families/dynasties who won WW2 or the families/dynasties that post-1945 managed to own the companies through which 80% of the world's trading is handled, consider that increasing people's choices to foster human rights could not weaken their strength and stability; then this signifies that those powerful families/dynasties who control so much in the economic and political life of any nation must be convinced that there is no force that could weaken them. If the families/dynasties who won WW2 or the families/dynasties that post-1945 managed to own the companies through which 80% of the world's trading is handled, consider that there is no force that could weaken them. Then this signifies that those powerful families/dynasties must be convinced that increased people's awareness would not weaken their stability. If those powerful families/dynasties believe that they could control any threat that seeks to destabilize their wealth, prestige, or power, this signifies that they are undermining the power of human ingenuity to cause unplanned events that could destabilize their strength or stability.

To perfect a civil society that would put an end to the historical dynamic, people must voluntarily or unwillingly practice tolerance for as long as newborns are allowed to freeze social space and accumulate material things on a cumulative basis. If the families/dynasties who won WW2 or the families/dynasties that post-1945 managed to own the companies through which 80% of the world's trading is handled, reaching that increased personal awareness (i.e., increasing the options that become at a person's disposal) reduces an individual's frustration and makes him become tolerant. This signifies that those powerful families/dynasties who control so much in the economic and political life of any nation have reached a postulate that is opposite to what historically increased human knowledge seems to support. In other words, if those powerful families/dynasties who control so much in the economic and political life of any nation reached a point where they can deviate away from the work program that the founding fathers of the UN proposed and instead increase the awareness of any person about options without worrying about the new options that a person acquires confusing the capacitated individual or pushing him to have the ambition to resize them, this signifies that those powerful people believe that they can control any unplanned event that the human brain

can generate that has the potential to destabilize their wealth and power.

Humans are not programmed to predict the future and do not have the potential to prevent unplanned events from taking place. I do not have a way of knowing how the families/dynasties that won WW2 or the families/dynasties that managed to own the companies that, through them, 80% of the world's trading is handled post-1945 reached a point where they could structure or regulate people's motion or behavior without the type of awareness that the UN and international aid agencies are teaching, prompting any person to refuse to have the courage to accept the second best if what one considers the first best is not attainable. On the other hand, those powerful families/dynasties refuse to allow post-1945 new families/dynasties to have the right to develop weapons that can threaten their wealth and power. They also refuse to take action on demilitarizing as per what the leaders in the United States who lived before 1945 counselled that all existing UN member states be devoted to doing (i.e., including the US) to perfect a civil society that would put an end to this historical dynamic, and they seem to have no objection to UN member states boasting about how much financial aid they are spending to militarize.

If the public's demand for social justice continues to grow, all governments will face one of two possible choices. The first choice would be to co-exist in an environment that resembles how peace and security have been in Lebanon since 1975. The people in Lebanon cannot end the ongoing frustration or competition that has persisted since 1975, so peace and security cannot be restored unless one of the competing groups fighting for power either voluntarily surrenders its freedom or is forced to do so. Alternatively, members of powerful institutions within governments can anticipate events that they believe could weaken their strength and stability and take precautions to avoid becoming weakened and reverting to a simpler form as occurred in Egypt during the civil unrest that was taking place during 2013-2014. While the confrontations were ongoing between the different classes of the Egyptian social fabric, the Egyptian military interfered in the social order and ousted the civilian government that was democratically elected and installed an interim government in its place. The Egyptian

military rulers claimed that they acted in this manner to spare the country from plunging into added chaos.

If the aforementioned two options are the only two scenarios that any nation whose citizens voice a need to improve social justice can take, this signifies that those powerful families/dynasties who won WW2 or the families/dynasties that post-1945 managed to own the companies through which 80% of the world's trading is handled believe that they can control any unplanned event that has the potential to destabilize their wealth and power even if members of powerful institutions within the governments in their own home countries try to destabilize them.

I have no way of knowing how those powerful families/dynasties may have reached the point where they could control any unplanned event that has the potential to destabilize their wealth and power in the future. If those powerful families/dynasties reached a way to control all the philosophies and material and human resources components that the UN is teaching and making people become aware of to ultimately create an egalitarian world without such interference pushing people to have the ambition to resize them, this scenario signifies that they must have figured out a way to prevent the treacherous nature that exists in each human character from predominating human relations.

Humans were not programmed to foretell but to predicate. Therefore, I cannot know whether those powerful families/dynasties figured out a way to prevent the treacherous nature that exists in each human character from predominating human relations. Likewise, I cannot know if those powerful dynasties/families figured out a way to manipulate any unplanned event so it would remain integral and prevent any uprising or incident from threatening their wealth, prestige, or power, no matter what the future would hold or any explicit or implicit attempt to resize them occasion.

Until such a claim about humans becoming able to control thought becomes scientifically confirmed, we can only assume that treachery, betrayal, and backstabbing are part of each human character and the priority of the families/dynasties that won WW2 or the

families/dynasties that post-1945 managed to own the companies that, through them, 80% of the world's trading is handled is to prevent that human treacherous nature or character from threatening their wealth, power, and prestige.

It is important that readers keep in mind that the concern to ensure that the families/dynasties who won WW2 or the families/dynasties that post-1945 managed to own the companies that through them 80% of the world's trading is handled do not become disintegrated is not to ensure that their monetary wealth or political power and prestige do not get resized or diminished but rather for their support of the idea to work to ensure that every member of the human family be able to live free from fear and want as stipulated in the UN Declaration of Human Rights. Herein, I would like to once again remind you that the concern to ensure that the power and wealth of the United States in the international order do not become diminished is not necessarily to see that the people in this country continue to get their way despite the resistance of the others, but rather to ensure that the understanding that the American people gained of themselves so they would be ready to surrender freedom to see that no member of the human family lives in fear and wants to be destabilized. This understanding, which the American people gained and which took thousands of years to cultivate, represents the highest human achievement to ultimately perfect a civil society that would put an end to this historical dynamic.

As I said earlier, this culture, which took generations through individual and group striving to cultivate, represents the frontier of mankind's evolution; hence, it ascertains the level of understanding of the dignity and worth of the human person that mankind has reached to date. This culture that the American people managed to reach by 1945 does not belong anymore to the United States only but to all of humanity, as I said in earlier chapters. Therefore, we can continue to let every age, as Carl Philipp Gottfried von Clausewitz pointed out and I mentioned earlier, have "its kind of war, its limiting conditions, and its own peculiar preconceptions" build on this idea as we have been doing since 1945 with one step forward and two backward, or we could continue to let the United Nations help us foster human rights to create an egalitarian world when we know that this organization has

become an economic operator and its officials are deepening treachery in the world.

As I said before, we cannot know if this systemic frustration or intolerance has gradually increased post-1945, making it seem that places once thought to be last to encounter any crisis are now showing evidence of being in crisis. If, as I just said, it was not confirmed scientifically that humans managed to figure out a way to prevent the treacherous nature that exists in each human character from predominating human relations, this conclusion then signifies that the people who pose the biggest threat to the success of the families/dynasties that won WW2 or the families/dynasties that post-1945 managed to own the companies that, through them, 80% of the world's trading is handled to ensure that mankind stays on course to attain the goals that are set forth in the UN Charter could only be from the people whom those powerful families/dynasties commissioned to coordinate the activities between states on a global scale to attain those goals.

For example, when a person is under an imminent threat from multiple individuals, it is those who are closest to that person's physical body who pose the greatest danger. If, as I just said, when many people are surrounding a person, it is the people who are the closest to the physical body of the encircled person who possess the biggest threat to one's own stability and wellbeing, then this scenario signifies that the United Nations workers could be the ones who are instigating this rise in frustration and intolerance that emerged in the world post-1945. This is because the United Nations is the formal organization that was commissioned to coordinate the activities between states on a global scale to attain the initial UN goals and other ones.

To show how this could be the case, I will present two cases. One case supporting the idea that people's ability to influence events in a certain way poses no threat to the families/dynasties who won WW2 or to the families/dynasties that post-1945 managed to own the companies through which 80% of the world's trading is handled (i.e., case A), and another case that does pose a threat (i.e., case B).

Case A: In 2013, the Egyptian military rulers declared that they were worried that religious currents would consider Egyptian opposition a refusal of religion, and as a result, Egypt would face confrontations between people who believe they fight for religion and those who simply want the country ruled in a different way.¹⁶ The Egyptian military junta then alleged that there were forces “taking the country into a dark tunnel”¹⁷ and declared that it was imperative that certain precautions be taken to prevent the ongoing confrontations that were waging in Egypt from breaking out of control. They then gave the first democratically elected president of Egypt and his government an ultimatum of 7 days (the first warning) plus an additional 48 hours (the second warning) to “resolve its differences”¹⁸ or contain the situation and achieve national reconciliation. Before the expiration of the second ultimatum, the Egyptian military rulers requested that the people of Egypt hold mass demonstrations to grant them the right to confront violence and terrorism.¹⁹ The first democratically elected government in Egypt was unable to address the widespread national protests that occurred during the two ultimatums issued by the military rulers. Upon expiry of the two ultimatums, the Egyptian military rulers removed the president of Egypt from power, suspended the Egyptian constitution, and installed an interim government.²⁰ They then provided a “road map” with plans for new parliamentary and presidential elections.²¹ The military rulers were continually expressing that they had no interest in politics²² and that the only reason why they were interfering was because they were fulfilling the mandate that the people of Egypt gave them to confront violence and terrorism to ultimately build a national consensus.

16 <https://www.facebook.com/EgyArmySpox/posts/speech-of-general-abdelfattah-el-sissydeputy-prime-minister-commander-in-chief-m/346300132167642/>

17 <https://www.nytimes.com/2013/07/25/world/middleeast/egypt.html>

18 https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/2013_Egyptian_coup_d%27%C3%A9tat

19 <https://www.nytimes.com/2013/07/25/world/middleeast/egypt.html>

20 https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/2013_Egyptian_coup_d%27%C3%A9tat

21 <https://www.reuters.com/article/us-egypt-protests/egypt-army-gives-mursi-48-hours-to-share-power-idUSBRE95Q0NO20130701>

22

<https://www.aljazeera.com/news/middleeast/2013/07/201373203740167797.htm>

1

The Egyptian Armed Forces did discharge its civil responsibility, contained division, and answered demands of responsibility. The Egyptian military rulers did stay out of politics as promised. In fact, the Egyptian armed forces did not sideline or marginalize any political party in the country after this institution discharged its civil responsibility and removed the first democratically elected president of Egypt. The Egyptian military rulers fulfilled each promise they made to the Egyptian people. The military takeover was only temporary or until fresh presidential elections were held. The establishment of a national government followed.

I believe it is worth highlighting one detail due to its impact on humans' ability to influence events and, thus, to support the idea that complete and absolute certainty of an event's result is only possible once it occurs. This detail is the following. While the military was moving quickly to organize new parliamentary and presidential elections under an interim government to return Egypt to operating under a new democratically elected government, the commander-in-chief of the armed forces and the minister of defense and military production, who led the preemptive bid to stop the forces that were plotting to “take the country into a dark tunnel” and who expressed that he was against suspending the Egyptian constitution of Egypt and holding new presidential elections,²³ decided to end his military career after 45 years of service in order to continue to serve and defend his country but while wearing a civilian uniform.²⁴

The population of Egypt was estimated at 92 million in 2014.²⁵ Two candidates were competing to become Egypt's sixth president in the same year. One of the two candidates was the former commander-in-chief of the armed forces and the minister of defense and military production. According to the Egyptian government, the former commander-in-chief of the armed forces and the minister of defense and military production obtained 97% of the vote, making him the second democratically elected president of Egypt.²⁶

23 <https://www.facebook.com/EgyArmySpox/posts/speech-of-general-abdelfattah-el-sissydeputy-prime-minister-commander-in-chief-m/346300132167642/>

24 <https://www.bbc.com/news/world-middle-east-26764201>

25 <https://www.statista.com/statistics/377302/total-population-of-egypt/>

26 https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/2014_Egyptian_presidential_election

Indeed, the preemptive measures that the Egyptian military rulers took to control and end the violence and unrest that was waging in 2013 in Egypt brought back peace and stability into the country, although the long-term effectiveness of these measures remains a topic of debate among political analysts. Likewise, the efforts that the commander-in-chief of the armed forces and the minister of defense and military production turned to the president have been exhausting in confronting violence and terrorism, including rebuilding the country after he resigned from military service and began to wear a civilian uniform, which has been remarkable so far. However, it is not possible for the newly elected president to convince the Egyptians that he won the election without employing treachery.

Now, irrespective of whether the former commander-in-chief of the Egyptian armed forces and the minister of defense and military production turned president won the country's presidential election through treachery or not, the outcome would not have any impact weakening the strength or stability of the families/dynasties that won WW2 or the families/dynasties that post-1945 managed to own the companies through which 80% of the world's trading is handled. This situation is because this president and his military junta are not the ones who were designated as the formal coordinator on behalf of those powerful families/dynasties to foster human rights to create an egalitarian world, but rather the UN workers were. In fact, the people who rule in Egypt lock up and put in jail any person who teaches anything related to human rights in the country.

Case B: For example, in 2013, a US national who was employed by the UN in the DRC questioned the decision of his senior management to sign a project in which the UN bank account was going to be used in an apparent money laundering operation. The senior managers of this US national program approved that the government of the DRC deposit \$25 million in the UN's bank account. UNOPS, the UN agency that signed this project, will charge a 12% fee after depositing the money in the UN bank account. Then, UNOPS planned to follow UN rules and regulations to redeposit the funds back into the same bank account from which the money originated, allowing the entity that deposited the funds to implement a virtual project.

Instead of punishing the UNOPS employees implicated in this treacherous act, UNOPS managers made it clear to the American national that he has two choices. The first option is to transfer to Sudan if he still wants to keep his job with the UN, and the second option is to wait in the DRC until his contract expires before returning home. In Sudan, this American national discovered that his senior management was involved in similar treacherous acts as those occurring in the DRC, with the only difference being that the misconduct took place in a different geographical area.

In Sudan, this American national refused to accept conditions on a project that were against the UN financial rules and regulations that the Department for International Development (DFID) of the Government of Great Britain was financing.

The decision of this American national to not trade in the DRC or in Sudan the pledge that his political leaders took on his behalf in 1945 and that from this date on, no American would prioritize his self-interest to gain advantage made him pay a big price. His UN senior managers, who were senior government officials in their own countries before joining the UN at the prime minister and minister level, preferred the income that the organization was going to gain (which they pay their salaries from) over observing the rules that they were hired in the first place to protect. Their intolerance led them to conspire to accuse this American national of being a threat to the UN's best interests in order to distance him from the office and secure the fees they expected from the governments of the DRC and DFID.

While under investigation, the supervisors of this American national sent him a letter informing him that they were restructuring the organization and that they were not needing his services any more. They even offered him the chance to apply for the downgraded position he held, despite the accusations that he posed a threat while in that role and the uncertainty regarding whether the disciplinary action would result in his dismissal.

After they informed him about the ending of his contract, his managers sent him a letter to inform him that they cancelled the investigation.

Employers use this unethical tactic to prevent their employees from filing a lawsuit against them. By proceeding with the cancellation of the investigation, the UN effectively prevented this American national from filing a lawsuit, as his supervisors could claim that his dismissal was due to restructuring rather than the charges against him.

Throughout the entire time this American national was under investigation, he was not informed of the identity of the person who pressed charges or of the exact charges, in total violation of the UN's legal framework. In other words, the UN failed to grant him due process.

The American national launched a law suit at the UN court to seek damages for violating his rights to due process while under investigation. When the proceedings started, his supervisors agreed to settle with him and even promised to recruit him back if he dropped the case. Then again, this American national paid a big price when he assumed that the UN courts are independent and impartial. After the UN judges learned about the unfairness and wrongdoing by senior UN officials (who were former politicians), including hearing UN investigators say that this American national was charged against their advice and hearing his immediate supervisors testify that those senior officials were hiding their misconduct, the UN judges rejected his application on the ground that it was time barred.

The UN judicial system deemed this American national's application time-barred because he exhibited tolerance. The penalty that he committed is that he waited until the UN lawyer informed him that the case was cancelled to challenge the UN decision charging him. By following his government's instructions after 1945 to accept the charges and surrender his freedom in exchange for his remaining rights, he forfeited his right to a fair hearing. The UN judicial system decided to deny this American national right to compensation because he did not employ reactive coping and challenged why his supervisors charged him as per UN rule within 60 days of the date he was informed that he was a threat. By choosing to adhere to the standards and waiting until the UN informed him that the investigation was cancelled before taking action, he lost his right to make any claims.

Upon appeal and despite showing evidence to support that the decision that is being contested is not time-barred and has nothing to do with the dismissal but his rights to due process, the UN judges dismissed the case by arguing that the American national changed his claim on appeal.

The behavior that the UN officials or the UN judges portrayed is not new. The challenge with the UN's actions—accusing this American national of being a threat to sideline him from the office, allowing the organization to gain income his supervisors would lose if the two businesses went through, and the dismissal of his application to protect the UN's interests and avoid paying his due compensation—is much more complex than the UN assumes.

The UN is the formal organization that the families who won WW2 or those who owned the companies that handle 80% of the world's trade are relying on to maintain their power and stability. Those powerful families and dynasties, who control significant aspects of the economic and political life in any nation, could be using the UN to implicitly or explicitly achieve their goals regarding the evolution of international order.

If the UN has become a ground where its officials are using their authority to make events fall in certain ways to protect their best interests rather than their masters' best interests, as the treachery that the UN officials exhibited seems to point to based on how they treated this American national, then the conduct of the UN is serious and worrisome. First and foremost, this signifies that the UN could revert the families/dynasties who won WW2 or the families/dynasties that post-1945 managed to own the companies through which 80% of the world's trading is handled to a simpler form, in the same way the officials of this organization reverted this American national when he decided to prioritize the importance of the work program that those powerful families/dynasties defined in the aftermath of WW2 over the unimportance of his happiness. The situation is very serious and worrisome. In other words, if the UN officials are prioritizing their happiness, as the way they denied this American national his rights seems to point, then because humans can make events fall in different ways, which makes it impossible to have a complete and absolute

certainty of the result of an event until it occurs, the officials of this organization connive to resize the families/dynasties that won WW2 or the families/dynasties that post-1945 managed to own the companies through which 80% of the world's trading is handled in the same way as the families/dynasties that managed to oust the military rulers that were ruling in Egypt during the 2011 revolution.

The military rulers in Egypt managed to regain political power after being ousted in 2011, but their return cast a long shadow over the prospect of Egypt transitioning to a new civilian democracy, as was seen in 2012. Could the families/dynasties who won WW2 or the families/dynasties that post-1945 managed to own the companies that, through them, 80% of the world's trading is handled be capable of preventing their collapse after the UN has become an organization whose officials are using its ground to increase their happiness? Could those powerful families/dynasties who control so much in the economic and political life of any nation manage to bounce back and take control of the international order in the same way the military rulers managed to get back to the center of political power if people's outcry for social justice continues to grow and people continue to recognize each other?

As I said before, the purpose of this work is not to make predictions about what the future would hold for the families/dynasties who won WW2 or the families/dynasties that post-1945 managed to own the companies through which 80% of the world's trading is handled, but rather to comprehend if their heirs would be able to continue to uphold the work program that they are endorsing while UN officials are using their power differential to desecrate the UN rules and regulations to accommodate the income that would increase their happiness, including using the UN ground to deny people rights.

As the previous chapters showed, the decision of the UN member states to deviate away from what Great Britain and the United States counselled the UN be created to serve and to let the UN, along with development aid agencies, interfere in the social order is among the principal reasons why the world remains insecure.

In the Bible, it is reported that Jesus entered a temple and found people selling and buying in the temple court in the same way they do in markets. The story says that when Jesus saw the people using the temple court to buy and sell, “he overturned the tables of the money changers and those selling doves.” He then said, “My house is a house of prayer, and you are making it a den of robbers.” The story says that he managed to throw out all the money changers and those who were selling doves, and Christianity survived until now.

The families/dynasties who won WW2 or the families/dynasties that post-1945 managed to own the companies that, through them, 80% of the world's trading is handled could continue to let the UN officials boast about this culture of impunity that any UN worker is automatically granted when he starts to transact in the name of this organization and comes with rights to privileges and immunity, or they could continue to ignore the complex threats that they could be sowing by allowing that treachery overshadow the truth.

In other words, those powerful families/dynasties could allow the interpretation of democracy to be a state that produces the dictatorship outcome that now exists in Egypt to arrive at artificial peace and security, or they could do as Jesus did and flush out those fake rulers who are in Egypt preaching their own form of democracy from their den so the real version that the people in the United States practiced from 1945 to 1945 takes over. Similarly, those powerful families/dynasties could continue to allow the UN or its officials to exploit their power differential to simplify the lives of those who prioritize their country's work program over their own happiness, as this American did at a great cost, or they could revoke the right that UN officials currently enjoy, which allows them to act without fear of punishment, thereby ensuring that no one perceives them as above the determination of the world's people to make the international order proposed by the United States successful.

Every choice carries its benefits and its detriments. For example, no one knows what impact Jesus’s decision to overturn the tables of the money changers and those who were selling doves in the temple court had on the families/dynasties who condemned him and crucified him because they felt that he was teaching ideas that contradicted what

ensured that their strength and stability were maintained. Likewise, no one knows if Christianity would have survived if Jesus did not overturn the tables of the money changers and those selling doves and kick them outside the temple ground.

If every choice a person takes carries a weight and it does not matter if the idea that the person is promoting is right or wrong, as Jesus's fate is a good example, this signifies that the security of an individual is not a function of the righteousness or wrongfulness of the idea that the person promotes or insists on its truthfulness or falseness but rather is a function of the powerful differential that a person or a group of people employ to see that their strength and stability do not get resized. This is very serious and worrisome. In other words, when Jesus preached an idea, people connived to arrange that he gets crucified so he does not continue to threaten their strength and stability or resize them, when in principle, those families/dynasties who decided to crucify Jesus should have not only eliminated him but also barred his idea from continuing to spread, including wiping out any historical reference to his existence or to his idea so no one would remember him or his idea, thus posing the slightest threat. But as we saw, the families/dynasties that were in power did not bar his idea from continuing to spread and/or wipe out any historical reference to his existence or to his idea so no one would remember him or his ideas and be influenced by them. And since it is not possible to know if the families/dynasties who were in power at the time when Jesus lived acted in the manner they did because they wanted to take advantage of the movement that he influenced to continue to grow or if they did it because they were powerless in front of the masses that his idea managed to attract, this signifies that if the families/dynasties who are now controlling so much in the economic and political life of any nation continue to allow the UN to grow and to spread the ideas that they suggested on how they would like the international order to be reoriented to accommodate their interests and the interests of others post-1945, the families/dynasties who are using this organization as a platform to increase their happiness will use their power differential to revert each other to a simpler form in the same way the families/dynasties who crucified Jesus did when his idea threatened them or either they saw it as an opportunity to build on it.

Moreover, it is unclear whether the families or dynasties in power during Jesus' time viewed his idea as a chance to increase their wealth after his death, or if entirely new families or dynasties utilized his idea to gain power. This scenario signifies that if the families/dynasties who are now controlling so much in the economic and political life of any nation continue to let the UN be the formal organization that is coordinating activities between states on a global scale and, at the same time, a commercial entity that different families/dynasties use its legal identity to transact in the same way commercial companies do to increase their happiness, they face the same end that Jesus had to yield to. This situation is because what Jesus was promoting was an idea, and what the families/dynasties who won WW2 or the families/dynasties who post-1945 managed to own the companies that through them 80% of the world's trading is handled are promoting is also an idea. Until Christianity was legalized, Jesus and all those who preached his idea were either killed, imprisoned, or reverted to a simpler life. Since 1945, all the violence and wars that people are aware of have been aimed at ensuring the success of the ideas or work programs promoted by the families and dynasties that won World War II.

However, if from 1945 to now, all that mankind has to show for it is that those who decided to emphasize the importance of the work program that the families/dynasties who won WW2 want UN member states to prioritize to ensure lasting peace are either dying (i.e., all the soldiers of the different UN member states who died in the line of duty to let the idea of the UN charter succeed) or reverted to a simpler form (i.e., the US national who prioritized the UN charter instead of his happiness and lost his job and any claim to any right), then this is very serious and worrisome.

This is because if the families/dynasties who are now controlling so much in the economic and political life of any nation continue to delay the process of plunging the world into a new global war (1) to stop the people, the UN made them start to focus on what their neighbor is doing instead of letting governments be responsible for determining how natural and legal rights should be managed and distributed, and (2) to resize the international order so every nation goes back to knowing its place in the international order, then two scenarios can

await the world. The first scenario is that nations not in crisis will start to show signs of crisis like Lebanon, and the second is the one I mentioned in Egypt. Therefore, the choices facing the Lebanese people regarding the ongoing outcry for social justice could lead to one of two scenarios. The first is whether the Lebanese people would voluntarily or involuntarily surrender their freedom to the Lebanese military or to the strongest faction in the country so peace and security could start to be normalized. The second is if the Lebanese people would voluntarily or involuntarily surrender freedom and start to practice the work program that is stipulated in the UN charter—one that the country's power holders seem to oppose. This signifies that if the Lebanese people do not come to terms with and begin to implement the work program outlined in the UN charter, they may face a situation similar to that of the people in Egypt. The situation is very serious and worrisome.

If the families/dynasties who won WW2 or the families/dynasties who post-1945 managed to own the companies that, through them, 80% of the world's trading is handled, and decide to not plunge the world into a new global war and continue to favor how to prioritize how to safeguard their power instead of actively defending the idea that they wanted people around the world to observe in 1941 to reaffirm faith in the dignity and worth of the human person, then the current global governance system would continue to erode and to progress toward showing signs of UN member states returning to being ruled unilaterally anarchically, as the case is like in Egypt, China, or Russia, where democracy is perceived to be a competition between the military rulers and the civil societies in the country. Therefore, some nations cannot sustain themselves without depending on external resources, potentially undermining their sovereignty. Such an outcome would result in two scenarios. Those two would determine whether the hegemonic country or the countries establishing a balance of power would allow intergovernmental organizations to coordinate activities to regulate the order's existence.

Throughout history, no country or empire has managed to get all the organized societies around the world to consider its opinions before acting, so this scenario is rare. For this scenario to work, those in

power would need to control and regulate people's thoughts, including how ideas are shared.

Hence, it is highly likely that if the families/dynasties who won WW2 or the families/dynasties who post-1945 managed to own the companies through which 80% of the world's trading is handled decide to prioritize how to safeguard their power instead of actively defending the idea that they wanted people around the world to observe in 1941 that more than one country would be establishing a new balance of power after the current global governance system plunges into a unitary system that is geographically anarchic, this signifies that those remaining actors may decide to permit or forbid intergovernmental organizations to coordinate activities between them.

I have no way of knowing if the families/dynasties who would be controlling so much in the economic and political life of the nation and the ones who would manage to cause the families/dynasties with small powers to consider their opinions before taking actions of their own would decide to permit or forbid intergovernmental organizations to coordinate activities between them.

This work aims to see if the American values and attitudes acquired over generations through individual and group striving would remain intact, rather than to see if the families/dynasties controlling the nation's future economic and political life would support coordinating activities through intergovernmental organizations to maintain the international order they would be fixing or do it themselves. As I mentioned earlier, this American culture represents a culmination of cultivated behaviors that humanity has invested thousands of years in developing. This American culture does not belong anymore to the United States but to all of humanity because it is like any idea or religion that humans determine and strive to promote. Most people believe that ideas, religions, and philosophies, like humans, undergo a cycle of birth, growth, and eventual death. In 1945, the American people's newfound understanding of themselves helped humanity begin to secure the aspirations necessary for cooperation based on the principle of equal rights. Hence, this teaching is the only philosophy that mankind could explore to ultimately perfect a civil society that would put an end to this historical dynamic. If the families/dynasties

who control so much in the economic and political life of the nation allow the aspirations that were woven by all the people (or nations) in the UN Charter, which is an extension of American culture, to erode, the result would be mankind beginning to lose interest in this only idea that is known to man to increase happiness. This idea is the philosophy embodied in the US Constitution that all men are created equal. If this doctrine were to perish, mankind would revert to the doctrines that were tested prior to 1945, as exemplified by the current governance system that the Egyptian people are adopting since the country's independence. This governance system in Egypt, which favors exploitation, domination, and subjugation, also exists in many other countries, with France, Russia, China, and India at the top of the list. The only reason the exploitation in France, Russia, China, or India isn't exposed like the abuse in Egypt is that those countries can prevent leaks about their activities.

Hence, the choices ahead of the families/dynasties who would be controlling so much in the economic and political life of the nation in the future would be a choice between deciding whether to organize the international order so it would be divided between what George Washington (1732 – 1799) did when he agreed to surrender freedom and ruled for two terms²⁷ only, thus giving the principle of equal rights a chance to prosper as the case happened in the United States right after this country obtained its independence versus the manner the rulers in Egypt and in other countries are doing it, where they prevent any political parties from developing power to compete. For example, Egypt, one of the oldest nation-states, still claims that it will take years for its people to understand and practice democracy.^{28,29} In other words, it's as if humans were an immortal species and thus could have a chance to benefit from the democratic idea that a person is obliged to devote his life to legitimizing! I will use the remaining work in this chapter to determine if we could expect this American culture to survive and/or if it would be disintegrated so those successors go back to living in the “dark tunnel” that the Egyptian military rulers claimed that they were interfering in the social order to prevent the people of Egypt from knowing. In other words, I plan to determine if the practice

27 <https://www.history.com/topics/us-presidents/george-washington>

28 <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Z27UzrhZHxc>

29 https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=n_WKGeOuShQ

of the American culture would lead mankind to live in obscurity or if the practice that the political leaders in countries like Egypt and others are adopting would eventually bring any nation to such a fate.

If the American culture survives, its success would signify that the heirs of the families/dynasties who won WW2 or the families/dynasties who post-1945 managed to own the companies that, through them, 80% of the world's trading is handled and that included the new ones that would be part of this league managed to prevent the ideas that other families/dynasties would be using to resize them. Most importantly, if the American culture survives, it would also mean that Welch's concern about the disintegration of the United States would not materialize, despite all the events that the world would witness.

If the people who are in positions of power now and the new ones that would succeed them in the future decide to continue to cooperate to secure the goals that are set forth in the UN charter, those people would need to continue to proclaim that their mindfulness about the worth of the human person remains their highest aspiration.

"Aspirations" is defined as a strong desire to achieve something high or outstanding.³⁰ The ideas or things that people care deeply about can be concepts whose righteousness or wrongness is rationalized by individuals, or they may result from a process involving many participants. For example, a strengths, opportunities, aspirations, results (SOAR) analysis is a strategic planning tool that focuses an organization on its current strengths and vision of the future for developing its strategic goals.³¹

The challenge is that the aspirations that an individual could care deeply about and devote his life to attain and/or the goals that a sum of people come up with using a decision-making method such as SOAR could come to fruition during the life of the person (or people) who prioritize specific ideas, and they may materialize after their death. Perhaps the bigger the aspiration(s), the closer a person or a team of people must follow to see them materialize. For example, no one

30 <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/aspiration>

31 <http://asqservicequality.org/glossary/strengths-opportunities-aspirations-results-soar-analysis/>

knows what John Lackland (1166–1216), King of England, aspired to achieve during his time. Despite becoming unpopular with the English nobility and clergy during his reign, he managed to resize the nobility and the clergy, leading to the rise of the British Empire, which at the end of the second millennium became one of the biggest empires the world has known.

If we take the aspirations that the rulers in Egypt are claiming that they are exhausting efforts as of 2013 to eventually attain and the policies of domination that they are employing to attain those things that they are claiming everyone in the country cares deeply about, many political observers would have a difficult time imagining how such treatment could lead to achieving the results that the British Empire managed to attain.

It is unknown whether the policies that John Lackland adopted when he became unpopular and the nobility and the clergy revolted against him were identical to the strategies that the Egyptian rulers rationalized that they are now temporarily pertinent to eventually produce for the people of Egypt the happiness that the political leaders who succeeded Lackland in Great Britain managed to achieve.

However, when we examine the social construction realm that emerged after 1945, we find that the resizing patterns occurring since then do not resemble the socio-politico-economic competition trends that existed before 1945. Before World War II erupted, nations were adjusting the socio-politico-economic structures or geographical social spaces of their competitors without altering their own internal socio-politico-economic structures. The apparent resizing that emerged post-1945 seemed to lead to the collapse or reduction of power among those who exercise political authority within a specific socio-politico-economic structure and geographical social space. This new impression that emerged post-1945 is a result, of course, of UN member states adhering to the requirement of respecting the sovereign rights of all peoples and their territorial integrity as stipulated in the UN Charter.

The scary or incomprehensible part in the new way people are sizing each other up post-1945 is the animosity that certain people (or

nations) are expressing toward the United States, which should not take place at all if those people who are expressing discontent understood the doctrine that the United States proposed. In the book, *The Prison: Reflections on how the United Nations is weakening Republicanism and Liberalism*,³² I have described the international order that the families/dynasties who won WW2, or the families/dynasties who were controlling so much in the economic and political life of the nation in 1945, adopted to ensure lasting peace. In this book, I aim to demonstrate that the international order is similar to the organizational structure found in a prison, where each nation is treated as an individual prison cell unit.

If the people in the nations that are discontent with the United States understood the international order that the families/dynasties who won WW2, or the families/dynasties who were controlling so much in the economic and political life of the nation in 1945, adopted, they should be grateful to the United States for having managed to let those powerful families/dynasties accept ending colonialism so people begin to free themselves from continuing to live under the dominance of their own corrupt political leaders. The revolt that began in Lebanon in October 2019 represents a shift toward this end. But if the people in Lebanon, Egypt, and other countries are not able to free themselves from continuing to live under the rule of the political leaders who are controlling their country in partnership with the military rulers to posteriorly start to cooperate based on the work program that is stipulated in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, this signifies that those powerful families/dynasties who are controlling so much in the economic and political life in Lebanon and the ones who are doing the same in other countries have not understood how the international order works and how it could be scaled so it could be used to maintain peace and stability within a given country, including how this doctrine could be used to maintain one's own strength and stability.

On the other hand, two competing scenarios contribute to the instability engulfing many countries worldwide. The first scenario involves the refusal of political leaders in unstable countries to either coordinate according to the work program defined in the UN Charter

32 Maloof S., *Reflections on how the United Nations is Weakening Republicanism and Liberalism*, 2018, www.centermpa.com

or to relinquish their freedom to the United States, which could assist these countries in establishing that work program. The second scenario results from political leaders in unstable countries implementing work programs that are incompatible with the one defined in the UN Charter. Those two competing scenarios (i.e., rise in global protests) are partly due to the failure of the powerful families who control much of the world's economy and politics to take responsibility. To give an example, most political leaders in Lebanon are warlords. If the families/dynasties who control so much in the economic and political life of any country had permitted fiscal responsibility in Lebanon to remain at a higher level, the rule of law would have improved. Likewise, if the families/dynasties who control so much in the economic and political life of any country permitted the military rulers in Egypt to avoid going back in 2013 to the work program that the people in this country rebelled against in 2011, Egypt would not have relapsed back into the same social and political order that existed pre-2011.

If there are many countries that are unstable in the world, due mainly to the political leaders of those nations refusing to surrender freedom to cooperate based on the work program that is defined in the UN charter or to surrender freedom to the United States so this country orients them on how to troubleshoot their socio-political system to increase their happiness and the happiness of their dependent people, we can say that a principal reason for this rise in intolerance or frustration that emerged in the world as of 1945 is due to the families/dynasties who won WW2 or the families/dynasties who, post-1945, managed to own the companies through which 80% of the world's trading is handled, beginning to emphasize the importance of their own personal power and conscience over the one that is emphasized in the UN charter to distinguish between what is right and what is wrong.

If the families/dynasties who controlled as of 1945 so much in the economic and political life of any UN member state are favoring that their actions be harmonized based on what their personal power and conscience dictate to them between what is right and what is wrong rather than based on the work program that the founding fathers of the UN counselled they remain faithful to its norms, their behavior

signifies that those powerful families/dynasties are rationalizing based on what their own self-construct is splitting or perceiving as what is right from what is wrong and not based on what the founding fathers of the UN counselled they start to motivate post-1945 to ensure lasting peace.

In other words, if the families/dynasties who as of 1945 control so much in the economic and political life of any country are permitting that the people of Egypt change the constitution of the country to allow a serving president to remain president for life,³³ this signifies that those powerful families/dynasties are deviating away from the work program that the founding fathers of the UN counselled they remain faithful to its norms, because they are prioritizing their happiness over the importance of the work program that those founding fathers counselled they secure its observance.

If the families/dynasties who won WW2 or the families/dynasties who post-1945 managed to own the companies that, through them, 80% of the world's trading is handled by, are prioritizing their happiness over the importance of the work program that those founding fathers counselled they remain faithful to its norms, and if all people are motivated by the desire for happiness, we can say that this behavior should lead to a social construct that would motivate multilateralism. The social construct would be split between those who claim to be faithful to the work program that the founding fathers counselled everyone to keep in mind to increase their ability to get their way despite the resistance of others by being unfaithful to its norms, and those who claim to be behaving faithfully so the same work program succeeds. The latter group is loyal to the work program the founding fathers advised everyone to remember so they could use it to get their way despite resistance. If their goal was otherwise, they would have become monks. That is said, we can say that the families/dynasties who, as of 1945, control so much in the economic and political life of any UN member state and all the people from rulers to common people in UN member states who claim that they are faithful to the work program that the UN Charter stipulates but whose actions show the opposite belong in one group. Likewise, we can say that all the

33 <https://www.cnn.com/2019/02/14/africa/egypt-sisi-parliament-approves-presidential-term-extension-intl/index.html>

remaining individuals who claim to be faithful to the work program outlined in the UN Charter are, in reality, using it as a tool or a means to achieve their own goals, despite facing resistance from others. Moreover, we can say that the intergovernmental organizations, non-governmental organizations, charities, foundations, aid banks, bodies, institutions, and unions and coalitions that those groups create and depend on to resize each other up, their members are also using the work program that the founding fathers counselled everyone be keeping always in their minds to ensure lasting peace to achieve their way despite the resistance of others. In fact, I tried to show in this work in earlier chapters how instead of people letting all those platforms that they create to resize each other remain neutral as our predecessors did in antiquity, the people who are in positions of power want the members of those platforms to become economic operators who operate with privileges and immunities (i.e., the UN workers).

The people who promote peace congresses and invite people to work for a world free of want and fear find enormous support. When Christ suggested people harmonize actions to work for a world free of fear and want, all the people who heard his ideas (and especially the poor) were ready to voluntarily surrender freedom to observe his suggestions, minus the rich or the families/dynasties who were ruling around that time. The ruling families and dynasties crucified Jesus when he was 33 years old. Jesus did not create a movement whose members began preaching his ideas, but he was doing it himself.

The United States is not a human being but a legal entity. In 1941, the leaders of the United States took the ideas that they care deeply about and managed to convince the families/dynasties who controlled so much in the economic and political life of any existing nation around that time to agree to surrender freedom to work for a world free of want and fear in the aftermath of WW2. Surprisingly, we find that in some nations, the poor do not seem to reciprocate this offered opportunity as the poor who heard Jesus' ideas did, based on what most historians depict, possibly due to a lack of trust in the intentions of the United States and the perceived disparity between the ideals presented and the realities experienced by these populations. Since 1945, many poor people have shown hostility towards the United States, while both poor and rich individuals are beginning to support

ideas that advocate for the collective efforts proposed by the US in the UN Charter in 1941 so the US either dominates the world or solely increases the happiness of its dependent people. As I said before, this behavior is abnormal and is very serious and worrisome at the same time. In other words, the rich, not the poor, should be expressing disenfranchisement with the United States. The principle of self-determination, which includes the principles of equal rights, was proposed by the United States to encourage all people to harmonize their actions based on this premise after 1945; however, it primarily benefits the rich rather than the poor. It is the rich who should be against the United States and not the poor. In fact, the United States proposed in 1941 that people in all the land harmonize their actions post-WW2 in exactly what religious clergy preach: keeping fellowship in mind. People do not show the same behavior when their ecclesiastical religious organization demands that they surrender freedom, as many individuals may prioritize their spiritual obligations over personal liberties, which are two leading causes of conflict between faith and autonomy. Actually, different clergy teach their adherents to be tolerant so that those who follow the religious teachings they believe in can be rewarded in heaven. The United States urged people from all nations to come together and practice tolerance and ethics in order to create a world where everyone can find happiness both on earth and, for those who believe in eternal life, in heaven.

If the invitation of the American people to the rest of the existing nations to work for a world free of want and fear has prompted some people (and some nations) to consider this offer as a threat post and not as an opportunity, and if, on the same hand, the religious traditions and values that our predecessors depended on to create change are not attracting newborns post-1945 to cooperate to create lasting peace, then only one conjecture can explain what could be prompting this abnormal rise of intolerance in recent years. This suggests that people began to influence each other's behavior after 1945 based on a "rule" that inherently prevents individuals from practicing tolerance, unlike our predecessors who were able to do so before 1945. In other words, a "rule" emerged in the world post-1945 that guarantees a person will be dissatisfied, regardless of how hard he tries to avoid being influenced to be intolerant.

People develop intolerance from two sources. The first source is prompted by what one's own senses drive, and the second is propelled from one's own internal imagination. Could the failure of UN member states to prevent wars after 1945 be attributed to their decision to deviate from the work program proposed by the United States and to allow the UN and various development aid agencies to interfere in the socio-political and economic affairs of governments?

If the circumstances that prevented the UN member states from preventing wars post-1945 are due to the UN member states having converted the UN into a "den of robbers," as the way the UN officials treated this American national who refused to prioritize his self-interest over the ideas that his government instructed him to always keep in mind and to respect, then it is highly likely that the circumstances that Jesus dealt with would be events that the United States would experience as well.

Let us take a weight hung from a fixed point so that it can swing freely backward and forward (i.e., a pendulum). Let each end of this hanging weight that would be swinging forward and backward be set to represent zero. Let zero refer to crises and conflicts or ruin. In other words, when Jesus was teaching people to be tolerant, he managed to decelerate people's interests in material things, thus pushing those who sympathized with his movement to decrease their consumerism or to swing backward. When the people decreased their consumerism (i.e., swung backward), the rich launched a war against Jesus and crucified him because all their interests, assembly lines, or factories were being affected. If the UN is teaching people to be intolerant and to accelerate their access to consumerism or material things, then this organization is pushing people to swing forward. If people swing forward, such a shift would mean that people are requiring that material things be shared on equal footing. When people's need to share on equal rights and material things increases, the US, who is playing the global policeman role, would be required to strengthen the rule of law. The more the US tightens its grip on law and order, the more the internationalists, greedy bankers, and corrupt politicians who Welch said are working to establish a one-world government that the UN would act as its authority would have no other choice but to see that

the sovereignty of the US gets collapsed to prevent that when the gap between the rich and the poor becomes so small that such a shift would compromise their interests.

If human nature has not changed since man appeared on earth, John Welch's concern that U.S. sovereignty was at risk of disintegration after the U.S. allowed the UN to maintain its stability and strength appears justified.

Likewise, if whoever dedicates his life to seeing that ideas that are embodied in aspirations like the one Jesus prioritized, he/she becomes reverted to a simpler form when the idea begins to interfere with people's interests, then there is a good chance that the families/dynasties who are to this day still defending this collective idea to create a peaceful world in the United States will become reverted to a simple form as well. This is because the idea that Jesus was prioritized and the idea that the United States proposed in the UN Charter are one and the same. They both counsel practicing tolerance. After the UN member states (including the US) decided to deviate from the ideas that the founding fathers of the UN (i.e., the US) counselled that existing nations be devoted to securing post-1945 to ensure lasting peace in favor of letting the UN and international aid organizations do the opposite (i.e., accelerate people's access to material things, knowledge, or feelings, thus, in so doing, increasing people's intolerance), we seem to have been devoted as of 1945 to testing whether we can produce a different outcome than the ones that are reported in the religious scriptures happened to those who prioritized ideas like the one that Jesus emphasized.

I wish to highlight my strong belief that the United States opposed UN members, the UN, and international aid organizations increasing people's access to knowledge and feelings at the rate that transpired around the world post-1945, because this country knows better. In other words, the US knows that humans were delegating to automation the actions that the human body may have been programmed to perform in the natural world, and so I strongly believe that the US political leaders went along with this idea because they were helpless. For example, when the US national was prioritizing the ideas of the

UN Charter and, in so doing, going against the best interests of the UN, he was helpless.

Once again, the purpose of this work is not aimed at proposing new solutions (i.e., hypotheses) to the United States or UN member states regarding how to prevent the UN and international aid organizations from accelerating the collapse of their ideas (or the international order). The principal purpose of this work is to determine whether John Welch's fear that the UN poses a risk to the US's ability to maintain its stability and strength is valid. This information can give us insight on whether the families and dynasties that control significant aspects of the economic and political life of any existing nation today would be able to maintain their own stability in the future. In other words, if the people whom those powerful families expect them to prioritize as of 1945 (i.e., the UN goals) can be reverted to a simpler form when they prioritize their work program over increasing their self-interest, as happened to the US national, this signifies that if those powerful families continue to allow the UN to be an economic operator while granting rights so its workers enjoy immunity and privileges, including maintaining their own judicial system, they would be reverted to a simple form in the same way the senior UN officials whom they are trusting at this intergovernmental organization to protect their strength and stability reverted this American national to one when he prioritized their work program (i.e., the work program stipulated in the UN charter) over the work program of his supervisors (which is to increase their happiness).

8

Dice of Destiny

At this juncture, it's crucial to remember that in 1941, the United States proposed to the families and dynasties who had won World War I and were involved in another global war starting from 1939 to resize the families and dynasties attempting to undermine their position so they would be the ones to start getting their way despite the resistance of others. They suggested creating a new association of nations to replace the League of Nations, allowing existing nations to practice tolerance before anyone takes action on their own, and not converting the UN ground into machinery that would be used to thrust people around the world to be involved in legitimizing a new social contract. Definitely, the United States could not have proposed to arrange that all the people in all the nations collectively cooperate in the economic field to rule the world. I strongly believe that the US political leaders who suggested in 1941 to create an association of nations to attain the goals that are stipulated in the UN Charter knew that empires are not constructed by inviting nations to form a union to secure such a goal but rather by making the poor nations consider the opinions of the powerful people before taking action on their own.

Most importantly, I am totally convinced that the US political leaders who suggested in 1941 to create an association of nations to attain the goals that are stipulated in the UN Charter knew that the history of the world was founded on the organization of human activities into hierarchical social classes whereby power becomes concentrated into the hands of a ruling class that trickles down its power to a subservient authority. This subservient authority is usually engaged in harmonizing actions horizontally and vertically among the urban and rural populations, ensuring that the interests of both groups are represented and that the directives from the ruling class are effectively

implemented. It is astonishing that today's powerful families/dynasties, who control much of a nation's economy and politics, seek cooperation to maintain their strength and stability, considering that no pre-1945 great power nation/empire exerted power without concentrating authority in specific ruling families/dynasties solely.

The world has never seen a social construct where three authorities cooperate and compete in each nation. The UN and development aid agencies spearhead one authority—under the pretext of fostering human rights to create an egalitarian world—that aims to benefit the individuals involved. The second authority is the power that government exercises—to benefit the individuals involved—but under the pretext that this interference is required to maintain law and order. The third authority is the power that the different religious organizations exercise—to benefit the individuals involved—but under the pretext that this interference is required because humans are wicked, often justifying their influence through the belief that moral guidance is necessary to counteract inherent human flaws.

It is important to note that the families and dynasties that currently control significant aspects of the economic and political life of any existing nation (i.e., those that influence the global money supply) could represent a fourth authority or be integrated into one of the three previously mentioned authorities.

Hence, it is possible that people would continue to believe in religion until researchers find a way to cheat death; then we can say that this authority would last until man manages to live forever. All the scientific advances being made in transportation and telecommunications no longer require the use of different governing methods (i.e., monarchy, democracy, republic, federation, etc.) but rather a single method. In other words, hence, it is not necessary to sponsor government-controlled markets but automated ones; this signifies that if there are powerful special interests or internationalists, greedy bankers, corrupt politicians, etc. who are plotting to mount a collectivist New World Order managed by a 'one-world socialist government,' as Welch claimed, the work program of this secretive group would have to be to weaken the power of the different

governing methods that exist as a tool to maintain peace and security in order to let the UN exercise this role.

The United States proposed that the different governing methods that existed pre-1945 remain strong post-1945; however, the deteriorated state of the world and the large number of stateless countries that emerged post-1945, including the challenge that nations struggling to protect their own governing methods seem to be beginning to show some evidence of probably being in crisis, seem to support the opposite. The situation is very serious and worrisome. Hence, it is not possible to know if there is a secretive group that is plotting to mount a collectivist New World Order managed by a 'one-world socialist government,' as Welch claimed, or not; it is not possible to know if all the interventions that the US is taking part in around the world to supposedly fight adversity and inequality, which is resulting in nations becoming stateless, are serving to contribute to creating the conditions that are stipulated in the UN charter or if they are a prerequisite to ultimately transfer power to the UN.

As I said before, it is not possible to rationalize that within the US government there are powerful special interests or internationalists, greedy bankers, corrupt politicians, etc. who are plotting to mount a collectivist New World Order managed by a 'one-world socialist government,' as Welch claimed, because throughout history, whenever a government (or an empire) became excessively powerful, the oppressed rebelled and overturned the authority of the suppressors. After advances in transportation and telecommunications allowed people to connect and learn, any government attempt to hide the truth is suicidal. The assassination of a reporter in the Saudi Arabian embassy in Turkey³⁴ serves as evidence.

If it is not possible to know if there is a secretive group that is plotting to mount a collectivist New World Order managed by a 'one-world socialist government' as Welch claimed or not, and if the United States could not have proposed that post-1945 people start to weaken the power of the different governing methods that existed in 1945 to recreate the past world history but with new people, then it is possible to say that the deteriorated state of the world along with the

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

accompanying ongoing rise of the number of governments that appear to show as if they are probably having a challenge with protecting their own governing method could be due to two drivers. The first possibility is that a secretive group is plotting to establish a collectivist New World Order managed by a 'one-world socialist government,' as Welch claimed. The second is what I said in earlier chapters could be the case, and this would be if the families/dynasties who control so much in the economic and political life of any existing nation today (i.e., the families/dynasties who control the money supply of the world) think that their actions are what is driving the world events to progress to the events that they see take place, but in reality, this process is unmanned.

It is important that readers keep in mind that I am not talking here about building a house or a tool so we could see it finished when its construction is over. I am talking about producing behaviors or patterns that would be comparable to what the United States managed to achieve for the people who lived in this country from 1776 to 1945, which, as of 1945 and/or when the philosophy was expanded to cover larger geographical and social space, the resulting patterns seem to be incongruent so far.

I will give an example to show patterns that are congruent and patterns that are not incongruent so readers can understand the problem better. When Jesus was preaching his ideas to people to practice tolerance, the people who were surrendering freedom and agreeing to produce the behavioral patterns that he was suggesting were from different races, colors, sexes, languages, religions, political or other opinions, national or social origins, properties, births, or other statuses. If we take the history of the United States from 1776 to 1945, we find that the people who managed to produce the patterns that aided this country to be a superpower by 1945 were also from different races, colors, sexes, languages, religions, political or other opinions, national or social origins, properties, births, or other statuses. The people who lived during the two intervals agreed to surrender freedom to practice tolerance.

Now if we take the behavior that the people expressed when Jesus lived in Palestine (i.e., land of the Philistines)^{35,36} plus the one that transpired when the United States was preaching the ideas that its political leaders were teaching in North America and analyze the patterns that emerged post-1945 when all the people were asked to practice tolerance and who were also all from different races, colors, sexes, languages, religions, political or other opinions, national or social origins, properties, births, or other statuses, we find that the patterns that were produced so far are totally incongruent.

It is highly likely that all the ongoing violence since 1945 results from a reorganization process in which people from all nations exchange their values and traditions, allowing democratic ideals to begin to emerge. However, the more governments seem to clarify and grasp the behaviors that create obstacles to make people comprehend the opportunity that everyone has to live in a world that would be free from fear and want, the more the patterns that are emerging seem to point to people either not being ready or prepared to stop being bound by their personal power and conscience to progress beyond having to return to pre-1945 means to maintain peace and security or the peaceful coexistence idea that the United States proposed is unattainable, which could not be true because people are capable of surrendering freedom.

Coexistence theory is a “framework to understand how competitor traits can maintain species diversity and stave off competitive exclusion even among similar species living in ecologically similar environments.”³⁷

Peaceful coexistence was “a theory developed and applied by the Soviet Union at various points during the Cold War in the context of primarily Marxist-Leninist foreign policy and was adopted by Soviet-allied socialists so that they could peacefully coexist with the capitalist bloc (i.e., U.S.-allied states).”³⁸

35 http://www.holyorderofmans.org/Jesus-of-Nazareth/03-land_of_jesus_birth.htm

36 <https://www.britannica.com/place/Palestine>

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

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

I have no way of knowing if people could manage to peacefully coexist when the forces that generate stable coexistence relationships are determined by the fitness differences between species, such as economic and military power, and the environmental conditions in which each species exists. Let us split the pursuit of peaceful coexistence into two parts: let one part be related to the quantitative representation of natural and sexual selection, which humans depend on to exclude each other within the natural or environmental conditions in which a species exists. The second part refers to the man-made or ideological frameworks that humans use to exclude each other within an ecological niche, including factors such as religion, race, sex, language, political opinions, national or social origin, property, birth, or other statuses.

In the book, *Progressive Regression*,³⁹ I try to show that for as long as our species maintains diversified philosophical ideas such as religion, language, political doctrine, and form of government, mankind will not be able to reach a stabilizing relationship to create world peace.

The families/dynasties who control so much in the economic and political life of any existing nation today can continue to let the UN and the people who control the governments of the different UN member states justify that Islamic extremism, population growth, technology, environmental degradation, etc. are threatening their efforts to see that people peacefully coexist, but this rhetoric cannot be true because if it were truly the case, they would have been leading by example. Historians claim that Jesus and his disciples were leading by example until the leaders of the Christian movement began to pursue its aspirations in a manner similar to that of current world leaders and UN workers. This activity is done by wanting people to use the ladder of democracy to mount to their lives of luxury instead of sharing with them the material things they have accumulated. When Jesus's followers began to use their personal power and conscience to achieve their way, they were teaching people to postpone their desire for the afterlife.

Unfortunately, no one has returned from the dead to confirm whether the freedom that a person surrenders is truly recoverable in the

39 <http://www.centermpa.com/book/b3index.html>

afterlife. However, if the patterns that the UN is promoting in the social order to make people prioritize the self over the collective continue, the happiness that the families/dynasties who control so much in the economic and political life of any existing nation are working hard today so their heirs could also enjoy does not appear imminent.

Indeed, the excessive or tight control that governments are beginning to exercise to prevent people from challenging them to erect anytime soon new democratic means of government signifies that if peace and security continue to deteriorate, governments will be suppressing more and more the means in which ideas are transmitted.

The United States did not advocate for post-1945 societies to enslave one another and deny access to education, as some nations seem to be doing recently. For example, the United States proposed a different approach than some countries that focus on ending extremism and violence; this approach emphasizes practicing democracy and not ending extremism first, then educating people about it to start practicing it after that. The way the people in power in Egypt are governing represents a vivid case. In other words, if the people in the country regarded as the world's mightiest militarily (i.e., the United States) and its political leaders have had the courage to surrender freedom to one another, thus preventing their happiness from rising above the idea that unites them, other governments can also do the same to stop people from considering democracy a progressive echelon. Anyone who believes that changing any political system from autocratic, tyrannical, oligarchic, absolute, or dictatorial rule to democratic rule could destabilize a society is peddling fiction. If such a scenario were the case, the United States would not have become a superpower. Likewise, anyone who claims that the United States is acting as a global policeman to maintain its economic viability and fulfill a specific agenda is also spreading falsehoods. The United States proposed that all people in all nations be devoted to pursuing the realization of the full development of their personality based on the principle of equal rights in 1941 because this country did not want to dominate the world. In other words, if the people in the United States had any hidden agenda that did not coincide with the needs of the poor people worldwide, this country would not have agreed to go along

with humans beginning to harmonize actions post-1945 in a manner that would be based on enabling any person in all the lands to manage to realize, as much as possible, the full development of his personality so no person can feel that his rights are getting denied and resort to disregard and contempt to increase his happiness. Most importantly, if this country had any hidden agenda, its leaders would have refrained from threatening to withdraw from international affairs. If the political leaders in the US are unyielding in their refusal to see the ideas that are stipulated in the UN Charter succeed, such behavior should be strong evidence to support that their agenda is sincere.

Two motives could have driven the political leaders in the United States to persuade the nations with great power to give up the domestication method that they were using until 1939 and which was based on domination and exploitation in favor of harmonizing actions on the aftermath of WW2 based on the principles of equal rights and self-determination, which is an idea that weakens the ability of a given nation to defend its best interests. One motive is fear and the other is maturity. It took other countries only a few years to develop nuclear weapons. This shows that no one can control world affairs indeterminately. Only courage or maturity could have driven the people in the United States to recognize that no one wins if the world remains insecure. Yet despite the efforts that the United States exerted so all people stop cooperating post-1945 based on hierarchical social classes but rather based on the employment of the self-determination ideology, which is a doctrine that stipulates that people harmonize their actions based on letting their personal power and conscience guide their relations to evolve toward ultimate wisdom, we find that many people in many countries are competing against this country instead of being indebted. If people in countries like Lebanon, Iran, Iraq, Yemen, etc., who are as rich in value to history as they are, consider that regimes that function and are not any different from the one that dominated their fathers before 1945 are better for them than the one the United States proposed, this is very serious and worrisome. Some of the reactions or behaviors that have been reported by the media about how some poor people in different Middle Eastern countries express hostility and disenchantment with the policies of the United States in recent years make any observer perceive that if the United States were a human being, there would be people among those

who are protesting against the US that would be demanding that a crucifixion judgment be passed.

Ali ibn Abi Talib (601- 661) was a cousin and son-in-law of the Islamic prophet Muhammad, who ruled as the fourth caliph from 656 to 661. Ali is a significant authority on Islam, according to Muslims. Shia and Sufis narrate a hadith in which Muhammad states, "I'm the city of knowledge, and Ali is its gate..."⁴⁰ Ali nominated a new governor for Egypt when he became caliph and handed him a letter that contained instructions on what conduct he believed could aid this new recruit in being successful in his mission. Ali said that "the indignation (or discontent) of the poor would satisfy the local leaders. However, when calamity prevails, beware of the local leaders because they are the ones who would betray, backstab, and crisscross you first."⁴¹ Ali suggests to the new governor that he ensure, throughout his reign, that his loyalty is only to the truth. Herein, what Ali meant to say to the new governor is to avoid siding with the local leaders because their goal is always to prioritize their propensity to act against the needs of the common people to stay in power.

If the disenchantment of the common people in the Middle East has been rising since 1945, it could be attributed to two factors. Either the governments that the United States is supporting in the Middle East are betraying and backstabbing the US as Ali claimed or the United States failed to play the global policeman role in accordance with what Ali suggested.

I do not know which of the two motives mentioned above is leading the common people in the Middle East to believe that the ideas the United States claims to care deeply about are actually ones that displace their own values, even though those values are fundamentally the same. However, what we can say is that the decision of the political leaders in the United States to disregard what Ali counseled this new governor to be always aware of when he arrives in Egypt led to the creation of two challenges. The first challenge happened with the cohort that lived from 1945 to the year 2001 when the September

40 https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ali#Prophetic_knowledge

41 [https://books.google.com/books?](https://books.google.com/books?id=guRGCwAAQBAJ&printsec=frontcover&source=gbs_ge_summary_r&cad=0#v=onepage&q&f=false)

[id=guRGCwAAQBAJ&printsec=frontcover&source=gbs_ge_summary_r&cad=0#v=onepage&q&f=false](https://books.google.com/books?id=guRGCwAAQBAJ&printsec=frontcover&source=gbs_ge_summary_r&cad=0#v=onepage&q&f=false)

11 attacks occurred. The new challenge started in the year 2001 and is now ongoing.

A deep state, also known as a "state within a state," is a form of clandestine government made up of hidden or covert networks of power operating independently of a state's political leadership in pursuit of their own agenda and goals.⁴² I have no way of knowing if the families/dynasties who won WW2 or the families/dynasties who managed to own the companies that, through them, 80% of the world's trading was handled in 1945 operate as a deep state and dictate to the United States' elected officials policies, conditions, and directives to attain the ideological objectives that are stipulated in the UN charter, or if the elected United States officials play the global policeman role to attain the same ideological objectives without considering the opinion of the families/dynasties who control so much in the economic and political life of any existing nation before taking action on their own. However, what we can say is that the decision of the families/dynasties who control so much in the economic and political life of any existing nation or that of the elected United States officials to go along with continuing to maintain autocratic, absolute, oligarchic, etc. political systems from 1945 to the year 2001 in the Middle East and in other countries while humans are transient prevented the people whose knowledge is ahead from cultivating a democratic form of governance.

Moreover, the decision of the families/dynasties that control so much in the economic and political life of any existing nation (or that of the elected United States officials in case they are playing the global policeman role to attain the UN ideological objectives without considering the opinion of those powerful families/dynasties) to continue to disregard the importance of making all the countries in the Middle East (and elsewhere) give up post-2001 (or at the start of the third millennium) the fixed autocratic, absolute, oligarchic, etc. form of governance that is adopted in this region so the families/dynasties that are governing become transient, like their own human body, is creating a much more complex challenge. The knowledge gained from 1945 to 2001 has made it impossible for those born at the start of the third millennium in the Middle East (or elsewhere) to tolerate their

42 https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Deep_state

leaders using democracy to gain power while the US allows this behavior, which contradicts the UN charter that it claims to uphold. In other words, the US is interfering in the business of other nations to help protect them.

In the letter that Ali ibn Abi Talib sent to the new governor he was dispatching to Egypt, he informs him that the Egyptian people have experienced their fair share of ups and downs. Ali reminds the governor that the people in Egypt will judge his conduct based on how previous conquerors ruled over them. He also mentions that the Egyptians would be perceiving him in the same way he would be perceiving them.

In the Arabic world, Ali is regarded as the second personality in prophetic knowledge after the prophet Muhammad and the author of the most famous collection of sermons and letters in wisdom ever written to date (i.e., *Nahj al-Balagha*, or the way to eloquence).⁴³ Ali is considered the last rightly guided caliph in Islam.⁴⁴ The 30-year period of Rashidun caliphate in Islam signifies the adoption of the ideal form of Muslim governance.

If people's intolerance is on the rise in the Middle East post-1945, this signifies that one of two situations could have prompted this rise. Either the local families/dynasties who control so much in the economic and political life in those Middle Eastern nations are not ruling by example in the same way Ali and the governor he sent to Egypt ruled, or the international families/dynasties who control so much in the economic and political life of any existing nation (along with the elected United States officials who are playing the global policeman role on their behalf to attain the UN ideological objectives) are not prioritizing the UN ideals.

The Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL) is a terrorist militant group and a former unrecognized proto-state that follows a fundamentalist, Salafi Jihadist doctrine of Sunni Islam. Most Middle Eastern countries oppose ISIL and are contributing financial aid to fight this terrorist group. The financial aid from families/dynasties

43 https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Nahj_al-Balagha

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

controlling much of the economic and political life in various Middle Eastern nations contributes to the fight against ISIL, but this support is not because those nations are fighting Islam. If we go along and claim that the intolerance of the families/dynasties who control so much in the economic and political life in the different Middle Eastern nations with this terrorist group is because those powerful Middle Eastern families/dynasties are against this group prioritizing that people in the region begin to emphasize the importance of adhering to a fundamentalist, Salafi jihadist doctrine of Sunni Islam more than the one that the policies, conditions, and directives that are stipulated in the UN charter represent, we would be arguing that Islam is a false religion. In other words, any country that claims that its politics are based on Sharia (Islamic law) and the Quran and does not support ISIL would be one that is rejecting that Mohammad was a prophet, that the Quran was an inspiration from God, or that God exists. However, since the only reason why the people that began to care deeply about prioritizing ideas that emphasize the importance of adhering to a fundamentalist Salafi Jihadist doctrine of Sunni Islam is because the families/dynasties who control so much in the economic and political life in the different Middle Eastern nations are rejecting the politics that are based on Sharia (Islamic law) and the Quran, we can say that if the international families/dynasties who control so much in the economic and political life of any existing nation (along with the elected United States officials who are playing the global policeman role on their behalf to attain the UN ideological objectives) prioritized the UN ideals (which are the same ideals that are in Islam), we would have spared the 2001 attacks.

Most importantly, hence, we have no way of knowing if the insecurity that has been prevailing in the Middle East from 2001 to now is because of the failure of the international families/dynasties who control so much in the economic and political life of any existing nation (along with the elected United States officials who are playing the global policeman role on their behalf to attain the UN ideological objectives) to prioritize the UN/Islam ideals, which emphasize the importance of the principles of equal rights over the unimportance of the self. We have no way of knowing if this ongoing abnormal rise in intolerance from 2001 to now is due to the international families/dynasties who control so much in the economic and political

life of any existing nation (along with the elected United States officials who are playing the global policeman role on their behalf to attain the UN ideological objectives) doing the same thing. In other words, if those international families/dynasties who control so much in the economic and political life of any existing nation (along with the elected United States officials who are playing the global policeman role on their behalf to attain the UN ideological objectives) are able to have control over themselves (or the weakness of their will) to do like Ali and his governor when they were protecting the idea that they both cared most deeply about, then the world will be a better place. In other words, Ali and his governor were good policemen in Egypt because they didn't let their personal interests or those of their communities interfere with governance. We cannot say the international families/dynasties who control so much in the economic and political life of any existing nation (along with the elected United States officials who are playing the global policeman role on their behalf to attain the UN ideological objectives) have been doing the same since 1945. If this were the case, they would not have allowed the families and dynasties that control so much in the economic and political life of the different Middle Eastern nations to prioritize themselves over UN ideals.

After the 2001 attacks, it is not possible to know if the international families/dynasties who control so much in the economic and political life of any existing nation and/or if the elected United States officials who are playing the global policeman role on behalf of those powerful international families/dynasties to attain the UN ideological objectives are interfering in the Middle East to protect their personal interests and the best interests of their dependent people or to defend the policies, conditions, and directives that are stipulated in the UN Charter. Hence, it is not possible to know if the interference that the elected United States officials who are playing the global policeman role on behalf of the international families/dynasties who control so much in the economic and political life of any existing nation are making in the political status of nations is intended to defend the policies, conditions, and directives that are stipulated in the UN charter or their personal interests and the best interests of their dependent people. This signifies that it is not possible to know if the wars and destruction that the United States is taking part in are to protect (1) the UN ideological

objectives, (2) the interests of the United States, and (3) the families/dynasties who control so much in the economic and political life of any existing nation and who designated the officials of the United States to be their policemen. This situation signifies that it is not possible to know if the postwar international order is on its way to collapse or if the different UN member states would continue to be able to patch it.

Moreover, since it is not possible to know if the “America first” declaration that the United States started pronouncing post the 2001 attacks are proclamations that the United States began to employ because its leaders began to prioritize their personal interests and the best interests of their dependent people over the ones that are proclaimed in the UN charter, because they are afraid of losing their power, or if the reason is because they do not know how to make people in the Middle East consider their opinion before taking action on their own without feeling that they are doing to secure the best interests of the US instead of their own, this signifies that until the United States begins to lead by example in the same way Ali and his governor were doing in the 7th century, this country could be doomed.

Likewise, if, as Ali claimed, the indignation of local political leaders makes the people of any country side with the abusive power of their political leaders, even if they are unfair and dominating (i.e., the truth), this then signifies that if the international families/dynasties who control so much in the economic and political life of any existing nation (along with the elected United States officials who are playing the global policeman role on their behalf to attain the UN ideological objectives) do not begin to prioritize the policies, conditions, and directives that are stipulated in the UN charter over their self-interest so people could start to perceive that they are leading by example, they would be accelerating the collapse of the postwar international order or hurrying the return of all the UN member states to be ruled under pre-1945 political regimes. Both paths undermine the power and authority of international families/dynasties and their global policeman (i.e., the United States).

Readers should keep in mind that any reference to the United States in this work refers to the fixed US ideology plus the transient US political

leaders who ensure that the UN ideological objectives (which aim to achieve basically the same goals that the US ideology prioritizes, i.e., increase happiness) are secured and observed. The US political leaders, along with the other four countries that act as global policemen post-1945 or permanent members of the UN Security Council, are humans. In other words, from 1945 to now, the US political leaders, along with the political leaders of the other four countries that act as global policemen post-1945, are not supposed to be interfering in how UN member states secure the goals that are stipulated in the UN Charter, because if the other way around were the case, the global powers that existed pre-1945 would have not granted independence to any nation. The purpose of granting independence to nations was to secure that the nations that are granted independence begin to prioritize the UN's ideological objectives. In other words, Great Britain and the rest of the western European powers did not grant independence to Saudi Arabia, the UAE, Oman, Qatar, Lebanon, etc., etc., so that new local families/dynasties began to control so much of the economic and political life of the people that live in those nations. To put it differently, France did not give independence to the people in Lebanon so that the families/dynasties that have converted this country into becoming stateless keep the international order dynamic. Likewise, the British did not grant independence to the Egyptians so the military replaced the British, but rather to see that the people in Egypt began to prioritize the policies, conditions, and directives that are stipulated in the UN charter. This is to say that the reason why the US political leaders are not able to prevail over the weakness of their will to play the global policeman role without letting their personal interests or the best interests of their country overshadow their protagonist role as defenders of the policies, conditions, and directives that are stipulated in the UN Charter is because the circumstances that are transpiring cannot make them naturally become capable of practicing tolerance. Earlier I said that post-1945 people started to domesticate each other based on the premise of a "rule" that makes a person become incapable of naturally prevailing over the weakness of his will as our predecessors were mostly doing pre-1945, and that was to practice tolerance. I do not know what this rule might be, but I cannot think of a rule that would push another reason to practice intolerance except when two people are trying to establish a relationship whereby one person finds that the

ideas that he deeply cares about are not being shared by the other. For example, I do not know what the political leaders in the US deeply care about other than seeing the people who live in the Middle East manage to live with each other peacefully and/or considering their opinion before they take action on their own that violates the UN Charter. Hence, we cannot say that if the political leaders in the Middle East would begin to relinquish control to the voting public of their regimes and become ready to cooperate based on the principles of equal rights and consider the opinion of the US or any other member of the UN Security Council on matters that can be a breach to the UN charter, that the US or any other UN Security Council member would have a reason to interfere in their social order. This conclusion signifies that the selfishness of the political leaders who rule the Middle East is what has perpetrated all the violence that this region has known since 1945, and not the US, as the poor people in those countries claim.

Then again, we can say that up until the political leaders in the Middle East begin to relinquish control to the voting public of their regimes and start to cooperate based on the principles of equal rights, and up until the five UN Security Council members force the political leaders of those countries who have been claiming that they are in favor of democratic ideals and forms of governments but refuse to relinquish control to the voting public of their regimes, we cannot expect this region to know any peace. Moreover, we can expect that the frustration and intolerance that many poor people in the Middle East express toward the United States will grow. This is because it is the US that is taking the role of global policeman to create an environment that would prevent challenges to the establishment of a democracy in all the UN member states, and not the other four members of the UN Security Council, which may lead to increased resentment and protests against US policies in the region.

The word "protest" refers to an act in which a person (or a group of people) stresses an open or public statement against something, usually an idea or a course of action.⁴⁵ Protests can take many different forms, from individual statements to mass demonstrations.⁴⁶

45 <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/protest#other-words>

46 <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Protest>

In the latest wave of protests that began in Lebanon in October 2019, protesters demanded that their leaders relinquish power in favor of democratic ideals and forms of government, while also expressing new opinions that had not been heard in previous demonstrations. Protestors were asking the Lebanese government to take direct action so regimes like the ones installed in Russia, China, or Europe protect them against the injustice that the United States was encumbering them with.

All the opinions or ideas that people express during protests are intended to influence public opinion or government policy. The goal of protest statements is to urge the government to act. The open or public statement that protesters make during demonstrations could be opinions or ideas based on evidence, experience, or faith. Most importantly, they affirm conviction in the face of denial or doubt.

The word "pattern" refers to a configuration that could have occurred naturally or by chance.⁴⁷ It is not possible to know whether the opinions expressed by demonstrators aimed at urging the Lebanese government to take direct action for protection from injustices imposed by the United States were based on convictions formed through evidence, experience, or faith, or if they were simply a reaction to the desire for regimes similar to those in Russia, China, or Europe. However, the situation is very scary and worrisome. This uncertainty arises from the inability to determine whether the protestors' suggestion to seek protection from regimes similar to those in Russia, China, or Europe against the injustices imposed by the United States was based on a genuine belief in the worthiness of those regimes or a desire to escape their current situation.

A behavior pattern is defined as "a recurrent way of acting by an individual or group toward a given object or in a given situation."⁴⁸ Pattern recognition is the science of making references based on perceptual data.⁴⁹ Ideas or doctrines serve as solutions for addressing perceptual problems.

47 <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/pattern#other-words>

48 <https://www.dictionary.com/browse/behavior-pattern>

49 https://www.byclb.com/TR/Tutorials/neural_networks/ch1_1.htm

If the protestors in Lebanon are perceiving that regimes like the ones installed in Russia, China, or Europe are better for them to interact more effectively with each other to ensure lasting peace than the policies, conditions, and directives that are stipulated in the UN Charter, and the US is acting as their principal defender, then this would signify that if mankind continues to let the US interfere in the political and economic status of nations to attain the UN ideological objectives, humanity is doomed. This conclusion is irrational and anti-logic.

The whole objective of ending colonialism and granting people (or nations) independence in 1945 was to stop exemplifying the political regimes that Russia, China, and many Western European countries follow to date. But if there were among the demonstrators those who were pushing the government in Lebanon with ideas that were calling to exemplify the political regimes that Russia, China, and many Western European countries follow to date, this signifies that if this behavioral pattern is not studied to understand how it was motivated, we can never predict and expect what is coming.

There is no codified human behavior. Psychologists codify the different types of people in sociology.⁵⁰ The list of behavioral patterns that exists is exhaustive. Herein, I will focus on only two: the escapist and the conformist type. If humans are a species that exhibit escapist and conformist-type behaviors, this signifies that people have the capacity to exemplify in reality actions that are erroneous just because they want to evade truth. If people have the power to ignore problems or choose to just follow the crowd regardless of what they are following, whether good or bad, such behavior signifies that mankind can be living in denial of the international order being on its way to being disintegrated and living in denial. This scenario also means that this behavior that protestors in Lebanon began to care about could be a warning to the international families/dynasties who control so much in the economic and political life of any existing nation about whether they want to continue to prioritize the UN/US ideological objectives or the people who control the standing autocratic, absolute, oligarchic, etc. regimes in the Middle East.

50 <https://www.quora.com/What-are-the-different-types-of-behavior-in-Psychology>

The behavioral pattern expressed by some protesters during the late 2019 demonstrations in Lebanon—seeking protection from regimes like those in Russia, China, or Europe against the injustices imposed by the United States—may reflect ideas that the demonstrators encountered. This perception could have been self-propelled as well.

The position that the protestors in Lebanon expressed to prioritize the regimes that are in vigor in Russia, China, or Europe versus the UN ideological objectives that the US is acting as its principal defender affirms conviction of denial or doubt about the UN ideological doctrine being a conduit that aids in achieving the proclaimed changes and casts doubt about the capacity of the US to play the global policeman role to attain said changes. Again, readers should remember that this denial or doubt is false. If we compare the ideological doctrines practiced by China, Russia, and European powers from 1776 to 1945, most historians agree that the US ideological doctrines contributed more to the happiness of people living in the Americas than any other doctrine from that period. Besides, remember that the US did not interfere in the political status of nations from 1776 (or from when this nation was founded) to 1945, while western European nations did. This statement also means that the ideological doctrines of China, the US, and Russia were all at par from 1776 to 1945. Those three great powers today were not controlling the sea from 1776 to 1945; rather, the different Western European powers were doing it. That is also to say that the claim that some political leaders in the Middle East make about the culture in those countries being one that does not permit or is ready to relate based on the democratic form of governance are all pretexts that do not contain any element of truth. When the American patriots obtained their independence from Great Britain, they did not have a solid, coherent scheme that could form a framework to form a democratic government. The same happened when Christ's disciples were spreading Christianity or Muhammad's followers. The international families/dynasties who control so much in the economic and political life of any existing nation are going along with permitting that autocratic, absolute, oligarchic, etc. form of government to stay in power in the Middle East for implicit reasons or because they are taken by other priorities, such as maintaining stability and protecting their own economic interests. In other words, there is a

significant threat in underestimating the consequences of allowing autocratic, absolute, and oligarchic governments to continue exercising power, especially when the UN's ideological objectives advocate for a different approach.

Hence, it is not in the best interests of the autocratic, absolute, oligarchic, etc. regimes that exist in the Middle East that the form of governance change and become decided upon through a voting process; let us take all the external convictions that made some protestors in Lebanon suppose that the regimes that China, Russia, or the European practices are better for them than the one that is woven in the UN / US ideological doctrine and temporarily put those convictions to the side. This is because these views could have been convictions that protestors reached based on escapism and conformism. In other words, they could be behavioral influences that protestors reached without any self-evidence, experience, or faith leading them to side with such a view. For example, some of the speeches that the political leaders in Egypt make post-2013 express views that the military and the sovereignty of Egypt are interlinked. In other words, Egypt's sovereignty would collapse if the country attempts to develop a democratic culture without integrating the military into the democratic process. We know that this view is not true. Many countries around the world are not ruled by their own military institutions, nor do they let their military visibly interfere in the political, economic, or social preparedness of their nationals, as it is done in Egypt, and they are happy. This evidence also signifies that the pro-government demonstrators in Egypt reached this conclusion about supporting a military government instead of a civilian one erroneously. This is because from the year 1953, when Egypt gained independence, to now, this country has rarely had a civilian government in charge of preparing the people to understand whether their lives would improve. The last instance of civilian government ruling Egypt lasted only one year. The military orchestrated a coup to revert the country into becoming a military state, which also cast doubt on whether the civilian government that was elected was legitimately brought to power. This skepticism is because it is hard to believe that a nation whose political rulers, with its dependent people, did not demonstrate any behavioral pattern from 1953 to 2012 to support that they were prioritizing governance based on Sharia (Islamic law) and

the Quran would vote into power a civilian government that prioritizes Islamic jurisprudence.

If we set aside the external beliefs that led some Lebanese protesters to think that the regimes of China, Russia, or Europe are better than the UN/US ideological doctrine and focused only on whether those ideas were based on self-evidence, experience, or faith, we could say that those protesters were driven by the belief that they didn't care about the UN ideological doctrine. In other words, the protesters who arrived at this conjecture were questioning which political authority or ideology they should be loyal to. This would have occurred if they had accepted the credibility of the United States as an instrument or a global policeman to assure the success of the UN goals. As I said before, the US ideological doctrine and the UN ideological objectives are very closely related. If protesters cast doubt on the UN/US ideological doctrine or its objectives to assure global peace and stability, it signifies that people's readiness to conform to what the US considers a universally important idea is no longer a priority for everyone. What makes any idea succeed or fail depends on the capability of the people who believe that their idea is good to incubate a base that would accept the idea and build on it. If people perceive that the UN/US ideological doctrine is failing to increase their happiness or offer anything new, this signifies that the international families/dynasties who control much of the economic and political life of any nation will stop implementing this doctrine if there is no "customer" base that desires it or seeks to build on it. This situation is very serious and worrisome.

If more people continue to perceive that the United States is using the idea of democracy (i.e., UN ideological objectives) and the role of global policeman of the UN ideological objectives as a ladder to reach its national goals, there would be more people who would be perceiving that the decision of the United States to make the world become a better place is a pretext to aid the families/dynasties that rule the United States to dominate the world and not to attain the policies, conditions, and directives that are stipulated in the UN charter. In other words, the freedom that many people around the world are surrendering to allow the US to interfere in their preparedness will ultimately serve the best interests of the American people rather than

their own. This situation is very serious and worrisome. This concern is because no one can determine whether the US interferences around the world, aimed at ensuring that everyone cares about the UN ideological objectives, are intended to strengthen US domination globally or to achieve the goals outlined in the UN Charter.

In other words, hence, it is not possible to know if the non-democratic regimes that the United States is supporting in the Middle East and elsewhere are contributing to attaining the UN ideological ideas and if the tolerance that the US exhibits against people's outcry to let the form of governance become decided through a voting process is what is prompting this rise in disenfranchisement and dissatisfaction that people are expressing around the world; the US could be prompting people to feel animosity against its actions by being its own worst enemy. This signifies that if people around the world continue to perceive that the US actions contradict what the UN ideological objectives dictate that this country's global policeman role should tolerate, and if people continue to perceive that the US is using the democratic ladder as an instrument to further its interests and the interests of the different regimes that it is protecting, this could lead the people who are frustrated with the US behavior and the behavior of the regimes that this country is supporting to clash with the custodians of the protectors of those regimes to determine where the limit of the freedom of each stops. This situation is very serious and worrisome, because if the autocratic, absolute, oligarchic, etc. regimes that the US (and the rest of the permanent members of the UN Security Council) tolerate and depend on to get their way despite the resistance of others clash with their dependent people to determine the limit of the freedom of each, this makes all those who are involved in this conflict become confused and incapable of determining where the limit of human worth or dignity stops. All the violence and wars that people are aware of are prompted by the importance that human beings place on their own dignity and its worth. If the regimes that any powerful country relies on to get its way despite the resistance of others become destabilized, this weakens its ability to use the idea of democracy as a ladder to achieve its goals.

When powerful nations become unable to depend on the different regimes that play a decisive role in aiding them to get their way

despite the resistance of others (i.e., the case of the Lebanese government) and/or on the dependent people that those local regimes play (i.e., the case of the Lebanese population), such a scenario constitutes a serious threat to world peace or the international order. This is because if the political leaders in powerful nations (such as Great Britain) stop fulfilling the roles for which they were elected—specifically, to enhance the happiness of their dependent populations—their constituents will begin to withdraw their support. Hence, the only two ways that are known to man to increase his happiness are to either forgo the happiness of his neighbor to increase his own or to look for options that can allow him to do it from within his own social space (i.e., the case of Great Britain after exiting the EU) and without the freedom exercised making the neighbor feel that his freedom is being threatened (i.e., the new relationship between Great Britain and the EU). This scenario signifies that the politicians in Great Britain and in the different EU nations can no longer use the idea of democracy as a ladder to increase the happiness of their respective dependent people jointly as they were doing in Lebanon, for example. In other words, when Great Britain exits the EU, this country would have to start to use the idea of democracy as a ladder to obtain its way alone (and in some cases in partnership with other nations). When Great Britain begins to use the idea of democracy as a ladder to get its way in Lebanon alone, this country would need to rely on new politicians in Lebanon to help it to size up the politicians who are aiding other nations such as the Chinese, the US, Russia, the EU, etc. to get their way in the same country. If the balance of power becomes destabilized between the powerful nations that are trying to each one get its way from the resources (human and material) that exist in Lebanon, the situation could escalate to a war between the powerful nations.

All that humans do from birth to death is to change matter from one state to another. In other words, humans fall into two categories: those who destroy and those who rebuild. Since 2011, Russia and the US have claimed to intervene in Syria's civil war to fight terrorism, but it's unclear which country is trying to recycle Syria's progress to increase its happiness and which is trying to uphold the UN Charter's policies, conditions, and directives. We cannot say that those two countries are interfering in accordance with the policies, conditions, and directives that are stipulated in the UN Charter, because the ideological

objectives that are stipulated in the UN Charter counsel that people seek passive solutions to disputes, which contrasts with the active military interventions that Russia and the US have undertaken in Syria.

Animals that hunt to meet their survival needs and feed their cubs either do so alone or form a team to increase their chances of capturing prey. When a lion attacks a group of buffaloes and one falls victim, the surviving buffaloes continue their lives. Unfortunately, humans are not a species like animals that carry on with their lives when one member of their kind dies of unnatural causes. Humans are a species that believes that they were programmed to explore. This belief made humans divide human ingenuity into two camps: one is good and one is evil. The medium that allows the group of people who claim that they are working to increase righteousness (i.e., to resize the group of people who are denying them added happiness) is tolerance. Moreover, because the group of people who deny others the right to happiness stem from their conviction that practicing tolerance would decrease their own happiness (or others would seize it before them), we now have a situation in which, as I said before, it is impossible to know whether the intolerance that Russia and the United States are exhibiting in Syria is a reorganization that is strengthening or deteriorating the international order.

Humans divide actions into right and wrong and believe that killing a human life is wrong and evil; this conviction has led them to establish relationships based on various ethical, religious, social, and legal contexts. Throughout history, all the ethical, religious, social, and legal relationships that humans established were based on the premise that all newborns have the right to happiness, which must be earned through individual achievement rather than given benevolently. This scenario means that the ability of any newborn to increase his happiness using a pathway other than what he would find his own parents can provide him becomes a function of the individual's ability to get his way despite the resistance of others or his ability to produce scientific, literary, or artistic work to change the state of happiness that he is born into.

An individual can get his way by making another person surrender freedom either voluntarily, by force, or by virtue of a system of

governance that has this objective. All people fear each other, and so do the families/dynasties that rule Russia; they fear the families/dynasties that rule the United States (the families/dynasties that rule the United States fear the families/dynasties that rule Great Britain, etc.). This situation makes the families/dynasties that rule in nations with great power resort to ideas to resize the families/dynasties of other nations to avoid doing it through wars because no nation can be sure that it could win a war once it becomes entangled in one. When people decide to resize each other up through ideas, this makes it very difficult for a person to be bound by his personal power and conscience to get his way. This is because if an individual wants other people to surrender freedom to him and he does not adhere by example to the general standards, guidelines, or governing principles of the ideas that he cares deeply about, the people whom he wants to make deeply care about what he prioritizes could start to withdraw support and feel free to disobey.

Humans classify all the changes they prompt in matter that violate predefined ethical, religious, social, and legal standards they legitimize or establish relations on as illegal actions. This framework allows the individuals in positions of power to use force to discipline those who interact with objects or humans in a manner that is different than the general standards, guidelines, or governing principles that they fix. Therefore, individuals in positions of power cannot justify their right to act in ways that deviate from the general standards, guidelines, or governing principles they establish, unless they claim it is to ensure the discipline of those who threaten human lives or property. This approach allows the individuals in positions of power to get their way despite the resistance of others to attain the social change that they claim they are working to secure.

For example, the global war on terror, the war on drugs, the war to end prostitution, the war to end discrimination against LGBT people, the campaign to end gun production, etc. are all activities (or interventions) that can be misused by anyone to achieve personal ends, regardless of others' resistance. People in positions of power use ideas that they know everyone deeply cares about to justify their devotion to ending or controlling those ideas, granting themselves the right to

behave in ways the public is unwilling to tolerate, despite general standards, guidelines, or governing principles.

In 2001, pursuant to the Sept. 11 attacks, the US government launched a war on terror. Since then, most regimes have been hurrying to use this idea to classify any action, whether physical or verbal, that their dependent constituents express related to the pursuit of political, religious, ideological, or social objectives as being a terrorist act.

Mark Twain (1835-1910) was an American writer, humorist, entrepreneur, publisher, and lecturer.⁵¹ One of Twain's quotes states that "there is a charm to the forbidden that makes it unspeakably desirable."⁵²

No one knows whether regimes classify any action, whether physical or verbal, expressed by their dependent constituents in pursuit of political, religious, ideological, or social objectives as a terrorist act to maintain control over their domain, or if, as Mark Twain suggested, people naturally become more interested in forbidden things, similar to the situation when God forbade Adam and Eve from eating from a particular tree.

The challenge of classifying any action, whether physical or verbal, that relates to the pursuit of political, religious, ideological, or social objectives as a terrorist act by those in power when it is not in accordance with standards they are legitimizing is serious and worrisome. This plan aims to prevent dependent constituents from gaining control over the violence-wielding apparatus known as "government," which rulers use to maintain their current control over the voting public.

In the Bible, it is reported that God commanded Adam and Eve not to eat from the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, for when they did, they would surely die. (Genesis 2:17)⁵³ In 1945, the United States did not propose to people to eat from a tree that increases a person's own ability to distinguish between good and evil but rather to use the

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

52 https://www.brainyquote.com/quotes/mark_twain_128375

53 http://web.mit.edu/jywang/www/cef/Bible/NIV/NIV_Bible/GEN+2.html

awareness that is programmed in the human body to distinguish between good and evil.

No one knows what type of power Adam and Eve were going to gain after they disobeyed God and ate from the tree of knowledge about good and evil. Likewise, we have no way of knowing whether, during the time that Adam and Eve lived, God was invisible in the same manner that people today describe him, or if he was behaving like any living being with flesh and adhering to the same understanding that humans have about how the human body follows the same physical laws as other matter and motion.

This question is important because if God were visible when he commanded Adam and Eve to not eat from the Tree of the Knowledge of Good and Evil, we could have had a different world history than the one that exists in the Bible. Unfortunately, we cannot question whether God was a visible living being or invisible today because our circumstances have changed. In 1945, God did not instruct the political leaders in the United States to push for the end of colonialism and to prioritize the creation of a postwar world where everyone would live free from fear and want. If the United States continues to let the UN and international aid organizations increase people's awareness to distinguish between good and evil while its political leaders act contrary to the UN ideological principle that they claim to deeply care about, they could be prompting people to feel animosity against their actions. This situation is very serious and worrisome. This is because if the United States continues to take on the role of global policeman and make decisions that are not in accordance with the UN ideological principle that this country claims it deeply cares about and/or continues to support autocratic, absolute, oligarchic, etc. regimes that hurry to classify any action, whether physical or verbal, that their dependent constituents express related to the pursuit of political, religious, ideological, or social objectives as being a terrorist act to preserve their control over their domain, this country will be thrusting people to write a different world history than the one this country articulated in the preamble of the UN Charter.

If the United States continues to take on the role of global policeman and makes decisions that are not in accordance with the UN

ideological principle that this country claims it deeply cares about, humanity could be on a path to rewrite world history from when Adam and Eve lived onward. This situation is very serious and worrisome, because the Bible claims that pursuant to Adam and Eve's decision to behave contrary to what God commanded, destruction occurred of the progress that humans accomplished between the date when Adam and Eve disobeyed God and the date when the Flood occurred.

All that humans do from birth to death is to explore. The pursuit of political, religious, ideological, or social objectives are non-physical types of explorations that people depend on to achieve their way despite the resistance of others. Up until 1945, it was justifiable to assume that the people in positions of power were unable to defeat the systematic use of force by their constituents to seek justice and/or to liberate themselves from continuing to live under the cruel and oppressive power of the autocratic, tyrannical, oligarchic, absolute, or dictatorial regimes that were widespread. Earlier I said that there is no breakthrough that people could cooperate to ensure lasting peace besides agreeing that relationships be based on a work program that is based on the principles of equal rights, and in 1945, this milestone was reached. If, after 1945, people continue to use violence or spread fear to achieve their goals despite resistance from others, it indicates that those relying on violence for political, religious, ideological, or social objectives doubt that their political leaders will relinquish control to the voting public.

This situation means that the United States needs to decide whether it wants to act as a global policeman dedicated to stopping or preventing disillusioned people from resorting to violence or terror to achieve their goals, such as installing democratic governments to let autocratic, absolute, and oligarchic regimes continue to get their way despite resistance from others. Alternatively, the United States could focus on launching an international military campaign to identify and stop individuals who use violence to force their political leaders to relinquish power in favor of democratic ideals, including those who attack U.S. interests worldwide.

Humans spread terror by nature only when they feel threatened or perceive that other peoples are depriving them of what could increase

their happiness or survival needs. If people are getting disenfranchised with the United States to the extent of favoring to resort to violence or terror to get their way, their behavior could be prompted by two motives: Either those people who are spreading violence are disenfranchised with the way the United States is handling its global police role, or this country is purposely instigating people to feel animosity against its actions to push them to behave irrationally so it could have a reason to dominate them.

It would be irrational to assume that the United States is instigating people to feel animosity against its actions because violence increases violence, and no one wins when security is dynamic. If we consider that the United States has not done a lot to remove the standing autocratic, tyrannical, oligarchic, absolute, or dictatorial regimes that are standing in the Middle East or elsewhere; and factor in all the international military campaigns that this country has launched since 1945 to find and stop the individuals who resort to violence to make their political leaders relinquish power of their regimes in favor of democratic ideals or forms of government, including stopping those who attack its interests around that world, we can say that the United States is not involved post-1945 in preparing governments to relinquish control of their regimes to the voting public but in extracurricular activities. One of those principal activities is the perceived ambition to address a societal problem that previous generations failed to manage effectively. This perceived dilemma refers to ending humanity's reliance on violence or terror as a means of resolution or exploration.

I will use the political gridlock in Lebanon as an example to illustrate the societal problem or project that the United States appears to be addressing globally. In other words, instead of the United States interfering in Lebanon to force the people who are ruling Lebanon using a combination of autocratic, tyrannical, and oligarchic principles to relinquish power to secure the demand of the common people as of October 2019 to form a government based on democratic ideals, the United States continues to ensure that the people who threaten the UN ideological objectives or its interests are stopped and defeated.

In other words, the United States falls short of forcing the removal of the people who rule Lebanon from power, either due to those using language that they manage to support through it, that they are taking actions to secure the UN ideological objectives contrary to what people think, or because the US (or another powerful nation) is protecting them.

This situation means that for as long as the United States is allowing that human resort to violence or terror as a way to explore in Lebanon and/or is being devoted to searching to find those who are threatening the UN ideological objectives or its interests to stop and defeat them, instead of forcing the removal of the people who rule Lebanon from power or lifting the protection that it is granting them, we can expect one of two scenarios to occur. Either the resistance of the people in Lebanon will triumph, or the resolve of the US and Lebanese governments will weaken, leading to a US surrender.

I have no way of knowing if the United States is at war to end the violence or terror this country seems to be waging since the start of the third millennium, using governments that prevent the regimes they control from being subjected to a fair voting process. However, I strongly believe that the founding fathers of the UN would have counseled against US involvement in doing what Great Britain refrained from doing for most of the time it ruled a significant part of the world. This was to interfere and to take actions to stop the people who live within any culture from exploring using violence or encourage the people who rely on gentleness to get their way despite the resistance of others. Instead, the British rulers restricted their interventions to actions that were traditionally defined as threatening the best interests of their empires, such as wars and control of the seas, and did not search in caves or underground for individuals involved in acts of terror, corruption, child labor, or poverty. Thus, they fulfilled the responsibilities of those to whom the empire had granted the rights to manage the rule of law.

There is an ancient metaphor in Arabic that states that “the judge of the boys hanged himself.”⁵⁴ This metaphor refers to a king who hears that a judge is bound by his conscience and not the law. In fact, he had

54 http://yupnop.blogspot.com/2019/04/blog-post_5.html

hung three people in one day. The king called for the judge and asked him to explain the reason why he hanged three people in one day. And the judge answered, because the first killed his father. The second felt pity for the first and said, “God have mercy on the killer.” And the third was telling others in the kingdom that the second man said, “God have mercy on the first.”

The king then asked the judge to justify why he killed the second and the third. The judge replied that he hanged the second man because “he questioned God’s justice.” In other words, how can God have mercy on a man who killed his father? In as far as the third is concerned, he questioned the kingdom's justice system. In other words, if he had believed in the justice system of the kingdom, he would not have feared that God would destroy it, and he would have mercy on those who killed his father.

The metaphor continues by saying that the king was so impressed by the judge's prudence. The king had many wives and children who constantly fought, so he brought the judge in to help. The metaphor states that the judge hanged himself the same day; that’s because of how overwhelmed he was with the number of problems that he was solving.

This metaphor is very serious and worrisome. If the United States is trying to assume the role of states in solving our societal problems, it risks overextending itself. When people attempt to take too much work or responsibility upon themselves, they increase their risk of suffering from a breakdown and/or of getting to their targets or finishing all that they have started.

What if the United States did set the bar too high? Did this country set itself up to achieve impossible standards for the future, such as ending terror, violence, corruption, etc.? What could happen to the strength and stability of the United States if it fails to live up to its promises to end terror, violence, etc., as it has been actively pursuing since the start of the third millennium? In early 2020, the BBC reported that the Taliban now controls more territory than at any point since their ousting in 2001.⁵⁵ Would people continue to support the United States'

55 <https://www.bbc.com/news/world-asia-51430867>

interventions to fight terrorism, violence, corruption, etc., on their soil and to increase destruction around them when its ongoing efforts to increase people's happiness do not seem to be aiding them to get out of insecurity or to permit the US to see its goal through to the end to have confidence in what it is promising that its meddling is securing?

Friedrich Wilhelm Nietzsche (1844–1900) was a German philosopher whose work has exerted a profound influence on modern intellectual history.⁵⁶ Nietzsche said that “Whoever fights monsters should see to it that, in the process, he does not become a monster.” And if you gaze long enough into an abyss, the abyss will gaze back into you.”⁵⁷

All the convictions of both past and present people depict views that aim to legitimize actions intended to increase connectedness between individuals. If this widespread view is true, it would be irrational to assume that the actions that the United States is taking around the world to secure the ends stipulated in the UN Charter are turning this country into a monster because many people would be ready to support that their happiness increased when they lived in environments in which social cohesion was strong. However, if there is consistently a cost incurred by those who interfere in the lives of others to enhance their own happiness, as well as that of those being interfered with, we can conclude that the true measure of a person’s (or nation’s) ability to persuade others to think or act as desired relies on their skill in controlling what people remain unaware of. In other words, a person (or a nation) can persuade people to think or act as desired by mastering how to make them friendly with what they do not know.

Ali ibn Abi Talib claimed that “humans are hostile to what they do not know.”⁵⁸

If humans become hostile when persuaded to think or act according to someone else's desires or to accept the unknown, this means education or awareness has no effect on influencing individuals to behave differently or to consider everyone's interests. Because humans always use their views or beliefs to explore ways to increase their happiness, it

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

57 https://www.brainyquote.com/quotes/friedrich_nietzsche_124387

58 <http://elsada.net/20657/>

is impossible to make people prevail over the weakness of the will; this signifies that “for as long as humans continue to explore to distinguish between what is right and what is wrong, their efforts to master and control what they are unaware of would be elusive.”⁵⁹ In the book *Social Improvement and Human Security: Collateral Damage*, I provide a solution that could help policymakers to control and regulate this paradox.

To illustrate how critical an individual’s (or a nation’s) coping strategy is to achieving their goals, let us consider this example. A man can become lost in a desert knowing that it has no walls, doors, stairs, or corridors, just as he does in a maze. In other words, if the ancient Egyptians who wanted to be called Jews had been tolerant and stayed in Egypt despite the abuse, they might have avoided the desert ordeal that historians say happened when they left to form a new nation. Most importantly, the successors of those who formed a new nation probably managed to do what our political leaders are now doing: allowing us to coordinate relations without interference from the differing beliefs or views we each insist are true. If such a scenario happened, most likely “God” would have had no reason to send his only son to thrust people to practice tolerance. If the Jews who lived when Jesus began his movement had been tolerant and accepted him as the son of God, perhaps their successors would not have suffered at the hands of those who still abuse those who value this faith, even though they had nothing to do with the actions of those who lived 2000 years ago. If this happened, most likely “God” would have had no reason to send a prophet to thrust people to practice tolerance. Still, if the people now cohabit in the social space that the Palestinians call their own and the Jews call their own, perhaps we could prevent God from having to interfere a third time to thrust mankind into practicing tolerance, as he did in his previous interventions.

And so if today we have an idea that the United States began to attach great importance to as of 1945 (i.e., to practice tolerance), yet we know that it is one that would not be any different than the one God already has counselled mankind to adopt each time he interfered, how can we be sure that if the United Nations continues to thrust people to

59 Maloof S., book: *Social Improvement and Human Security: Collateral Damage*, 2005. www.globalhumansecurity.com

prioritize their own views and beliefs on how natural and legal rights should be managed and distributed (i.e., coming up with UN goals and fixing dates to attain them), its persuasion to people to refuse to be tolerant and to begin to be devoted to get their way despite the resistance of others would not begin to make people around the world get frustrated with the United States in the same way the Jews became frustrated with Jesus and his followers?

Historians claim that the Jews were receptive initially to Jesus's message, but later they turned against him and his followers.⁶⁰ In 1945, all the people were receptive to the idea of the United States cooperating in the economic field to attain the UN ideological goals. If people around the world continue to perceive that the United States interferes in their lives to change their views and beliefs, rather than to control what they are unaware of, there is a good chance that the United States could face a fate similar to that of Jesus. In other words, the Jews' beliefs and practices were no different from Jesus' teachings. It was right around when Jesus' ideas began to pose a threat to the wealth and power of the people who were teaching similar values that those people who were in positions of power turned against his ideas. In other words, those in power began to withhold Jesus' teachings from their dependents to preserve loyalty to their own teachings.

This situation is very serious and worrisome. In other words, we now understand that Jesus's message was clearer than the teachings of the people living during that time, as his teachings led individuals to agree to surrender their freedom most willingly. Therefore, the idea that the United States could be wanting people around the world to begin to surrender freedom to pursue could be much better than the autocratic, tyrannical, oligarchic, absolute, or dictatorial forms of government that people are using, but if the powerful people who rule over those forms of non-democratic government believe that the idea of the US is encroaching on their powers, we all know that it is whoever possesses more military might and firepower who would last. The leaders of Iraq, Libya, Afghanistan, and others launched wars against the US, which serve as good examples.

60 https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Acts_of_the_Apostles

However, the United States seems to be up against a much bigger challenge than the regimes that this country toppled in its ongoing search to end violence, terror, and promote democracy, particularly as it faces the rise of new authoritarian powers that are more resilient and strategically sophisticated. Oliver Wendell Holmes Jr. (1841–1935) was an American jurist who served as an associate justice of the Supreme Court of the United States and as acting chief justice of the United States.⁶¹ During his 30 years as associate justice of the Supreme Court, he became known for his “clear and present danger” argument for the limitation of free speech and his convincing dissents.⁶² Holmes's most important legal contribution was his maxim: "The life of the law has not been logic; it has been experience."⁶³ The form of moral skepticism that Holmes espoused shifted American legal thinking towards legal realism instead of maintaining it as a doctrine of natural law.

Moral skepticism is defined as “a class of meta-ethical theories all members of which entail that no one has any moral knowledge." Many moral skeptics also make the stronger, modal claim that moral knowledge is impossible. Moral skepticism is particularly opposed to moral realism: the view that there are knowable and objective moral truths.”⁶⁴

Legal realism is defined as “a naturalistic approach to law. "It is the view that jurisprudence should emulate the methods of natural science, i.e., rely on empirical evidence. Hypotheses must be tested against observations of the world.”⁶⁵

Humans come up with an “immortal declaration” regularly. In my view, Holmes's opinion in *Abrams v. United States* (1919), when he regarded the United States Constitution as “an experiment, as all life is an experiment" and believed that as a consequence, "we should be eternally vigilant against attempts to check the expression of opinions

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

62 <https://www.history.com/topics/us-government/oliver-wendell-holmes-jr>

63 Holmes, Oliver Wendell Jr. (1881). *The Common Law*. I. Boston: Little, Brown and Company.

64 https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Moral_skepticism

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

that we loathe and believe to be fraught with death,"⁶⁶ captures a realism that most people would support.

Holmes's opinions capture the attitudes and values that the American culture managed to reach in 1935, just four years before the outbreak of WW2. Holmes' jurisprudence represents a sample of mankind's ongoing search to understand the idea of freedom and the frontier that this notion has reached by 1935. As I said before, American culture represents the deposit of cultivated behavior that mankind invested thousands of years in reaching. Those ideals do not belong anymore to the United States alone, but to all of humanity.

However, post-1945, international political (or legal) thinking has not been built on the pragmatism that American culture or ideals reached before WWII; instead, our political leaders (and legal thinkers) seem devoted to figuring out what they could still salvage from the idea of freedom, rather than drawing from those ideals to leave great things for our successors.

Abū 'Abdillāh Muhammad ibn Idrīs al-Shāfi'ī (767–820) was an Arab theologian, writer, and scholar who is regarded as the first contributor to the principles of Islamic jurisprudence.⁶⁷ Al Shafii was born in Gaza, which is a self-governing Palestinian territory within the state of Israel. Al Shaffii claimed that when two choices present themselves and a man becomes confused, unable to figure out which is right from wrong, then a man has to disagree with his passion—the passion leads the soul to what is wrong.⁶⁸

If the relations that humans are pursuing post-1945 are inciting or causing political leaders to place limits on freedoms of speech, press, or assembly, this means that the intolerance that the people who are in positions of power are expressing is due to either perceiving that their limitations spare their constituents from harm, and this forms part of their tasks, or the limitations spare their own downfall. In other words,

66 Abrams v. United States, 250 U.S. 616, 630 (1919).

67 <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Al-Shafi%E2%80%98i>

68 <https://www.amrkhaled.net/Story/1016500/%D8%A5%D8%B0%D8%A7-%D8%AD%D8%A7%D8%B1-%D8%A3%D9%85%D8%B1%D9%83-%D9%81%D9%8A-%D8%B4%D9%8A%D8%A6%D9%8A%D9%86-%D9%81%D8%AE%D8%A7%D9%84%D9%81-%D9%87%D9%88%D8%A7%D9%83>

if people in countries that are run by autocratic, tyrannical, oligarchic, absolute, or dictatorial regimes continue to protest to seek regime change to install democratic forms of governments, the people who are in positions of power have no choice but to come up with an “enemy” to use as a pretext to deter their dependents from pursuing to make progress on the UN ideological objectives or to preoccupy them with other priorities that deal with how to get them to be devoted to prioritizing how to sustain their survival needs over their happiness.

Most people are ready to support that as of 2001, Islamic radicalization has been depicted as a principal perpetrator for this accelerated wave of intolerance that emerged in the world along with other contributing motives such as rates of growth of population; knowledge; technology; communications; commerce; weapons; and environmental degradation.

For instance, let us consider the proposal to outlaw Islam and regulate all actions that people believe contribute to inciting violence. Those people who would remain have to structure how reward and punishment would still be shared with them, ensuring that the system promotes accountability and discourages further radicalization.

Oliver Wendell Holmes Sr. (1809–1894) was an American physician, poet, and polymath based in Boston and the father of Oliver Wendell Holmes Jr.⁶⁹ Holmes Sr. claimed that "to obtain a man's opinion of you, make him mad."⁷⁰ This is very serious and worrisome, because it means that if one wants to know what others opine of them, they deviate.

No matter what doctrine humans outlaw or allow, the conduct of the person trying to make others think or act as they want is critical to determining the rewards or punishments they can reap; therefore, one must, as Oliver Wendell Holmes Sr. claimed, “Beware of how one takes away hope from another human being”⁷¹

69 https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Oliver_Wendell_Holmes_Sr.

70 <https://www.azquotes.com/quote/351560>

71 <https://www.goodreads.com/quotes/197356-beware-how-you-take-away-hope-from-another-human-being>

Ralph Waldo Emerson (1803—1882) was an American essayist, lecturer, philosopher, and poet who led the transcendentalist movement of the mid-19th century.⁷² Emerson was regarded as “a champion of individualism and a prescient critic of the countervailing pressures of society.” He advocated for social reforms but was nevertheless suspicious of reform and reformers,⁷³ believing that true change must come from individual self-reliance rather than imposed solutions from society.

Transcendentalism is “a philosophical movement that developed in the late 1820s and 1830s in the eastern United States. It arose as a reaction, to protest against the general state of intellectualism and spirituality at the time.”⁷⁴ A core belief of transcendentalism is in “the inherent goodness of people and nature.”⁷⁵ Adherents believe that “society and its institutions have corrupted the purity of the individual, and they have faith that people are at their best when truly "self-reliant" and independent.”⁷⁶

“Ralph Waldo Emerson, Oliver Wendell Sr., Oliver Wendell Jr., Henry James Sr., Henry James Jr., and William James,”⁷⁷ and other notable scholars were all family friends and prominent writers and scholars who are regarded as having secured for themselves a prominent place in American cultural history. In fact, Ralph Waldo Emerson is regarded as one of the most widely known men of letters in America.⁷⁸

Oliver Wendell Holmes Sr. “A man's mind is stretched by a new idea or sensation and never shrinks back to its former dimensions.”⁷⁹ It appears that the United States' religious and social beliefs shifted after 1945 from an objective empiricism, which held that there was a fundamental continuity between man, nature, and God (or the divine),

72 https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ralph_Waldo_Emerson

73 <https://www.iep.utm.edu/emerson/>

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

75 Goodman, Russell (2015). "Transcendentalism". *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. "Transcendentalism is an American literary, political, and philosophical movement of the early nineteenth century, centered around Ralph Waldo Emerson."

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

77 https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Oliver_Wendell_Holmes_Jr.#Early_life

78 <https://www.iep.utm.edu/emerson/>

79 <https://www.goodreads.com/quotes/24189-every-now-and-then-a-man-s-mind-is-stretched-by>

to a transcendentalism that emphasizes humanity's capacity to formulate social reforms with little regard for the impact of emotions and individualism on the writing of human history leading up to World War II.

For example, from 1800 to 1850, a new movement emerged in Europe that was known as the Romantic era, whose adherents began to prefer the medieval rather than the classical.⁸⁰ The people who belonged to such a movement began to prioritize emotions and individualism as well as glorification of all the past and nature over the idea of collectivism. The people who belonged to this movement expressed their views and beliefs in actions or tendencies that were visible in visual arts, music, and literature. Historiographers claim that this movement had a significant and complex effect on politics, with romantic thinkers influencing liberalism, radicalism, conservatism, and nationalism, leading to WW2.

Oliver Wendell Holmes Sr. claims that "the mind of a bigot is like the pupil of an eye. The more light you shine on it, the more it will contract."⁸¹ If, from 1850 to 1941, the United States managed to keep bigotry (i.e., apprehension, horror, terror, awe, etc.) from contaminating the mind of the American people in the same way modernity was raging in Europe, this signifies that the social and political norms that the American people were prioritizing during this period were based on rational, objective empiricism and not subjective intuition. In other words, the American people were favoring a transcendentalism precept that emphasized that humanity is capable of formulating social reforms with little attention and deference to the impact emotions and individualism had on writing human history. If the American people resisted the influence of modernity on the social reforms prompted by its drawbacks (i.e., the outcome of the Civil War leading to a split of this country), this signifies that the American leaders were doing exactly as Al-Shafi'i claimed a person must do when faced with two choices (i.e., disagree with his passion). If the American leaders were disagreeing with their passion from 1850 to 1941, this means they were doing exactly what Jesus or Paul the

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

81 <https://www.goodreads.com/quotes/85004-the-mind-of-a-bigot-is-like-the-pupil-of>

Apostle was doing to persuade their dependent people to think or act in the way they wanted. In other words, they were setting an example.

If bigotry (i.e., apprehension, horror and terror, awe, etc.) does not seem to be contracting despite all the light that the United States shined on ending such prejudice from the hearts of people as of 2001, this could be due to either “the way this country is taking away hopes from other people” as per what Oliver Wendell Holmes Sr. claimed is critical whenever one wants others to think or act in the same way one wants or is giving away hopes.

Oliver Wendell Holmes Sr. claimed that "the books we read should be chosen with immense care, that they may be, as an Egyptian king wrote over his library, the medicines of the soul." If the ideas that the United States proposed to people to calm their souls are frustrating people, this situation means that either the idea that UN member states began to foster to create an egalitarian world is the wrong medicine to achieve the UN ideological objectives or the remedies that the United States has been using to tackle the symptoms that are giving rise to this increased bigotry (i.e., apprehension, horror and terror, awe, etc.) are not the treatments that cure why people are behaving the way they are

Götz Haydar Aly (born May 3, 1947) is a German journalist, historian, and political scientist. In his book, *Hitler's Beneficiaries: Plunder, Racial War, and the Nazi Welfare State*, he claims that “By exploiting material wealth confiscated and plundered in a racial war, Hitler’s National Socialism achieved an unprecedented level of economic equality and created vast new opportunities for upward mobility for the German people.”⁸²

If exploiting material wealth, confiscating, and plundering create vast new opportunities for individuals but do not contribute to a socially healthy state within a country, this indicates that if the United States continues to act as the global policeman while allowing autocratic, tyrannical, oligarchic, absolute, or dictatorial regimes to operate alongside the values it promotes, public frustration with the United States' approach to social justice will likely increase. This scenario

82 Götz Haydar Aly - *Hitler's Beneficiaries: Plunder, Racial War, and the Nazi Welfare State*, New York: NY, Metropolitan Books (2007) pp. 7-8

means that if the United States continues to play the global policeman role and continues to allow that people perceive that its policies are not any different from the ones Götz Aly claims Hitler's national socialist regime pursued, this country could be taking great risks.

Aly claims that Nazi Germany retained broad public support until later in WW2 because it was paying in large part for the economic, industrial, and scientific capabilities that it was throwing into the war efforts—"the Jewish wealth that it was confiscating and the plunder of the conquered countries."⁸³ He maintains that "the reason for the massive support the Nazi regime enjoyed among the German population was not so much a consequence of their violent anti-Semitism as their enjoying the fruits of the loot acquired by the Nazis in the occupied territories." He also argues that "the conservative, non-Nazi financial state bureaucracy and the leading banks were crucial in formulating this policy of mass plunder and murder."

During the Romanticism era (1800-1850), it was the lower level that emphasized intense emotion as an authentic source of aesthetic experience instead of emphasizing the sublimity of rationalism. Aly argues that the lower ranks influenced the leadership's decision to implement the Final Solution (i.e., the Holocaust) and that the actions taken to kill the Jews were not solely a top-down approach. In other words, it was the prevailing social order that was prompting the decisions that were being taken by the lower class, conservative banks, and the Wehrmacht (i.e., military). In other words, the Germans were not doing what Oliver Wendell Holmes Sr. claimed policymakers should be doing, i.e., ensuring that "a child's education should begin at least one hundred years before he is born."⁸⁴ Most likely, the Germans were making decisions in a manner similar to how the Lebanese people are currently addressing their own social and economic challenges as of October 2019. This involves finding common ground to prevent the country from descending into civil war by adopting solutions that protect the power wielded by various political leaders, rather than taking actions solely based on the UN's ideological objectives.

83 https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/G%C3%B6tz_Aly#Work

84 https://www.brainyquote.com/quotes/oliver_wendell_holmes_sr_135058

All the actions that people take are the result of a functionalism or intentionalism debate. This means that it does not matter whether lower-ranking individuals pressure higher-ranking ones to take action or vice versa, because all actions are rooted in maintaining a balance between intuition and emotion versus rationalism and classicism. If people around the world continue to perceive that the United States is using the UN's ideological objectives to prioritize its own happiness rather than improve global society, then those people would view the United States as prioritizing its own intuition and emotion in addressing issues that many believe contribute to the rise of intolerance worldwide, such as population growth, advancements in knowledge and technology, communication, commerce, weaponry, environmental degradation, nationalism, and religion.

Historiographers claim that the decline of Romanticism was associated with multiple processes related to subjective intuition, including social and political changes and the spread of nationalism. If the United States continues to play the global policeman role while allowing the United Nations and international aid organizations to promise hopes that we know raise the number of heroic figures who would be depending on their emotion as an authentic source of aesthetic experience, can this country manage to control the growing number of individual imaginations that the UN is awakening from preventing their degradation and eventual disintegration? In other words, can the United States let newborns come in contact with progressive ideas such as ending social injustice, ending poverty, etc.? While the UN is violating the UN charter as I showed earlier based on how this organization treated this American national, a good number of UN member states are supporting autocratic, tyrannical, oligarchic, absolute, or dictatorial regimes that corrupt the "purity of the individual."

I have no way of knowing if the United States could control the frustration that some people are exhibiting toward the increased rise of corruption in governance or the increased call by the lower class to be a partner in all political decisions or issues of governance and security. Throughout history, when the awareness of any society to improve social justice increased, this made people become impatient with one another to the extent of leading members to confront situations where

no one person could manage to ever be right in consideration of everyone. In other words, if awareness increases disloyalty (or makes it scarce) and what prompts political, social, financial, and economic instability within any nation is due, principally, to the diminished conviction in the capacity of the espoused political system or its leaders to create the sought change, this signifies that this rise in the number of people who are withdrawing their support to secure the aspirations that political leaders claim are prompting it signals an end to perhaps the era in which the idea of the state can be used to guide actions. This situation is very serious and worrisome, because policy and rule of law are related. In other words, if more people continue to lose faith in the idea of the state as an instrument to compel behaviors to achieve a desired outcome, this means that people's conviction in the freedom that they are surrendering to serve to increase their happiness would continue to diminish.

When societies begin to be unprepared to surrender freedom to support the political system espoused, this means that the members of those societies stopped believing that their political leaders are working to secure their happiness but are using the ideological system as a ladder to increase their happiness. This signifies that if the United States wants to continue to be the global policeman of the world (or the nation that guides actions toward outcomes that this country deeply cares about), its political leaders have two choices ahead of them. The first is to stop the UN from continuing to teach people to be impatient and devoted to fostering human rights to create an egalitarian world, and the second is to justify why its guiding actions are not in accordance with the conduct that it (i.e., the US) is expecting other nations (or people) to respect.

This is very serious and worrisome. In other words, ideologies (or policies) are processes that can be objectively tested, so when a person (or a nation) behaves contrary to the principles they are teaching, it becomes very difficult to make people surrender freedom voluntarily. Every time a person (or a nation) resorts to force to guide actions, this makes the people who need to surrender freedom to secure the desired outcomes have doubts on whether the behavior displayed was prompted to enforce the policies or if it was compelled for subjective purposes.

Hence, the United Nations teaches people to achieve the UN ideological objectives without employing force, unlike the United States. This requires that the US continually justify or defend its use of force when this country is teaching that respect for justice and international law be promoted. Furthermore, the United States lacks any justification for its use of force other than to achieve the UN ideological objectives; this situation leads people to question the legitimacy of the UN Charter as a means to fulfill the aspirations that the US claims it is using force to achieve. This is very serious and worrisome. The more the United States resorts to force to achieve the aspirations outlined in the UN Charter, the greater the destruction caused by its actions, which would hinder its leaders' ability to argue that their conduct is helping to make the world a better place. This situation again is very serious and worrisome. This conclusion is because we have no historical evidence to determine whether people's increased awareness can lead them to withdraw their support for injustice or to increase it. In other words, we cannot determine whether increasing global insecurity will lead to greater unwillingness among people to surrender their freedom or if it will result in increased support for such actions. In other words, the Germans surrendered freedom and agreed to let the Americans in East Germany implement the policies that they were dictating, because those guiding actions increased their happiness. If people around the world continue to perceive that the interference that the US is prompting is failing to change support for the force that this country is using to achieve the UN's ideological objectives, more people would perceive that its actions are intended to increase its own happiness. This situation is very serious and worrisome because, as I mentioned earlier, we have no way to know whether the preempted changes that people are advocating are shifting the international order based on programmed actions or if this state is unmanned. In other words, since we have no way of knowing whether the recent rise in intolerance expressed by people is driven by functionalism or internationalism, the United States may be the only country that still believes its actions are creating the changes it truly cares about. This means that if the US doesn't stop the UN from teaching people to promote human rights for an egalitarian world and begin to do what it did in Germany—teaching patience for what they hate and love, as Ali ibn Abi Talib and the UN's

founders advised—it will keep letting those who profit from using the UN's ideological goals as a tool to achieve their way be in charge of forcing people to act according to those ideas, which is the hardest task.

If the UN continues to lead the poor to believe that the post-1945 unification of nations aims to eliminate social injustice, poverty, adversity, and inequality in order to create a world where the poor and the rich share equal rights and resources, this will encourage more people to intervene in the distribution and management of natural and legal rights. When more people begin to interfere in how natural and legal rights should be managed and distributed, the political leaders in the United States will be thrust to decide between two choices. The first is to allow the UN and international aid organizations to be the interlocutor between the ideas that they deeply care about and want everyone to start to act in accordance with, and the second option is to take charge. If the political leaders of the United States decide to take charge, this option would mean that the political leaders in the US are going to have to stop the international order from continuing to be run based on the actual status quo whereby most people are either judging its handling of attaining the UN ideological objectives or wanting to be a partner in all the political decisions or issues of governance and security that are being taken to attain the UN ideological objectives. The difference between the two choices is straightforward. In the first scenario, the US would be uncertain whether the actors it involves to achieve its important goals would be working to increase their own happiness or to fulfill the aspirations outlined in the UN Charter. The second option would require the US to assume complete control. In other words, who would be doing the controlling?

When a person is riding in the passenger seat of a vehicle, it is the driver and the other drivers on the road who determine if this passenger will ever reach his destination or not. Thus, when a person delegates transport to another, their security and stability decrease. We could say that for as long as the UN and international aid organizations prompt people to perceive that the coming together of nations post-1945 to collaborate in the economic, social, and political fields is to increase the speed at which people delegate the role that their human bodies may have been programmed to serve in the natural world to

focus on how to increase happiness, the more this strategy would be making more people become devoted to increasing their awareness. The more people become devoted to increasing their awareness, the longer it will take for the United States to realize the things this country deeply cares about. When more people perceive that their purpose is to be devoted to getting rid of evil from the world to increase their happiness, the more this perception will be delaying the US from getting it to reach the goals that it deeply cares about. The idea that the United States adopted post-2001 attacks to intercept actions that delay the attainment of UN ideological objectives seems to be a double-edged knife. The idea to practice force to attain the UN ideological objectives seems to be a ladder whose drawbacks are similar to those people who rely on the idea of democracy to get their way despite others' resistance experience.

This also means that if the United States does not adopt a new strategy that enables it to achieve its deeply held values in the same manner as Christ, Gandhi, Nelson Mandela, and others did—specifically through exercising patience to control their desires and encouraging others to do the same, even if it involves surrendering some freedoms to facilitate progress despite resistance—more people will continue to view the US's reliance on force as a facade for pursuing its own interests rather than genuinely striving for UN ideological objectives. This could prompt more people (or nations) to have more doubt about the credibility of the US. It is not possible to know when a delay, strike, or progress on an idea is due to a functional flaw or if the obstacle that is obstructing or crippling progress is manmade. This means that if the UN and international aid organizations continue to prompt more people to use their added knowledge to forgo the happiness of their neighbor, the US will likely have to pay a hefty price to create the political and economic balance it desires. In other words, if the US continues to let the UN and international aid organizations prompt it to use violence to accomplish what religion failed to achieve through prompting people to surrender freedom rationally, this country could be accelerating its isolation and perhaps destruction. This is because the law of inertia tells us that when a body is in motion, it stays in motion.⁸⁵ This scenario means that if the United States does not stop the United Nations and all the international

85 <https://www.physicsclassroom.com/class/newtlaws/Lesson-1/Newton-s-First-Law>

organizations from teaching people to foster human rights to create an egalitarian world to stop people from having reasons to become impatient, the international order could continue to erode, thus accelerating in the process the risks that could prompt the eventual collapse of the US.

Robert Welch believed that powerful families/dynasties control the US and the international order and that the actions that the US or any nation or international aid organization takes are decided upon based on strategies that those powerful families/dynasties decide upon. Evidently, if the powerful families/dynasties who control the US choose to let the United Nations and all the international organizations continue to teach people to be impatient to create an egalitarian world, we could expect two scenarios. The powerful families/dynasties who control the US and the international order would continue to believe that the transformations that are taking place in the social order are contributing toward making people begin to prioritize the things that they deeply care about. Alternatively, the destruction would go on as humans have been doing, with one group destroying and another group conserving and building, and their predecessors would be able to sustain their power and authority as they have been doing.

Indeed, the new aspirations that the US embarked on as of 2001 to find and defeat every act of violence (or terrorist act) that challenges the UN's ideological objectives or its interests have not produced any significant result for this country so far except growing its leaders' frustration and the frustration of the people that this country is interfering in their lives with its behavior. On the contrary, the new goal that the US adopted in 2001 to end violence, corruption, and injustice has hindered the country's ability to understand the motives behind the actions of those who attacked its best interests. If the US did understand why people are behaving as they are, this country would have ended its ongoing military interventions by now.

In fact, everything has become much more difficult after the US decided to not keep its emotions in check pursuant to the September 11 attacks and chose to cooperate with autocratic, tyrannical, oligarchic, absolute, or dictatorial regimes to find the perpetrators who challenged the UN's ideological objectives or its best interests. If this country, in

the wake of the September 11 attacks, chose to go after the perpetrators who attacked its best interests only instead of choosing to deal with the people who were harboring them in the same way this nation did, this would have avoided the difficult situation that this country seems to be in today. Many commentators speculate about whether nations are willing to voluntarily surrender their freedom to prioritize issues that the US cares about or if they are prepared to engage in open, friendly relations without expecting the US to later withdraw from agreements that it views as threats to its strength and stability. Most importantly, today, it is people who are running the standing autocratic, tyrannical, oligarchic, absolute, or dictatorial regimes who are aiding this country to attain the things it deeply cares about when we already know that the powerful families/dynasties who won WW2 or the families/dynasties who controlled so much in the economic and political life of any nation in 1945 picked the US to be the global policeman of the world to replace those forms of governments with new ones that its members cooperate on based on democratic ideals.

I have no way of knowing how the regimes that are espoused in countries like China, Russia, Saudi Arabia, Egypt, Syria, Iraq, Turkey, and many others could be helping the United States to accomplish its goal of ending violence (or terrorism) and could be aiding this country to progress toward attaining the goals that are stipulated in the UN Charter when the people who are resorting to violence in those countries to get their way are picking this precarious behavior to free themselves from continuing to live under such regimes that their members refuse to relinquish control of the political system to the voting public.

When we closely examine the relationships that the United States maintains with the families and dynasties controlling those autocratic, tyrannical, oligarchic, absolute, or dictatorial regimes, we find that these families and dynasties can compel their dependent populations to act according to their wishes. The United States appears unable to persuade the families and dynasties that control those nations to relinquish their power and allow the voting public to take control, which would enable them to align with the country's interests.

As I said before, all that humans do from birth to death is to explore. If the United States is not able to make the families/dynasties who control those autocratic, tyrannical, oligarchic, absolute, or dictatorial regimes pursue the political, religious, ideological, or social explorations that this country considers to be matters to them, this then signifies that the US has not managed to be able to stop those families/dynasties from straying in order to begin to start to stand by the ideas that this nation deeply cares about. In other words, this country is managing to make the families/dynasties who control those autocratic, tyrannical, oligarchic, absolute, or dictatorial regimes submit to the ideas that this nation deeply cares about.

Judaism, Christianity, and Islam are three Abrahamic religions that refer to three distinct processes. In the Arabic language, Judaism refers to the people who stopped being strayed and managed to stand by the ideas they deeply care about. "Christianity" (or "Nassarah" in the Arabic language) refers to the people who managed to support or to be loyal to the idea that they deeply care about. "Islam" refers to the people who managed to submit to the extent of believing that this idea does. If the United States is not managing to make the families/dynasties who control those autocratic, tyrannical, oligarchic, absolute, or dictatorial regimes submit to the ideas that this nation deeply cares about, then what this country is failing at doing is making those families/dynasties who control those regimes continue to not stray first in order to permit the remaining two processes (i.e., the support and the submission) to occur.

If it is a prerequisite for any person who wants others to deeply care about the things that matter to him to make the people who have strayed away from surrendering freedom to his idea and to begin to believe that his idea does it, this signifies that those who believe that they would gain more by resorting to violence or to peaceful means to get their way despite the resistance of others are individuals who consider that they have a mission to prevent the substantive evils that the decision of those individuals who do not support or are loyal to their idea can encumber. If the families/dynasties who control the autocratic, tyrannical, oligarchic, absolute, or dictatorial regimes are not able to find the proximity and degree that allows them to surrender freedom to the work program that the United States proposed to ensure

lasting peace, this then signifies that all the disobedient families/dynasties believe that their current convictions and ideas about the world will prevent the substantive evils that they consider that their self has a right to prevent.

I have no way of knowing what all the different convictions and ideas are that the families/dynasties who have not relinquished control of the autocratic, tyrannical, oligarchic, absolute, or dictatorial regimes to the voting public are depending on to lead them to believe that it is a matter of time before they would collapse and die.

The Parable of the Grain of Wheat is an allegory that Jesus shared with his disciples. In the Gospel of John, it is reported that Jesus said, "Very truly I tell you, unless a kernel of wheat falls to the ground and dies, it remains only a single seed. "But if it dies, it produces many seeds."⁸⁶

If everything must die to produce many seeds, then this signifies that if the United States does not want to remain only a single seed, this country must get rid of the current convictions and ideas about the world that the families/dynasties who control the autocratic, tyrannical, oligarchic, absolute, or dictatorial regimes are still holding on to so all the ideas that the US deeply cares about can consequently thrive.

Humans legitimize how they get their way despite the resistance of others by censoring or permitting actions. Humans classify all the changes they prompt in matters that violate predefined ethical, religious, social, and legal standards as objectionable, harmful, sensitive, inconvenient, or illegal. Humans define "illegal" as any action that threatens or invades the legal right of another or is regarded in the menu of classified acts as forbidden by law. The actions that compel a person to begin or carry out an act that is believed to have a sole tendency to incite or cause harm are also considered illegal.

For example, humans define the word "violence" as being any behavior involving physical force intended to hurt, damage, or kill someone or something.⁸⁷ Humans define the word "gentleness" as being any behavior involving physical force intended to be kind or

86 <https://www.biblegateway.com/passage/?search=John+12&version=NIV>

87 <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/violence>

tender toward someone or something.⁸⁸ The two words involve the use of physical force, but with each force intended to serve a different end, man has no say whatsoever in what its outcome could turn out to be. For example, a person can be hit by a bullet and survive but can choke and die if he swallows incorrectly.

This allows us to say that all the laws that governments forbid or censor are not absolute, but they are measures that humans with power enforce to protect their authority and balance conflicting rights. In other words, if humans were to cease to come up with ideas or acts that would push them to categorize them as permitted or censored, there would not be any need to have all the moral, military, political, religious, or corporate censorship that people rely on to control the actions of each other. In other words, we cannot expect that the people who are in positions of power would levy a penalty on the people who would be ready to allow that their current convictions and ideas about the world die and to align it with the ideas that the people who are legitimizing what is right from what is wrong are dictating. It is important to keep in mind that humans create change until the last day in their lives, and they can be a threat throughout this period either via an idea that they communicate or an action that they take.

If there are no laws that can be leveraged against self-censorship, we can say that for as long as the world continues to be inhabited by more than one person, it would not be possible to allow that one's current convictions and ideas about the world to make others be ready to surrender freedom unless this is done through force or through beginning to understand why people are behaving as they are, which means practicing tolerance to transform the conditions that matter to them in accordance with what they really like to see happen.

For example, if we take the civil war that has been waging in Syria since 2011 and which began as a series of anti-government protests, uprisings, and armed rebellions in response to the decision of the Syrian regime to refuse to relinquish control of the political system to the voting public, we find that the United States supported the ousting of the government initially. Posteriorly, we find that the uprising, which the United States supported and had every right to support to

88 <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/gentleness>

secure the work program that was agreed upon in the UN charter, switched into one that included the ousting of the Syrian government plus the defeat of the people (i.e., ISIL), who the United States and the rest of the UN member states asserted disrupted the national unity and the territorial integrity of Syria in order to create an Islamic state that was not done in accordance with how the UN charter stipulates such action to take place.

If we analyze what exactly the United States achieved from extending its interference in Syria to include the ousting of the Syrian government plus the defeat of the people who wanted to form an Islamic State (i.e., ISIL), we find that what this joint cooperation that the United States involved other UN member states in to help it to transform the conditions and outcomes that matter to it did was increase destruction instead of etching this country to progress closer toward its objective. In other words, the military intervention that the United States invited Russia, the UK, France, etc., and other nations to take part in to help it defeat the people who wanted to form an Islamic State succeeded at defeating those people who disrupted the national unity and the territorial integrity of Syria, but in as far as making all the actors who were helping the United States to defeat ISIL begin to surrender freedom and to begin to transform the conditions and outcomes that matter to this country in accordance with what the US deeply cares about to see happen around the world, we could say that the United States does not have a lot to show off herein so far.

Ali ibn Abi Talib claimed that a person's enemies are three: "His enemy, the friend of one's own enemy, and the enemy of one's friend."⁸⁹ If Russia, the UK, France, etc. are fighting on the side of the US (in its role as global policeman) to defeat the people (i.e., ISIL) who everyone is ready to assert disrupted the national unity and the territorial integrity of Syria to create an Islamic State using a way that was not done in accordance with how the UN charter stipulates, but among those three principal countries that are helping the United States to defeat ISIL, there are those (i.e., Russia) who differ with it on removing from power the Syrian regimes so this political system can be controlled via a voting process that Russia was chosen to be a member of the UN Security Council to help secure, then we could say

89 <https://www.hekams.com/?id=5271>

that this idea that the US began to pursue to convert the world into becoming a better place for our successors in 1945 is bound to produce two scenarios. The first is a zero-sum result in Syria if Russia continues to be both a “friend” of the United States and a “friend” of the people who are running regimes that the United States was chosen by the families/dynasties who won WW2 to be the global policemen of the world to put an end to. The second is a continuation of the frustration or of the intolerance that the US started exhibiting as of 2001 to attain the UN ideological objectives faster, until, at the end, the political leaders in this country would start to be doing more damage than they think their actions are repairing, leading to more people around the world becoming frustrated with their interferences or ideological ideas that are not leading to improving their happiness but to prolonging their unwillingness to live under oppressive regimes. This is very serious and worrisome.

For example, when the Egyptians oppressed the Jews in antiquity to the point where they could no longer tolerate it, the Jews were forced to surrender and decide to leave Egypt. It took them from the 13th century BCE to 1948 until the state of Israel could come into being.^{90,91} The Jews were wandering and abused the whole time. But nothing could make them give up their faith or their belief that God gave them land and that they should live there. If the US's efforts to achieve UN ideological goals continue to create wanderers like the Jews, humanity may repeat their history if the wandering nations' history and religion are not erased.

The decision of humans to abandon keeping written records and to collect all the world history in order to make it stored electronically could help the families/dynasties who controlled so much in the economic and political life of any nation to rewrite the history that they wish. In this work, I am interested in understanding what made certain ideologies and religions collapse and others remain flourishing. In other words, I want to understand what made the Egyptians, Greeks, Romans, and others collapse. If everything must die to produce many seeds, other powers as Jesus claimed, then this signifies that if the United States does not want to remain only a single seed, this country

90 <https://www.britannica.com/event/Exodus-Old-Testament>

91 <https://history.state.gov/milestones/1945-1952/creation-israel>

must get rid of the current convictions and ideas about the world so all the ideas that the US deeply cares about can consequently thrive. In other words, the American people must be able to do what the Jews did from the 13th century BCE to 1948, when the state of Israel came into being, to prevent all the ethical, religious, social, and legal standards that people legitimize or establish relations on their premise of from weakening the values and attitudes that this country deeply cares about.

For example, from the 13th century BCE to 1948, the people who identified themselves as being Jews did not make any effort to create a nation to start to deeply use as a base to preach the values and attitudes that this country deeply cares about. Since 1948, many people have accused Jewish political leaders of causing the Palestinians to wander in a manner similar to how the Egyptians treated the ancient Israelites, who are referred to as Jews by historians.

If, as of 1948, the Jews began to devote themselves to affirming the worth of the nation they can now call their home, then the future actions of the newborns in this nation will be solely focused on affirming the value of this country. This indicates that those newborns will dedicate themselves to safeguarding an "ideal." In 1945, there were about 51 nations (or ideals) whose people were acting to affirm their worth.⁹² As of 2011, this number has become 193. If the nations with great powers allow the communities that want to form their own independent states (i.e., ideals), this number could easily reach 1000.

Ernesto "Che" Guevara (1928[5]–1967) was an Argentine Marxist revolutionary, physician, author, guerrilla leader, diplomat, and military theorist.⁹³ Guevara asserts that the poverty, hunger, and disease he witnessed radicalized him.⁹⁴ Many scholars claim that his burgeoning desire to help overturn what he saw as the capitalist exploitation of Latin America by the United States prompted his involvement in fomenting revolutions around the world to prompt social reforms.

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

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

94 <https://www.marxists.org/archive/guevara/1960/08/19.htm>

This class struggle and desire to create the consciousness of a "new man"⁹⁵ that Che cared for and perceived could have been driven by moral rather than material incentives, but this affinity could have been prompted through the wide spectrum of political perspectives that he was exposed to.

Che's and the US's ideas could be said to be driven by moral rather than material incentives. However, we now know that if the leftist leanings that Che supported had succeeded during his life, the world would not have been any better today; hence, the collapse of the Soviet Union is vivid proof.

However, when we look closely at how the wide spectrum of political perspectives has evolved around the world in the last few years, we find that the same hunger to support leftist ideologies that Che developed affinity toward when he was alive seems to be interspersed throughout the distinct societies. Many people perceive that there are unjustified inequalities that need to be reduced or abolished, and a large number of those people hold the United States accountable for this social hierarchy. This situation is very serious and worrisome.

Proletarian internationalism (also known as international socialism), adopted during the Soviet Union era, disseminated the perception that all communist revolutions were part of a single global class struggle rather than separate localized events.⁹⁶ Scholars claim that this perception was based on the theory that "capitalism was (is) seen as a world-system and therefore the working class of all nations must act in concert if they are to replace it with communism or another doctrine."⁹⁷

Close to 8 billion people inhabit the world. All the people are divided into 193 nations, and all are distributed into three social hierarchical classes, principally, i.e., the rich, the middle class, and the poor. Oliver Wendell Sr. claimed that "to obtain a man's opinion of you, make him

95 <https://www.marxists.org/archive/guevara/1965/03/man-socialism.htm>

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

97 Johnson, Elliott; Walker, David; Gray, Daniel (2014). *Historical Dictionary of Marxism. Historical Dictionaries of Religions, Philosophies, and Movements* (2nd ed.). Lanham, Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield. p. 294. ISBN 978-1-4422-3798-8.

mad.” This statement signifies that all the rich and/or all the people in the nations that are refusing to relinquish control of their regimes to the voting public are supporting the United States' aspiration to ensure lasting peace for as long as its ambitions do not forgo their authority or power. This leaves the middle class and the poor. Throughout history, the middle class has borne the greatest burden in the pursuit of any world revolution or the dissemination of any new idea. In other words, it was the awareness or consciousness that members of the middle class developed, which may have been driven by moral rather than material incentives, that led them to leave their original circumstances and strive for fairer political and social change. In as far as the poor are concerned, the rich managed throughout history to control this class by taking advantage of their illiteracy to lead them to believe that they are working to create social equity and egalitarianism.

The term "media" refers “to the communication channels through which we disseminate news, music, movies, education, promotional messages, and other data.”⁹⁸ Those channels include physical and online newspapers and magazines, television, radio, telephones, the Internet, and billboards.

Most media are controlled by governments; however, all media can be likened to a double-edged sword. Governments use the media as a tool to make the poor transform the conditions and outcomes that matter to them, but they are at the same time a means that humans depend on to compete economically. Because all the goods that people produce are disseminated in a manner that emphasizes their importance to increase a person's own happiness, this practice makes the media the principal obstacle to governments, who do not want their dependent people to be aware that they are in need of such material things and then begin to resist them.

The United States would have not hunted Guevara if he had chosen to self-censor his actions. The United States was pushed to hunt Guevara because he became deeply troubled by the poverty around him. His experiences convinced him that he should dedicate himself to fighting the people whose ideas he perceived as denying others their rights.

98 <https://marketbusinessnews.com/financial-glossary/media-definition-meaning/>

All the people who fought for their convictions and ideas were killed. This situation is very serious and worrisome. The United States is not pursuing anything different than what Guevara, Christ, and others were dedicating themselves to achieving, except each one decided to pursue a different means to achieve his goal. Guevara relied on violence to fight for a better world, and Jesus relied on kindness.

If the pursuer of any idea “must die and be shed before his idea can be reborn with a purer, more virtuous self that is stronger than the original,” as Jesus claimed, then the United States and the families/dynasties who won WW2 are bound to succumb to the same fate that Jesus, Guevara, or even this American national yielded to at the hands of the United Nations.

A person can commit suicide by jumping off a high cliff, which is an outcome that takes place without the person requiring a tool to assist him in accomplishing this process, or he can reach the same end by using a faster method, such as a rope or a gun.

If the United States allows the UN and international aid organizations to know that people learn to read and write, how can we be sure those two men teaching people that material things increase happiness are not tools accelerating the collapse of the United States? This is very serious and worrisome.

Hassan Nasrallah (born 1960) is a Lebanese philosopher, scholar in Islamic studies, and social activist who heads a sociopolitical organization that many countries designate as being a terrorist organization, including the United States.^{99,100} Hezbollah, the sociopolitical organization that Nasrallah heads, is working to achieve goals that are not any different than the one Guevara was pursuing, except that the two did it at two different time intervals, with Guevara focusing on Latin American liberation in the mid-20th century while Nasrallah's activism is centered on the political and social issues facing Lebanon and the broader Middle East since the early 1980s.

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

100

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Hezbollah#Designation_as_a_terrorist_organization_or_resistance_movement

Scholars claim that Guevara began to perceive that Latin America (or later the world) required a continent-wide liberation strategy in 1953 following a trip that he made to many Latin American countries starting in 1951. Nasrallah began his social activism career in 1982.¹⁰¹ Both believe that the underdevelopment of the third world is a result of imperialism, neocolonialism, and monopoly capitalism. Both believe that the solution is the downfall of the United States, which would allow leftist ideologies based on social equity and egalitarianism to rise.

Many people in Lebanon and in the Arab world consider Nasrallah a hero, but the widespread protests in Lebanon that started in October 2019 seem to have placed Nasrallah and his sociopolitical organization in front of two options. The first option is to call it quits, and the second option is to face the same fate that Guevara faced. This is very serious and worrisome.

The financial and economic isolation imposed by the United States on the countries supporting his sociopolitical organization, as well as on the people with whom he and his sociopolitical party engage to access resources, has led his supporters in Lebanon and the broader Lebanese public to question their willingness to continue caring about the issues that he and his close associates in Hezbollah are passionate about. This is again very serious and worrisome. We don't know if the Lebanese people's and his supporters' intolerance toward his values is due to their newfound appreciation for happiness over morality or if it's a result of financial and economic isolation forcing them to act similarly. If the former motive is indeed the reason for the indifference expressed by his supporters and the Lebanese people toward the issues he deeply cares about, then the United States may be preparing to confront similar challenges as those faced by Nasrallah and his sociopolitical party.

We cannot determine whether the ongoing rise in widespread protests around the world, calling for governments to do more to increase happiness (i.e., social equity and egalitarianism), is a result of either of the two scenarios mentioned. The first reason is the increased

101 Profile: Sayed Hassan Nasrallah". Al Jazeera. 17 July 2000. Retrieved 22 April 2013.

awareness that the UN and international aid organizations have created, encouraging people to delegate the role that the human body was originally programmed to fulfill for the survival of this population. The second reason for this widespread rise in intolerance is that humans, by nature, are a species that prioritizes happiness over morality, contrary to what people proclaim. This is because if humans prioritize moral incentives over material gains, the people in Lebanon and the Arab world should firmly support Hassan Nasrallah instead of siding with the United States. On the other hand, because Nasrallah and the United States are not pursuing anything that is different from the other (i.e., both are pursuing ideas), except Nasrallah is pursuing the things that matter to him the most within a small geographical space, and the other (the United States) is doing it all over the world, this situation signifies that the United States could be letting the promises that the United Nations and the different international aid are taking on its behalf to end adversity and inequality, setting it up to achieve aspirations, which we know that if it were possible to attain, we would all be living in peace with one another.

In other words, the Lebanese people are experiencing the financial and economic crises they face today because they chose to prioritize the protection of Nasrallah and Hezbollah over responding to the United States' plea for them to acknowledge their obligations under international law.

If the United Nations and various international aid organizations continue to make promises to end adversity and inequality while burdening the United States with the responsibility of addressing these issues, the US could be allowing "the Marxist concept of overthrowing capitalism in all countries through the conscious revolutionary action of the organized working class to go on."¹⁰² This situation is very serious and worrisome.

This is because "theorists argue that these revolutions do not necessarily have to occur simultaneously, but where and when local conditions allow a revolutionary party to successfully replace bourgeois ownership and rule."

102 https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/World_revolution

A continuum is defined as “a continuous sequence in which adjacent elements are not perceptibly different from each other, although the extremes are quite distinct.”¹⁰³

In principle, if Guevara lived and continued to thrust people to prioritize social equity, he should have faced the same end that Nasrallah is now facing after the international community decided to weaken his aspirations to create a new world order in which Islam holds the solution to any society's problems. However, both Guevara and Nasrallah share a commonality in that their leftist views are gaining popularity, leading some individuals to exploit these ideas to achieve their goals, even in the face of resistance from others in the United States. Candidates competing for the post of President of the United States promote socialist¹⁰⁴ and egalitarian ideas, which oppose the capitalist principles that underpin cooperation in the US economic field. Could this large visible sign of consciousness to address social equality that emerged as of the date that the UN began to provide economic and political solutions to stop people from continuing to be content with their traditions and values to be modernized be a consequence of the radicalization that the UN and international aid organizations have been prompting to thrust the working class to see capitalism as a threat? If this perception is true, could Guevara and Nasrallah have been only two elements within this continuum or ongoing invisible revolution whose behavior spiked or became noticeable above and beyond the rest because they chose to employ violence to get their way instead of passiveness? If there is an ongoing invisible proletarian revolution (or world revolution) driven by the increased consciousness of the working class, then it is likely that a result of this revolution would be the overturning or resizing of the United States.

In other words, if the United States continues to support regimes that its working class seeks to redress the socioeconomic inequality endemic to, this would cement people’s view about the United States' role in the international order as being one that was designed to strengthen its own interests and not as a savior for mankind.

103 <https://www.lexico.com/en/definition/continuum>

104 <https://www.ft.com/content/40de11c2-42a7-11ea-a43a-c4b328d9061c>

For example, if the United States had intervened forcibly in Lebanon during France's establishment of a confessional state in 1945 and opposed Lebanon's independence under those conditions, the people of Lebanon might have avoided the cultural imperialism and civil war that occurred in 1975, leading to greater recognition among the most influential political and economic families. If Nasrallah had been born in a different country, he likely would not have been exposed to the same level of violence during the civil war, which may have significantly influenced his views on the United States and his commitment to the principles outlined in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. If France had considered relinquishing power to establish a democratic government in Lebanon, rather than creating and maintaining unequal relationships among the Lebanese population that led to families fighting for power, it could have spared the people of Lebanon from experiencing the same hardships that the country faced in the 19th century and that were outlawed in 1905. Most importantly, Nasrallah would have discovered that the postwar international world order proposed by the United States in the aftermath of World War II shares the same values he believes in and that Islam is the solution to the problems faced by any society.

Psychological warfare is defined as “the planned tactical use of propaganda, threats, and other non-combat techniques during wars, threats of war, or periods of geopolitical unrest to mislead, intimidate, demoralize, or otherwise influence the thinking or behavior of an enemy.”¹⁰⁵ Humans do not have to be undergoing a war, threats of a war, or a period of geopolitical unrest to be misled, intimidated, demoralized, or otherwise to have their thinking or behavior influenced by an enemy; hence, their senses can help them know who is their enemy compared to who is their friend by just doing what Oliver Wendell Holmes Sr. suggested (i.e., to obtain a man's opinion of you, make him mad).

If a person's opinion of another individual is motivated by the compatibility of their likes and dislikes (such as beliefs, values, and hobbies), then any relationship between the two people that does not address questions about each other's general and personal lives is

105 <https://www.thoughtco.com/psychological-warfare-definition-4151867>

likely to be fragile or artificial. This situation is very serious and worrisome.

In 1941, the United States proposed that people collaborate to transform the social order rather than merely interpret it. In other words, the United States proposed that people become the architects of their own destiny in the aftermath of WW2 and not convert themselves into becoming modernized as the United Nations and international aid workers are interpreting the purpose of coming together to achieve the UN ideological objectives.

If the United Nations and international aid organizations are forcing people to find ways to stop being enslaved by their environment and instead sell themselves as commodities, then the United States is allowing these organizations to pressure individuals into transforming themselves out of physical necessity, rather than empowering them to become the architects of their own destiny as the US originally suggested. This situation is very serious and worrisome.

In other words, in order for a genuine transformation of consciousness to take root, people's social relations and values are necessary instruments to allow people to begin to transform the conditions and outcome that matter to them.

If the United Nations and international aid organizations are compelling people to transform their reality from a method in which their members dedicate themselves to becoming slaves of the tools of modernization instead of urging them to practice tolerance to be able to view each other as equals, then what those actors are campaigning for around the world is nothing other than assisting people to wear off their will to achieve the aspirations that the United States deeply cares about. This situation is very serious and worrisome. This assertion is because humans are selfish and corruptible and are not obedient and hardworking when their convictions become biased, as happened with Guevara and Nasrallah after their senses interpreted that the freedom that they were surrendering to achieve the unity, equality, and freedom that the United States claimed would take place if they were to become selfless or cooperative did not produce any change in their lives.

What if the campaign that the United Nations and international aid organizations are pursuing to end adversity and inequality is psychological warfare whose main aim is to influence the morale and attitudes of people around the world to believe that the United States is a threat to unity, equality, and freedom instead of a mechanism?

The United Nations and international aid organizations are waging a battle against ignorance around the world, but so far it has only increased people's attitudes toward race and individualism. This war to foster human rights to create an egalitarian world has so far weakened social relations and values, splitting nations into camps: those who believe that the wings of the United States need to be clipped and others who see its interferences to attain the ends stipulated in the UN Charter as a justified means.

Many people believe that the pursuit of a life filled with exploration or redemption has created a divide in mankind between those who make sacrifices and those who benefit from those sacrifices. This signifies that if the United Nations and international aid organizations continue to influence idealists who prioritize values and traditions different from those proposed by the United States, the US could be digging its own grave. In other words, if the United Nations and international aid organizations continue to design work programs that set deadlines for ending adversity and inequality, this could lead more people to feel compelled to revolt and rebuild their communities in response to the questions the UN is prompting them to consider about their general and personal lives. This situation is very serious and worrisome because if the ideas that the UN and international aid organizations continue to intersperse, this teaching would not be leading people to pursue the path that the United States proposed but to transform their consciousness to help save each other from the changes that they would believe are weakening their social relations and values instead of strengthening them. This would make people start to perceive the good soul as evil and the evil one as good, as is happening today with the way many people are interpreting the United States' interferences in Russia, China, Iran, Venezuela, the Middle East, and elsewhere.

This is very serious and worrisome, because if more nations, for example, continue to go along with this idea of supporting the United

States to end all acts of terror without this commitment that those nations are expressing being accompanied by results or evidence to support those regimes that are aiding the US to reach its objectives, are dealing with their dependent people democratically, or more people that the United States freed them from continue to live under the tyranny of their regimes, do not give this country a chance to help them to start to cooperate democratically, the experiences that would be lived would be making more people perceive that the United States is accountable for this social hierarchy (or increased bias) that the UN and international aid organizations are teaching people to fight.

Moreover, because few nations believe the US's aspirations to attain the UN's ideological objectives are genuine, and to make matters worse, the US lacks a way to demonstrate that its mindfulness is genuine because most nations the US is cooperating with to maintain international order prefer to keep their freedom and favor a horizontal governance of the international order rather than surrender it to the US, the United States is in deep trouble. In other words, the decision of this country to allow, during the last seventy years, a situation in which everyone becomes mindful about how to foster human rights led to a situation where we now have a condition in which 7.5 billion people do believe that their opinion on how legal and natural rights should be legitimized on earth should be taken into account. This is more and more leading to a condition whereby this experience, which we started in 1945 and in which it was agreed that the governance of the international order would be vertical governance, is becoming horizontal after the UN member states refused to allow the US to play the lead role, thus creating a condition where we all (i.e., the entire 7.5 billion people) agree on how the international order should be governed or no one would.

Furthermore, because the United States cannot genuinely support its mindfulness to make the world a better place for our children, and because the different regimes that aid this country despite others' resistance use its ideas to strengthen their interests and maintain control, the United States seems to be digging its own grave, as I said before, by prioritizing short-term political gains over long-term global stability and ethical responsibility.

Solomon (970 – 931 BCE) was, according to the Old Testament, a wealthy and wise king who was great in wisdom.¹⁰⁶ Most scholars claim that Solomon was the author of the Book of Proverbs that is in the Old Testament.¹⁰⁷ The book of Proverbs is a collection of proverbs that relates to questions of values, moral behavior, the meaning of human life, and right conduct. Proverbs 13:20 states, “He that walketh with wise men shall be wise: but a companion of fools shall be destroyed.”¹⁰⁸

If the proverb that Solomon stated is true, then it would be very difficult to make people perceive that the United States is working to achieve the UN ideological objectives genuinely if people are perceiving this country as being one that is a member of the *Ali Baba and the Forty Thieves*¹⁰⁹ folk tale. In other words, the United States is using the concept of democracy as a shield to protect its own interests and those of the regimes that support it, even in the face of opposition from others.

In the *Ali Baba and the Forty Thieves* folk tale, it was Ali Baba's faithful slave girl who saved him from the 40 thieves who were plotting to kill him.¹¹⁰ This scenario begs many questions. For one who could come to the United States' aid, if the countries that are helping this country to achieve the things that it deeply cares about are doing it to realize the full development of their personalities rather than to achieve the UN ideological objectives? In other words, could people's perceptions about the United States' war on terror be regarded as genuine when the destruction that this country is prompting is hindering the very people whom the US is coming to aid in freeing themselves from the autocratic, tyrannical, oligarchic, absolute, or dictatorial regimes that led them to yield to such outcomes? Most importantly, could the United States manage to reach the UN ideological goals when the UN itself has become an ideological operator?

106 <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Solomon>

107 https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Book_of_Proverbs

108 <https://www.biblegateway.com/passage/?search=Proverbs+13%3A20&version=NIV>

109 https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/One_Thousand_and_One_Nights

110 https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ali_Baba_and_the_Forty_Thieves

It looks as if people's frustration with the United States and with the regimes that the US is asking for their aid from in its war on terror would continue to grow in the years to come, although the regimes that are helping it to achieve its goals are prompting the same degree of intolerance or destruction, but it would be the United States that would always be regarded as the principal actor to be blamed. This perception occurs when Russia, for example, fights on the side of the Syrian government and the United States fights on the side of the people who are calling on it to help them install a democratic form of government in this country. What those two countries, Russia and the US, would be demonstrating to the whole world if this country turned out to be another Afghanistan, Iraq, Lebanon, or Egypt is that vice is superior to virtue and not the other way around. Hence, the United States is the one acting as the global policeman, not Russia. If the US continues to encourage people to prioritize the UN ideological objectives, people could start to turn away from this idea unless this teaching demonstrates empirically that it improves social cohesion and egalitarianism rather than adding cultural imperialism. This is because people did not agree to cooperate in the aftermath of World War II to increase their access to material things (or reduce poverty) but to increase social cohesion. In other words, reducing poverty (as the UN has been doing since 1945) does not increase social cohesion but, to the contrary, increases competition. What increases social cohesion is the capacity of people to “act” in accordance with the principles they deeply care about and the ones they expect others to also surrender freedom to start to prioritize.

It seems as if what the United States government needs to urgently do is to step back, take a deep breath, and try to keep things in perspective to understand if the ideas that this country deeply cares about are decaying or not. Anthropologists and archaeologists claim that when the socio-politico-economic sphere of a given civilization expands, its principles start to decay until it collapses (i.e., Greek, Roman Empire, etc.). If people continue to perceive that they are getting nothing out of the ideas that the United States deeply cares about, this could prompt our successor to withdraw their support to collectively collaborate in the socio-economic field to secure the aspirations that are stipulated in the UN Charter. If people withdraw their support to secure the UN's ideological objectives, this could impact negatively the continuity of

the Anglosphere idea. In other words, if nations begin to lose faith in the UN ideological objectives, this could lead powerful nations to begin to be less open to suggestions and possibilities to collectively cooperate in the economic field. No nation can be sure that its military leaders would remain faithful servants to its ideological ideas, no matter how cohesive their preparedness appears to be. This scenario signifies that if the powerful nations go back to prioritizing their national interests, there is a chance that the Anglosphere idea could collapse in the same way previous ideas collapsed and wiped along the way the authority of the families/dynasties that were benefiting from making others surrender freedom to prioritize their ideas.

I am unaware of any tool that can assist in managing people's emotions to comprehend why they are rejecting the idea of surrendering their freedom to the United States in order to achieve the UN's ideological goals, rather than exploring what others have done to overcome their setbacks and adversities when attempting to influence or persuade others to prioritize their own values and discipline them to act in accordance with their desires. I think that if we study what they did to change the behavior of the people they wanted to persuade them to behave in line with their own thinking, including reviewing what went wrong when they were trying to keep their ideas moving forward, this inquiry could help us to understand what they did to avoid discouragement and despair, including keeping morale high. This could also perhaps help us to check if we can compare their tactics to the technique that the UN member states are using and, in this way, understand what could be contributing to this growing dissatisfaction that people are expressing toward the interferences of the US in their lives and their unwillingness to surrender freedom to attain the UN ideological objectives, which are in their own best interests. Most importantly, this analysis would help us to know if we could continue to live with the UN teaching people to be intolerant and to be devoted to fostering human rights to create an egalitarian world on the one hand, while on the other, the US is teaching people to be disciplined and not to let the awareness that the UN is teaching them to increase their happiness push them to resort to violence to prompt their governments to relinquish control to the voting public of their regimes to create democratic forms of governments. In other words, I want to check if the international order could manage to cope with such a

relationship or if the frustration of people would be getting out of control and more people would be dissatisfied with the idea of democracy, thus prompting more people to be bound by their personal power and conscience to increase their happiness.

Christianity is an idea that a single man started about two thousand years ago. His name was Jesus Christ. At the simplest level, influence is simply the effective combination of three elements: The three elements of influence are a communicator, a message, and an audience. Jesus was crucified when he was persuading others to start acting in the way he wanted and/or to believe in what he was saying, and therefore, he did not live to see if the people whom he was communicating his message to understood it and accepted it. According to historians, only a handful of followers are depicted to have understood his message before his death.

Then again, of all the people that the New Testament claims have understood Jesus' message, most historians and scholars support that Paul the Apostle, also known as Saul, laid the groundwork that aided the message of Jesus to get through.¹¹¹ According to historians, Paul the Apostle was a Pharisee who "intensely persecuted" the followers of Jesus initially.¹¹² Paul did not know Jesus before his crucifixion. Christian scholars describe Paul's conversion experience as miraculous, supernatural, or otherwise revelatory in nature. However, what sets Paul apart from other followers of Jesus who deeply cared about his message was his power to know what he wants. In other words, Paul was able to clearly identify his exact desires from the limited choices available to him. Paul's choices were two. He could have continued to eradicate Christianity by seeking and arresting Jesus' followers, or he could have converted and become a follower of Jesus.

I think that Paul's most important accomplishment was his ability to found several Christian communities, which had a profound impact on the spread of the Christian faith. In other words, his power, despite not knowing every person he wanted to influence, allowed him to inspire those listening to him to act as he desired.

111 https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Paul_the_Apostle

112 https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Conversion_of_Paul_the_Apostle

Christian scholars claim that it was divine grace that helped Paul convert, become receptive to Jesus's message, and communicate in a way that put people at ease, so they would be ready to surrender their freedom and act according to his persuasion. Christianity defines grace as "the love and mercy given to us by God because God desires us to have it, not necessarily because of anything we have done to earn it."¹¹³ Until God gives us His love and mercy, allowing us to become like Paul—capable of distinguishing between righteousness based on the law and righteousness based on our own power and conscience—we have no choice but to rely on our actions to encourage a growing number of people to prioritize the things we deeply care about, so that others can convert and become receptive to our message.

This passage signifies that Paul's persuasion of the diaspora to make them have the courage to not prioritize their own views and beliefs of life had to have been tied to the acts he was exhibiting so the people who he did not know would notice him or listen to what he had to say.

I have no way of knowing what specific tactics Paul (or Jesus before him) used to persuade people to have the courage to act as per the way he was suggesting other than to consider that he was doing it by relying on making comparisons. In other words, he was giving them something away for getting something in return and to get people in the habit of being ready to have the courage to be tolerant. I do not understand what Paul (or Jesus) gave people to enable them to network and influence people to whom they previously had no connection, because Jesus' message was to practice tolerance and not prioritize accumulating material wealth or engage in violence to attain eternal life.

If what helped the Christian movement to grow and to make people become ready to surrender freedom was prompting them to become faithful, principally, to giving up desire in order to gain in return a spot in heaven, then the message that any communicator wants to be understood by his audience plays a very important role in making people act in the way one wants. The works that went into putting people at ease must have also been key in making the Christian movement move forward. This issue is very serious and worrisome.

113 https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Grace_in_Christianity

The international families/dynasties who won WW2 or the families/dynasties who controlled so much in the economic and political life of any nation in 1945 likely opposed the United States' 1941 call for mindfulness to end colonialism (i.e., subjugation, domination, and exploitation) and promote human rights and an egalitarian world. Those powerful families/dynasties should have gone along with the decision of the United States to play the global policeman role to see that the policies, conditions, and directives that are stipulated in the UN Charter succeed. This work plan was stipulated in the preamble charter and involved making people manage to “practice tolerance to live together in peace with one another as good neighbors.”¹¹⁴

If people's dissatisfaction with the United States, the international families/dynasties who won WW2, or the families/dynasties who managed to own the companies that, through them, 80% of the world's trading was handled by in 1945 is on the rise, this disillusionment could only be due to one of two scenarios: The first is that one of those three actors has gone and begun to pursue a role whose setback or adversity is making it impossible to move forward on the work program that was stipulated in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. The second is if any of the support actors who work with the three principal ones to secure the conditions and outcomes that matter to those three are prompting this frustration. Let us consider the case of the United Nations, as this intergovernmental organization is the primary formal entity coordinating activities between states on a global scale.

Vision, mission, objectives, strategies, and action plans are practical planning processes that humans use to help them define vision and sketch ways or frameworks to obtain the conditions and outcomes that matter to them. Two elements (or ingredients) are needed to provide any individual with the direction and order necessary to transform their ideas from dreams into action. The first is the vision, and the second is the blueprint that lays out what needs to happen to enact the change that would produce the vision.

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

I strongly believe that the social ideals employed by the United States by 1945 captured the dreams of the international families and dynasties who won World War II, as well as those who owned the companies responsible for 80% of the world's trading at that time. I also strongly believe, as I explained in the book *Reflection: Is the United States being used as an instrument to further the ends of despotism and Anarchy*,¹¹⁵ that the United States (i.e., as a country) was selected by the international families/dynasties who won WW2, or the families/dynasties who managed to own the companies that, through them, 80% of the world's trading was handled in 1945, to play the global policeman role to help those powerful families/dynasties build the conditions and outcomes that matter to them, and so this country (i.e., the US) was only used as a means. In other words, the ideals that the people in the United States deeply care about and the ideals that the international families/dynasties who won WW2, or the families/dynasties who managed to own the companies through which 80% of the world's trading was handled in 1945, are the same in terms of connecting people, ideas, and resources to help build, but with each one serving a different vision. In the case of the United States, the country prioritizes building healthier communities to ensure lasting peace and to end the historical dynamics that have prevented humanity from achieving lasting peace. This was to secure that the aspirations that were declared in the US Declaration of Independence about “all men being created equal”¹¹⁶ become the principle on which humans’ relations are built. In other words, the mere fact that all humans are equal means that all people have rights based on “the principle of equal rights” to increase their happiness.

I also strongly believe that the ideals that the international families/dynasties who won WW2, or the families/dynasties who managed to own the companies that handled 80% of the world's trading in 1945, deeply cared about went beyond the ideals that mattered to the people in the United States. That is to say, I believe that the ideals that the international families/dynasties who won WW2, or the families/dynasties who managed to own the companies through which 80% of the world's trading was handled, cared about involved connecting people, ideas, and resources to help build the social ideals

115 Maloof S., www.centermpa.com

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

that the United States managed to build in 1945 but without the quotation that was penned in the US Declaration of Independence about “all men being created equal” becoming the principle on which humans’ relations would be built when it comes to who would have the final say on who would rule the postwar international order. In other words, without the awareness that people around the world gain, threatening the power that those powerful international families/dynasties uphold.

To complicate matters further, rather than collaborating closely with the United States to transform the conditions and outcomes that mattered to them, similar to how Paul the apostle ensured that his priorities were always on track, the powerful international families and dynasties who controlled significant aspects of the economic and political life of any nation in 1945 sought to shape the post-WW2 world and permitted the United Nations to establish and manage that conceptual framework.

Earlier, I tried to relate the cognitive retardation of the Egyptian and Muslim people to a poem that Ahmad Shawqi expressed in 1914. Shawqi claimed that “an orphan is not the one whose parents passed away from life's worry, leaving him humiliated. The orphan is the one whose mother abandoned him or whose father is busy.” It seems as if the decision of the international families/dynasties that won WW2, or the families/dynasties that managed to own the companies through which 80% of the world's trading was handled in 1945, to let the United Nations put its hand on the helm of the postwar international order left those powerful international families/dynasties and the United States (i.e., as a country) in a situation that is not any different than the one that the Israeli government is offering to the Palestinian people today to put an end to the hostility that has been going on since 1947 between the two.

It seems that the powerful international families and dynasties, who control significant aspects of the economic and political life of many nations, including the United States, face two choices if they wish to regain what is important to them; these choices are similar to the options the Israeli government is presenting to the Palestinian people to end the ongoing hostility that has persisted since 1947. The first

option is to accept relinquishing their control and power over the international order so that the outcry from many people around the world, who are demanding a say in how natural and legal rights are distributed, is heard. The second is to continue to ignore the mounted frustration that people all over the world are expressing about having a role to play in how their natural and legal rights should be distributed, thus creating the same gridlock that the Palestinian / Arab nations have with the Israeli government.

What we do know is that if the Palestinian/Arab nations had taken action against the Israeli expansion on time, the Israeli government would have been unable to develop the power that led it to offer to the Palestinians "the bones instead of the whole chicken." Today, the Palestinians and the Arabs face two choices if they continue to insist that Israel return to the 1967 agreement. Either to wage a war against Israel on the hope that they would win and in this way claim back what they are insisting on or to accept the offer the Israeli government made to ultimately live in peace together. We could also say that if the Palestinians/Arabs continue to live in denial of those two realities, in fifty years from now, the Palestinians/Arabs will be getting nothing, because "bones," like any form of matter, crumble and become ash.

And so, it looks as if the powerful international families/dynasties who control so much in the economic and political life of any nation, including the United States (i.e., as a country), have two choices if they continue to insist on ignoring or blocking people's outcry to interfere in how their natural and legal rights are determined after they allowed the United Nations to lead mankind to believe that all the people around the world came together in 1945 to create an egalitarian world (i.e., end poverty, adversity, inequality, social injustice, etc.). The first is to organize a global war to reduce the number of people who are now rivaling each other to see whose way will get through. The second is to take action to stop the international order from continuing to erode, thus sparing us from ending up having to be dealing in the future with the same conditions that the Israeli government is now offering the Palestinians/Arabs to put an end to the hostility that has been waging between the two since 1947. In other words, stop allowing the United Nations and all international aid organizations to lead people to believe that the coming of nations (or

people) in 1945 was to create an egalitarian world to end poverty or social injustice and to put dates to reach such goals as if the international order were a bottle of yogurt that would go bad by a specific date if not consumed. This step also means going back to let the United States take the lead role in transforming the world in the same way this country managed to transform Europe in the aftermath of WW2.

Some think we can choose freely, but we can't escape the consequences.¹¹⁷ If the powerful international families and dynasties that won WW2 choose to prioritize increasing their wealth through the UN and international aid organizations over enhancing the security of the United States and other UN member states, they will need to navigate complex issues to achieve their goals. In other words, to quell the discontent with their new work program—especially since their predecessors expected them to follow the original design—they would have to factor the following. This is to permit the promotion of horizontal governance instead of a vertical one. In other words, create a situation where everyone governs or no one rules, meaning no one can rule because everyone is ruling.

Until 1945, people were able to achieve their goals despite the resistance of others by relying primarily on three main factors. Those three factors were wealth, prestige, and power.¹¹⁸ A person gained their power from any one of those three factors, either through birth or individual achievement. However, pursuant to the decision of the powerful international families/dynasties who control so much in the economic and political life of any nation to be impatient post-1945 and to want to pursue a work program that aims to increase production as a means to increase their wealth, instead of sticking to attaining this end by using the policies, conditions, and directives that were stipulated in the UN Charter and the associated treaties, they seem to have created a major challenge for themselves and for everyone.

As I said before, a person can make another individual surrender freedom to him voluntarily, by force, or by virtue of a system of governance that has this objective. Paul the Apostle, for example, was

117 <https://www.pinterest.com/pin/501166264756303387/>

118 https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Social_stratification

relying on making people surrender freedom by prompting the human ingenuity (or human behavior) of people to do it voluntarily. He was not using any physical tools or instruments created by human ingenuity, such as knives, swords, pistols, or weapons of mass destruction.

Automation is a tool that makes a person give up freedom (or practice tolerance) involuntarily. Until 1945, humans relied extensively on both their ingenuity and the behavior of others to persuade individuals to surrender their freedom. Post-1945, individuals began to increasingly depend on automation to compel others to surrender their freedom, as this technology can make a person relinquish their freedom without resistance.

If the powerful international families/dynasties who control so much in the economic and political life of any nation are not afraid of the UN and international aid organizations continuing to increase the awareness of the poor about the importance of rejecting their values and traditions in favor of being modernized, thus leading more people to continue to believe that they also have the right to start to get their way despite the resistance of others as per the same way the powerful international families/dynasties are doing it, then those powerful international families/dynasties could only be wagering on the power of automation in partnership with their control of outlawing any production of weapons of mass destruction to continue to maintain their authority or power.

In other words, if those powerful international families/dynasties believe that they could maintain their strength and stability without having to stick to prioritizing the work program that was specified in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights to be used as an instrument to enable any person to have any power (i.e., birth or individual achievement), but instead those families/dynasties believe that they would be able to secure an overwhelming number of people starting to deeply care about increasing their wealth or power without the UN and international aid organizations teaching them to increase material things around them affecting their loyalty, then those powerful families/dynasties believe that they could manage to achieve

what Moses, Jesus, Muhammad, Paul the Apostle, Gandhi, Nelson Mandela, and Martin Luther King achieved with their voice only.

I have no way of knowing if the strategy that Moses, Jesus, Muhammad, Paul the Apostle, Gandhi, Nelson Mandela, and Martin Luther King followed to get their way despite the resistance of others is better or the strategy that the powerful international families/dynasties who control so much in the economic and political life of any nation are pursuing is better to achieve the same, but what I do know from what is reported in historical books is that Moses and others were not relying on anything that is the product of man's ingenuity to make people surrender not only freedom but also their wealth to follow them.

If the powerful international families/dynasties who control so much in the economic and political life think that they can transform people's hearts by allowing the UN and international aid organizations to preach to people to take instead of preaching what Moses and others were doing, which is making the people who were following them give, then those powerful international families/dynasties must believe that they could manage to control the multi-tribe makeup of all the different societies exactly as Moses and others did by taking away from people what Moses and others were giving, which is their voice (or knowledge). In other words, the powerful international families/dynasties who control so much in economic and political life must think that if they keep people away from education (i.e., controlling science), they could control human ingenuity.

I cannot determine whether strategies aimed at controlling the transmission of ideas are an effective tactic for making people genuinely care about what they consider important. However, what I do know is that power is a function of wealth and prestige. As I mentioned earlier, until 1945, individuals could achieve their goals despite opposition from others (i.e., wield considerable power) based on the wealth and status they acquired through personal achievements or inherited advantages.

Max Weber claims that a person does not wield considerable power solely from wealth or status (i.e., individual achievement or gains from

birth); rather, holding a certain public position can enable an individual to exercise significant social power even if that person possesses little money, property, or status.¹¹⁹ For example, until 1945, an individual who did not have much money, property, or status wielded considerable social power only if he was a politician or a religious figure. Post 1945, any individual who manages security policies for railroads, buses, pipelines, ports, mass transit systems, and highways can make any wealthy person or an individual with status take off his shoes and belt, including emptying his pockets whenever he is crossing a security checkpoint.

The central assertion regarding the surrender of freedom to legitimize natural and legal rights is that it enables individuals to wield power through birth or personal achievement, rather than allowing their personal power and conscience to shape the laws and political order that govern people's relationships. In other words, the social contract and/or the political order that people pursue is simply a means to enable all members to fulfill their part of this agreement, but without this rule that ensures how a person could get to wield power (i.e., through birth or individual achievement), it becomes unrestricted. To put it differently, this well-defined and well-established rule is a law that is considered among the immortal declarations that man came up with (and some even believe that God handed them to him), protected, and regarded as an injunction that should not be threatened.

For example, from antiquity to 1945, no person would dare to exercise power or authority if this process did not factor in birth (i.e., social class) or individual achievement. If a poor person violates this well-defined and well-established social order, he will be penalized. Post-1945, powerful international families and dynasties that control much of the economic and political life in any nation want all people to continue respecting the social contract or political order upon which the distribution of material wealth is based (i.e., birth or individual achievement). In addition, those powerful families and dynasties want all individuals, especially the poor, to remove their shoes and belts, including emptying their pockets, whenever they cross a security checkpoint to comply with the security policies that these families

119 https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Social_stratification#Max_Weber

legitimize to maintain their influence and stability despite opposition from others.

From birth to death, people use their human ingenuity to manipulate matter and control the movement of the products they create as they both change from one place to another. Power (wealth and status) allows people to get their way despite resistance, and it also determines who can change or transport what type of matter.

Surely, humans began to delegate to robots the role that their human body was programmed to serve in the natural world, and very soon, there would be less and less need for this species to be in abundance on earth as the case is like now, that is, if they continue to delegate the role that they were programmed to serve to machines, but until then, we cannot ignore that humans were created on earth and they are made of physical matter. In other words, humans are objects and do obey the same physical laws as other matter and motion. To put it differently, they need to be structured and regulated; otherwise, they become uncontainable.

I have no way of knowing how the powerful international families/dynasties who control so much in the economic and political life of any nation reached the point where they could continue to make people respect the social contract or political order that, on its premise, wants the poor to distribute physical material things (i.e., birth or individual achievement) while making it simultaneously lawful that any poor person can intercept their human body to make them take their shoes and belt, including emptying their pockets, whenever they are crossing with the things they own at a security checkpoint when the whole purpose of making the poor people adopt the security policies that are now in place was to enable those powerful international families/dynasties to continue to get their way despite the resistance of others (i.e., maintain their strength and stability). However, we could say that until the powerful international families/dynasties who control so much in the economic and political life of any nation become convinced that man's progress reached a level that makes having the human species in abundance unnecessary, as the case is like now, it is necessary to have the human ingenuity and human imagination of this species controlled. In other words, the

powerful international families/dynasties who control so much in the economic and political life of any nation must come up with a strategy that allows them to make humans change with respect to time and space while ensuring that their behavior or any product produced by their ingenuity does not threaten them. To put it differently, the powerful families/dynasties would need to reform "individual consciousness" and values to produce better workers and citizens without the job that those powerful families/dynasties delegated to the poor people to be responsible for handling (i.e., making them control and regulate their motion in space and time), trusting them to have envy, bias, ambition, etc.

I have no way of knowing how the powerful international families/dynasties who control so much in the economic and political life plan to make humans function in time and space in the same way the tools that are products of their human ingenuity behave or function free from feelings. However, we could say that until now, or seventy-five years later, all that mankind managed to achieve from this aspiration that everyone in 1945 was ready to collectively cooperate to pursue is that instead of improving social relations and values, the powerful international families/dynasties involved managed to theoretically make the power of the Pope and the power of the family/dynasty that everyone is ready to support the most powerful family in the world (i.e., the British Royal family), and the power of a security guard at a security checkpoint is one and the same. Both the elite and the ordinary individual can equally decide how each other's actions change with respect to time and space, illustrating the paradox of power dynamics in a complex societal structure.

Surely, the ambitions of the families/dynasties who won WW2 or the families/dynasties who managed to own the companies that, through them, 80% of the world's trading was handled in 1945, to encourage the United Nations and international order to interfere in the social order to foster human rights to create an egalitarian world instead of staying steadfastly committed to letting the United States transpose its successes in building social relations and values to other parts of the world, have helped humans so far to manage to regulate and structure the motion in space and time of each other. In other words, instead of the wealth that was concentrated in the hands of a fortunate few before

permitting them to regulate and structure the motion in space and time of all the rest, all a security guard with no wealth and prestige has to do to possess the same power is to claim that he is not letting anyone pass beyond a security checkpoint because he is doing it for security reasons.

If all that people do from birth to death is to use the product of their human ingenuity to change matter and to control how the motion of the product that they create changes from one place to the next, and if, as I just said, today the security policies that, on their premise, the powerful international families/dynasties who control so much in the economic and political life of any nation want all people to establish relations on their premise do not require that a person be wealthy or have status or use his human ingenuity to create any weapon of mass destruction to possess the same power that any member of the British Royal family holds, but to obtain a position as a security guard to possess the same power for free, then we could say that all that is left to do to achieve the equal rights relationship that mankind delegated to the UN and international aid organizations to intervene in how it could be attained is to be able to control that greed and individual ambition do not stand in the way. I will provide an example to clarify the issue and help readers better understand my perspective.

Airbus is one of the richest and most powerful companies in the world. The families/dynasties who own the Airbus company refuse to give the blueprints that show the people in Lebanon, for example, how to be preoccupied with building airplanes instead of being devoted to using their human ingenuity to encourage the egotism and selfishness that have plagued this country since 1945. On the other hand, a security guard at the Airbus headquarters can block the president of this powerful company from entering into his office by just calling for a simple security drill inspection. As we can see, the deteriorated security situation led to the president of Airbus and the security guard having the same power over the control of the Airbus headquarters and the motion of people into this office building.

This signifies that when security decreases, it does not matter if one person owns a nuclear bomb and another is armless; human ingenuity can exercise the same controlling power. In the example above, the

security guard did not use any product of human ingenuity to control the president of Airbus. He achieved his goal by just calling for a security inspection. In other words, the security guard obtained his power using the same method that Moses, Jesus, Muhammad, Paul the Apostle, Gandhi, Nelson Mandela, and Martin Luther King used to get their way despite the resistance of others. He raised his voice and called for a security drill. This is very serious and worrisome. If the more security deteriorates, the more security drills and security checkpoints people must cross, then this signifies that the more egotism and selfishness rise, the more the conscious transformation that people would be prioritizing would be distancing them from becoming selfless, cooperative, obedient, and incorruptible.

If the powerful international families/dynasties who control so much in the economic and political life of any nation become convinced that man's progress reached a level that makes it not necessary to need the human species in abundance, as the case is like now, it would be important to control greed and individual ambition to stop the human ingenuity and human imagination from standing in the way.

The United States government and the rest of the UN member states who are aiding this country during its ongoing war on terror want to convince us that Islamization is a conversion in people's social relations and values that is preventing a genuine transformation of consciousness to take root. Islam is a religion that obliges its adherents to pray five times a day and to abstain from drinking alcohol, smoking tobacco, gambling, or pursuing immoral acts. It appears that the practice of Islamization (as well as Christianity, Judaism, Buddhism, etc.) represents a positive structural change that the US aims to implement in order to transform people's social relations and values, encouraging them to prioritize morals over egotism and selfishness.

Indeed, the findings in this work increasingly confirm that the US and governments working with it to foster a sense of "unity between the individual and the mass" are misdiagnosing the true reason for this rise in intolerance. It looks as if what is preventing the working class from feeling more complete with what the United States permitted starting from 1941 is the refusal of the UN member states to admit that the interference of the UN and international aid organizations in the social

order to foster human rights to create an egalitarian world raised egotism and selfishness instead of diminishing greed and individual ambition so more people can favor collectivism. Moreover, it looks as if the families/dynasties who won WW2 or the families/dynasties who managed to own the companies that, through them, 80% of the world's trading is now handled do not begin to pause the UN and international aid organizations from continuing to interfere in the economic and social preparation of nations and to arrange that democratic forms of governments determine any political status; mankind could continue to be addressing the wrong symptoms for this rise in intolerance that emerged worldwide post-1945.

3

The False Road

In Arthurian literature, the Holy Grail is depicted as being a treasure, such as a stone with miraculous powers that provides happiness, eternal youth, or sustenance in infinite abundance to everyone that lives within the realm, including the people with the least power.¹²⁰ King Arthur in the Arthurian legend used to congregate with his knights around a round table, as its name suggests, to search for the Holy Grail (i.e., prevent quarrels among his barons).¹²¹ Other recorded stories claim that there was always a vacant seat around the round table reserved for the knight who would one day be successful in the quest for the Holy Grail.¹²²

It seems as if the families/dynasties who won WW2 or the families/dynasties who managed to own the companies that through them 80% of the world's trading is now handled need to sit around a similar round table to go over their order of precedence. In this context, the decision must be made whether to allow the United Nations and international aid organizations to continue assisting them in achieving their important goals, or to prohibit these entities from interfering in the economic and political readiness of nations, thereby allowing governments to reclaim their role as advised by the founding fathers of the UN.

Evidently, this issue is important because in some Arthurian literature there are versions in which all the knights refuse to accept a lower status than the others and would end up involved in internal conflicts

120 https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Holy_Grail

121 https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Round_Table

122 https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Siege_Perilous

and kill each other.¹²³ There are even some versions in which a new King picks who sits on this round table after the death of King Arthur.¹²⁴

Interestingly, the round table concept depicted in Arthurian literature closely resembles the concept used by Jesus during the Last Supper that he shared with his apostles before his crucifixion.¹²⁵ Indeed, there are many similarities between the chronicles described in the gospel accounts, which depict Jesus sitting around a round table partaking in meaningful discussions, and those reported in the Arthurian literature.

Mysteriously, from as far back as the date when historians claim Jesus was organizing round-table dinners or meetings 2000 years ago until now, all that man has to do is to reflect on his humility to find this value converts any person into becoming the perfect architect of his own destiny. To the contrary, from 1945, the date when the UN member states are depicted to be partaking about the things they deeply care about until now, mankind continues to be transforming in manners that distance people away from the values which they came in the first place to help narrow its gap.

In the Arthurian literature, there are chronicle versions that depict that the seat that used to remain empty at the Round Table was left purposely empty because it marked the betrayal of Judas.¹²⁶

Could this decision that the families/dynasties who won WW2 took to let the United Nations sit with the UN member states on the same round table to discuss how to secure the ends stipulated in the UN charter be what has prompted this rise in intolerance that emerged in the world post-1945? Shall this seat remain empty so the UN member states go back to cooperating based on what the founding fathers pointed out to attain the UN ideological objectives, or would the decision of the families/dynasties who control so much in the economic and political life of any existing nation to allow the UN to encourage material incentives rather than moral ones be a choice that their successors would regret?

123 https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Post-Vulgate_Cycle

124 https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mark_of_Cornwall

125 https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Last_Supper

126 https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Uther_Pendragon

Indeed, the decision of the families/dynasties that control so much in the economic and political life of any existing nation to let the UN interpret the work program that the United States proposed instead of coordinating its transformation has increased betrayal, backstabbing, crisscrossing, corruption, egotism, and selfishness in recent years.

Could the intolerance, civil unrest, violence, and wars that people are exhibiting, including how the administrators of this organization are violating the UN Charter and running the organization's judicial system to protect their best interests and deny their victims' rights, be a sign that the social order is already in the zone of no return?

I have no way of knowing if the families/dynasties who control so much in the economic and political life of any existing nation would manage to save the disenchantment that people are feeling about how the international order that everyone began to cooperate collectively to transform has turned out so far in the same way King Arthur is reported in the literature to have managed to secure Great Britain against invaders in the late 5th and early 6th centuries. Alternatively, God would decide to interfere to save the world from all the egotism and selfishness that the UN was spreading before.

Indeed, the way UN administrators and judges prioritized their own happiness over the values outlined in the UN Charter—unlike the American national values discussed in part two of this work—supports the conclusion that this organization is leading humanity back to the era our predecessors warned us against, urging us to avoid reestablishing relations based on that premise.

Could the greed and individual ambition that the UN administrators/judges expressed when they were using the UN as a ladder to get their way despite the resistance of others be a warning to the US, the UN member states, and the successors of the families/dynasties who control so much in the economic and political life of any existing nation to reconsider their order of precedence? The aim is to initiate reforms within the UN to prevent a fate similar to that which Jesus faced, as described in the Gospel account and various Arthurian legends. In other words, determining who has the right to

interfere in how natural and legal rights should be distributed and managed to prevent the UN and international aid organizations from continuing to convert the UN into a market in the same way the Jewish religious leaders were allowing during the Roman Empire.

The monster-hunting protector role that the United States has played since 1945 to safeguard the unregenerate revisionism of human nature seems to be repelling people more and more away from its ideas, so people with true evil behavior play its global policeman role.

This situation is very serious and worrisome. All that the United States proposed to existing governments to start doing post-1945 is to domesticate their newborns based on the harmonization method that this country adopted to make its own newborns and those who immigrated to this country happy. This method was to foster unity between the individual and the mass. This method was similar to the one Jesus used to encourage people to eliminate their egotism and selfishness. Without the experience of the United States from 1776 to 1945 showing that prioritizing the moral over the material increases happiness, one could say that the intolerance that emerged post-1945 is a result of humans testing a new domestication method that was not tested before.

However, if, as I said before, governments do not have the valor to coordinate activities in accordance with the work program that the United States proposed in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, this situation could only be due to this country having been chosen by the families/dynasties who won WW2 to sit in the empty seat of their round table to stop this country from transforming the conditions and outcomes that matter to it in accordance with the UN ideological objectives, or those powerful families/dynasties permitted the UN to become an economic operator because they did not want the US to discover the Holy Grail (i.e., continue its quest to end financial oligarchy, discrimination, corruption, etc.).

“The themes, events, and characters of the Arthurian literature varied widely from text to text, and there is no one canonical version.”¹²⁷
Galahad was a knight of King Arthur's Round Table and one of the

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

three achievers of the Holy Grail in Arthurian legend.¹²⁸ Galahad was renowned for his gallantry and purity as the most perfect of all knights in a good number of Arthurian texts. According to some interpreters, Galahad surpasses his father in valor, and he becomes successful in his search for the Holy Grail.¹²⁹ In fact, some texts depict a feud between Galahad and his father, during which Galahad defeats him. Consequently, his father knights his son, and he gets to be invited to sit at King Arthur's round table. Most importantly, he is made to assume the empty seat at the round table (i.e., the Siege Perilous¹³⁰), which has proven to be fatal to anyone who sat on it.¹³¹

It is not clear why Galahad was led to sit at the Siege Perilous seat at King Arthur's round table. Some texts claim that “Galahad's arrival marked the start of the Grail quest as well as the end of the Arthurian era.”¹³² Other versions consider the motif to allude to the fact that “earthly endeavors must take second place to the pursuit of the holy.”¹³³

The United States course to strengthen social relations and values does not seem to be any different than the one Galahad or Jesus pursued. From 1776 to now, the otherworldly aspirations of this country seem to be different than the UN or the UN member states set out to find as of 1945.

From 1945 to now, the United States seems to be traveling alone in this journey to find the Holy Grail (i.e., to increase comradery and social cohesion), smiting and sparing enemies in the same way Galahad was doing. The United States may be following this solitary path because it operated from 1776 to 1945 in a manner that is completely separate from the generally sinful behavior exhibited by UN administrators on its soil. The refusal of governments that have adopted undemocratic laws since 1945 to relinquish control to the

128 <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Galahad>

129 https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Galahad#Conception_and_birth

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

131 https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Galahad#Knighthood_and_the_Grail_Quest

132 Kibler, William W. (1991). "Round Table." In Lacy, Norris J. (Ed.), *The New Arthurian Encyclopaedia*, p. 391. New York: Garland. ISBN 0-8240-4377-4.

133 https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Galahad#Knighthood_and_the_Grail_Quest

voting public clearly indicates that the ideals pursued by the United States are distinct from those pursued by these governments.

Surely, from any impression of the social construct that a person takes of the world post-WW2, he will find that the United States is fighting a battle between the ideal and the human. At the same time, if the United States continues to be perceived as a materialistic and imperialist country, there is a good chance that the intolerance, civil unrest, violence, and wars that are on the rise will continue to cement people's perceptions about the US being the obstacle for man's aspirations to strengthen "unity, equality, and freedom," which the UN administrators and judges are also using to transform conditions and outcomes to sustain their greed and personal ambition.

Guevara claimed that "the highest forms of human solidarity and loyalty arise among the working class or lonely and desperate people."¹³⁴ If the highest forms of human camaraderie are found among the poor, and the UN officials are teaching the poor and government officials egotism and selfishness, as the case that I shared in this work about how the UN officials treated this American national when he refused to prioritize his happiness over the UN principles clearly shows, then there is a good chance that if the US continues to search to make the world become a better place and the UN officials are pursuing their individual ambitions, the US will face the same end.

When corruption rises, the people in positions of power become capable of justifying easily why man-made distinctions such as religion, traditions, values, and lack of education prevent the establishment of a democratic form of government or how they are committed to relinquishing control to the voting public of their regimes, but in due time. This conduit gives the people steering the international order time, but they're not the only ones working to secure their aspirations. The natural system, plus another 7.5 billion people, is also doing it by influencing social dynamics and

134 Kellner, Douglas (1989). Ernesto "Che" Guevara (World Leaders Past & Present). Chelsea House Publishers (Library Binding edition). p. 112. ISBN 1-55546-835-7.

contributing to the challenges of governance and equality on a global scale.

Therefore, since the UN's ambition to foster human rights to create an egalitarian world has accelerated the awareness of all the people in all the nations to start to be conscious about the importance of reducing adversity and inequality, it is, in so doing, increasing crises and conflicts. This is because encouraging people to combat adversity, inequality, or corruption leads to the same unrest. This situation also means that if the UN and the international aid organization continue to interpret their role as being one that is programmed to end poverty, injustice, etc. rather than to transform people so they could begin to achieve practical results for the greater well-being of society instead of solely becoming motivated for happiness, the international order would continue to deteriorate, and more people would be conjecturing that their personal power and conscience dictate they have a role to play on the side of the UN and not the US. This is because the US is leading the control that human ingenuity once used to dominate, turning it from a process decided by human ingenuity to one that automation does. Hence, human ingenuity is powerless in front of the controlling power of science or automation. This conclusion means that the more the UN increases people's awareness to foster human rights, the more the conviction of the people about the US blocking them from getting their way to increase the happiness of its own citizens would grow. This scenario signifies that people (or nations) would all return to the days of persecution.

Throughout history, people (or nations) persecuted each other to increase their happiness, and some even resorted to tactics that employed famine as a tool to break the will of those who refused to surrender freedom to those who originated such a tactic. Evidently, this abnormal rise in intolerance that emerged post-1945 points toward one conclusion. Those who refuse to surrender freedom for the aspirations proposed by the United States in 1941 are unaware that happiness cannot exist where there is hunger.

Surely, people's preoccupation with delegating the task of securing food to robots signifies that those who focus on pursuing happiness rather than teaching their children how to grow wheat or bake bread

are relying on their government to provide the food they need to survive in the event of a new global war. People give up some freedom to elected officials to avoid worrying about survival during wars.

Perhaps people's desire to avoid prioritizing the work program proposed by the United States in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights is leading societies to focus more on socialism; thus, this strategy circumvents the struggle between the masses and competing ideas. In other words, rather than people becoming devoted to prioritizing cooperation based on the principles of equal rights, people are favoring political systems that relieve them of worrying about meeting their survival needs. In other words, how does one achieve the goals the US set in the UN Charter's preamble?

Since humans began to persecute or rival each other for wealth or power, it did not come to pass that there was a case in which the ideas or resources that people were fighting over permanently confiscated the unity of the people that were being pushed to surrender freedom to prioritize the social, political, or economic system of the party that originated such a tactic. All the time, the social space that people (or nations) rivaled each other to determine who could exercise power over its ideas or its resources (humans and material) ended up a decision that the people who inhabit the land made on how it would be ultimately managed and distributed. For example, Australia and Canada remain constitutional monarchies in the Westminster tradition because those who would express a desire for the masses to revolt and end their status as Commonwealth realms had not yet been born.

The willingness of the people living in Canada or Australia to remain constituent countries within the Westminster system of the United Kingdom is based on their belief that the parliamentary system, to which they are surrendering some freedom, will not interfere with their "unity, equality, and freedom." In other words, Canada and Australia would stay loyal to Britain as long as it doesn't act in a way that makes them think their freedom is being used to trample their rights to happiness. If the people in those two countries lose confidence in the neutrality of the British government in determining their "unity, equality, and freedom" or in failing to provide them the protection that allows them to be much happier than the people in Lebanon or

Afghanistan, for example, they would begin to challenge the legitimacy that Great Britain is exercising over their rights to control their resources (human and material), leading to repeating the same exercise or insubordination that the patriots in the United States manifested, leading to obtaining independence from Great Britain.

This signifies that it is in the best interest of Great Britain to prevent, before it's too late, that the people in Canada or Australia begin to want to discern good and evil on their own and that they continue to trust in the leadership of Great Britain's wisdom so the power of this country does not shrink. This is because if the people in Canada or Australia begin to want to seek autonomy and/or to want to define good and evil for themselves, it is highly likely that the world would sink in insecurity even more because instead of having 193 UN member states who are discerning between good and evil, we would have 195.

In the Bible, it is reported that after the people in antiquity began to spread and redefine good and evil, they built a major city, which they called Babylon.¹³⁵ The Bible describes the city dwellers as being united, speaking one language, until they decided to exalt themselves to the place of God and built a tower that would reach heaven. From that day onward, the Bible narrates the account of people who devote themselves, from one generation to the next, to building and knocking down cities plagued by violence and oppression. Most importantly, from the date that those people in antiquity began to build a tower that would reach to heaven and 1776, all the people who lived were looking to form a new kind of human. In 1776, it seems that "God" decided to test a new solution to end evil, which was different from the previous methods He had used to increase righteousness. "God" decided in 1776 to construct a model country to show man that it is possible for the human race to build a tower that reaches to heaven when people practice tolerance and speak the same language. God demonstrated that immigrants with diverse traditions and values can temporarily set aside their beliefs and habits to unite in support of a single tradition—practicing tolerance.

Strangely, when mankind decided in 1945 to adopt the American spirit as a set of ideals to rescue the entire world or increase the happiness of

¹³⁵ <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Babylon>

all people across nations, it seems that once again, humanity does not want to trust these American ideals to discern good and evil and instead prioritizes individualism, allowing each person to define good and evil for themselves. After 75 years of collective efforts to promote American ideals, the resulting social order seems to reflect the same conditions that reportedly flourished in ancient Babylon. People are more and more stopping speaking the same language and/or understanding each other, and the ideas of "unity, equality, and freedom" seem to be dying, thus giving a need to come up, once again, with a new solution to stop people from exalting themselves to the place of God.

The good news is that if God exists and is watching, He no longer needs to take action as He did in the past, when He insisted on ruling the world through humans, because humanity can now rely on its own ingenuity to govern effectively. In other words, man is now capable, through technology, of inducing behaviors that override natural human behavior.

Hence, technology is now capable of preventing humans from continuing to have to define good and evil for themselves, thus preventing violence and oppression. We can say that mankind does now have a solution to make all the people put their trust in the wisdom of the individuals who control and operate those tools or machines.

If humans continue to want to rule the world through technology, and if those who control and operate these tools prevent them from increasing intolerance or speeding human self-destruction, then we could say we need not continue searching for a new kind of human. In other words, for people to stop resorting to violence and oppression, they must be convinced that their trust in the wisdom of the tools or machines, as well as in the individuals who control and operate them, will remain unshaken.

I cannot determine whether the trust that people place in the wisdom of the tools or machinery, as well as in the individuals who control and operate them, will remain unbroken enough to prevent mankind from relapsing into violence and oppression. What I do know is that when

God was entrusting to humans the task of ruling the world, the Bible claims that there was a snake who was duping humans to continuously rebel against each other. All the solutions that God came up with managed to crush the influence of the snake on their behavior, but they were also later defeated by it, leading to a cycle of conflict and disobedience among humans.

If people choose to rely on the wisdom of tools or machinery, as well as the judgment of those who control and operate these instruments, to prevent a return to violence and oppression, it is crucial that the snake, which deceives humans into irrational behavior, does not influence these individuals to prioritize egotism and selfishness. Otherwise, the hope for peace on earth may simply become another unattainable utopian dream. Let's set aside our trust in the wisdom of the tools or machinery.

I have no way of knowing if the individuals who would be controlling and operating the tools or machinery that all people seem to be in favor of being used as an alternative method to the one that the United States used from 1776 to 1945 to make people speak the same language would abuse their role. This would depend on whether the individuals who would be controlling and operating those instruments would be reporting to the families/dynasties who won WW2 or the families/dynasties who managed to own the companies that, through them, handled 80% of the world's trading in 1945 or if new families/dynasties control those individuals altogether.

I have no way of knowing if the families/dynasties who won WW2 (i.e., the families/dynasties who picked the American ideals that were used in the United States from 1776 to 1945 to make people speak the same language all over the world) are the ones who are controlling the individuals who are operating the tools or machinery that humans' increased greed and individual ambition seem to be supporting, so their number is on the rise as an alternative to the method that the United States depended on to make people speak the same language, or if new families/dynasties control those individuals altogether.

This issue is important because we know that the American ideals managed to prevail over the snake who was duping the

families/dynasties to rely on violence and oppression to rule the world. If new families/dynasties control those individuals, and the families/dynasties who won WW2 (i.e., the families/dynasties who picked that the American ideals that were used in the United States from 1776 to 1945 to make people speak the same language all over the world) seem to be more and more surrendering freedom to letting such tools or machinery be used to control how people relate, then we have two challenges to overcome. First, we do not know whether the aspirations of those new families/dynasties to switch from continuing to use the American ideals as a method to make people speak the same language all over the world ultimately achieve the UN ideological objectives. In other words, the switch's main purpose is to increase their happiness over the rest of the world's or to prevent further social decline. Second, we have no evidence supporting the idea that people who trust the wisdom of those operating the tools or machinery would remain loyal to the families/dynasties that won WW2 (or new ones, if they differ), rather than being prompted by the serpent to pursue a goal different from the work program that the United States has developed over two hundred years. This was to show that it is possible with hard work and progressive ideas to make people of different beliefs and habits put their tribalism to the side to increase their happiness.

In as far as the first challenge, we have no way of knowing if this decision to switch from using the ideals that the people in the United States used to have, enabling people of different tribalisms to be able to understand each other (and which was based on making human behavior ready to surrender freedom voluntarily), has failed when it became employed as a tool post-1945 to increase the happiness of every member of the human family worldwide, because the people whom the United States freed from continuing to live under domination and oppression and invited to cooperate based on the ideals that it was using became impatient and did not give this country the chance to show them how its ideals could make them reach the same happiness that this country managed to achieve when its people agreed to be patient from 1776 to 1945. Alternatively, the decision of governments to switch from continuing to depend on adopting the methods that the United States used from 1776 to 1945 to make people of different tribalism surrender freedom naturally in favor of using tools or machinery that would make a person surrender freedom even

when this action is against his will is because the families/dynasties who are producing those tools and machinery are being impatient to increase their profit or wealth.

This is very serious and worrisome. First, because mankind has not practiced the work program that was stipulated in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (i.e., the American ideals) to know if the failure of people all over the world to speak the same language, as per what the United States managed to show, is possible before going ahead and using tools or machinery that would make a person surrender freedom even when this action is against his will, the problem is in the impatience of the governments that were supposed to practice the American ideals post-1945 or in a rule in the American ideals. This situation is very serious and worrisome because if mankind makes the switch before getting to know first, people started to be unable to speak the same language post-1945 because of the impatience of governments to practice the American ideals post this date, or if this challenge is due to a rule, this means that mankind is putting the American ideals in great danger. This is because if the failure of the people whom the United States freed from continuing to live under domination and oppression and invited to cooperate based on the ideals that it was using to increase their happiness is due to the governments that were supposed to be influencing them to cooperate based on these ideals not going ahead and ruling based on the principles that the United States employed from 1776 to 1945 (i.e., by putting tribalism on the side), this would mean that this rise in intolerance that emerged in the world post-1945 is not due to a flaw in the American ideals but due to the snake that makes people become unwilling to surrender freedom to attain the happiness that the people in the United States managed to triumph over by continuing to be thriving in those countries that did not get rid of their tribalism to be able to speak the same language afterwards.

This scenario signifies that if the governments who retained control of their regimes instead of relinquishing it to the voting public continue to be provided tools or machinery that aids them in forcing people to surrender freedom even when this action is against their will, those countries would remain unstable forever. Moreover, hence, it is the American ideals that would be preventing those governments from

controlling their people (that's because the American ideals are inscribed in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights); then, only if the American ideals collapse could those countries that are still relying today on tribalism to rule become capable of continuing to transform the conditions and outcomes that matter to them. This scenario signifies that it is very serious and worrisome because this situation also signifies that the faster the United States empowers governments with tools or machinery that can help them to make the people who refuse to surrender freedom to them do it even when this action is against their will, the faster the United States would be accelerating its collapse. Moreover, the longer the United States takes to come to aid the people who are revolting against their government for resorting to violence and oppression to make them surrender freedom to them using tools or machinery that makes them be obliged to surrender freedom against their will, the deeper people's conviction that the US is acting indifferently becomes because it is an accomplice to those oppressive regimes. This is very serious and worrisome because this also signifies that the international order could be out of control and is on its way to confronting harsher challenges if the United States does not begin to play its global policeman role or stops continuing to ship tools or machinery to any government that is not using such instruments to advance the work program that is stipulated in the Declaration of Human Rights. However, because the United States is not the only source that produces tools or machinery that the governments who refuse to relinquish control of their regimes to the voting public have to be loyal to to obtain such instruments, which are needed by them to help them to get their way despite the resistance of others (i.e., without having to resort to violence to make people refuse to surrender freedom to them), this situation signifies that the United States is doomed if it continues to play the global policeman role without siding with the regimes that adopt autocratic, tyrannical, oligarchic, absolute, or dictatorial forms of governance to rule and is doomed if it does not side with the people who are protesting against their governments' regimes to replace them with democratic forms of governments. This also signifies that unless the United States invites those families/dynasties who control autocratic, tyrannical, oligarchic, absolute, or dictatorial regimes to voluntarily relinquish control of their authority to the voting public, those families/dynasties whose US

ideals threaten the maintenance of their own strength and security would likely plot to weaken this country first.

If I add the likelihood of governments switching from the US's 1776-1945 methods of forcing tribalism to surrender freedom to using tools that make people surrender freedom against their will, it's because the families making those tools are impatient to increase their wealth, and the international order could end up like Cuba in 1960 or the current Iran-US situation if a global war doesn't strike first.

Cuba is a country comprising the island of Cuba, which is located south of the US state of Florida.¹³⁶ From the 15th century, it was a colony of Spain until the Spanish-American War of 1898, when Cuba was occupied by the United States. In 1902, the country gained a nominal independence and became a de facto United States protectorate.¹³⁷ From 1902 to 1959, this country was flagged by open oppression and corruption, characterized by political repression, economic inequality, and widespread human rights abuses against dissenters..¹³⁸ In 1959, Cuba became a socialist state.

From 1902 to 1953, the United States supplied the Cuban government with weapons to crush the people (or guerrillas) who revolted against their government for refusing to relinquish power to institute a democratic form of government. After five years of violence in the country, the rebels ousted the government in 1958 but refused to forgive the United States' support for them. Since 1959, the Cubans' refusal to forgive the US has had major effects on them and the world. In 1961, following a failed invasion to overthrow the Cuban government that succeeded to power in 1959 and in which the Cuban government accused the Americans of orchestrating, the Cuban leaders and the leaders of the Soviet Union placed nuclear missiles on the island of Cuba to deter a future invasion.¹³⁹ Later the same year, the Soviets agreed to dismantle their offensive weapons in Cuba and return them to the Soviet Union in exchange for a US public declaration and agreement to avoid invading Cuba again.

136 <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Cuba>

137 [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Republic_of_Cuba_\(1902%E2%80%931959\)](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Republic_of_Cuba_(1902%E2%80%931959))

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

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

Despite being neighbors, Cuba and the United States have remained two distinct worlds since 1961. The good news is the social order evolved in Cuba during the last sixty years, unlike the turn of events that happened in Japan when this country shut its borders to the rest of the world from 1639 to 1853, which led to significant isolation and stagnation in its development compared to Cuba's progress in human development metrics.¹⁴⁰ From 1960 to now, Cuba has managed to achieve some human development metrics that rank it better than many other countries. In 2018, the human development index of Cuba reached 72 out of 189 countries. The world regards Cuba as the only nation with a planned economy.¹⁴¹

If, despite Cuba being under embargo by the United States for almost 60 years, this country managed to transform itself into a nation that can be regarded as an economic model around the world, then we could say that if nations with autocratic, tyrannical, oligarchic, absolute, or dictatorial regimes continue to be impatient with the United States' involvement in their social order and choose to continue to depend on tribalism and on the power of tools or machinery to make the people who refuse to surrender freedom to the conditions and outcomes that matter to them do it against their will, they could then be able to achieve the human development index that Cuba managed to achieve.

This conclusion is very serious and worrisome because it confirms that the United States poses the greatest danger to the world, and that Cuba's decision to prevent U.S. interference in its political affairs is healthier for any nation than allowing this relationship to continue. In fact, to show how this conjecture could be true, let us take this case as a scenario.

The population of Cuba is estimated to be around 11.2 million based on the 2018 census estimate.¹⁴² Lebanon is a country with a population that is approximately half of Cuba's population, according to a 2018 estimate.¹⁴³ The people of Lebanon, from 1945 to 2018, have transformed their social order or economy from being a planned one to

140 http://hdr.undp.org/sites/all/themes/hdr_theme/country-notes/CUB.pdf

141 <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Cuba>

142 https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Demographics_of_Cuba

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

being among the least planned or unorthodox around the world. Unless "serpents" are interfering in the social order of Lebanon from 1945 to now to make the people of this country deteriorate their economy and social order, the United States becomes the first suspect in what could have prompted this insecurity that Lebanon is knowing on all fronts. The United States is one of the principal actors who have been intervening in this country's political and economic preparedness since 1945.

This conclusion supports what Guevara (or Fidel Castro) believed before his death and what Hassan Nasrallah, the leader of Hezbollah, now believes, but this is totally antonymic conjecture to what I have been throughout this work arguing in contrast. The United States did not close its borders to British people or immigrants after gaining independence from Great Britain, nor did it stop Great Britain or other Western European powers from exerting influence in the Americas following the country's creation. In fact, this country remains to this day a completely immigrant-based society. In other words, every immigrant brought with him his own tribalism when he migrated to this country. This country served as a beacon for freedom of speech and was not subject to violations like those that occurred in Cuba after the Cuban Revolution or in other parts of the world. To put it differently, if the United States has been racist, crime-ridden, corrupt, or politically corrupt from 1776 to 1945 and beyond (after all, the American people came from somewhere), how did this immigrant-based society manage to construct a truly modern country instead of becoming isolated, as the Lebanese or Cubans did after their independence?

I have no way of knowing why the Americans managed to be civilized and capable despite all the racism, crimes, bribery, or political corruption that the people were exhibiting to not be in rebellion against the American ideals except to support that despite all the mishaps that they were knowing, they never allowed their firm foundation of "unity, equality, and freedom" to shake their values. In other words, they chose to be faithful to the solutions that the people before them were providing to finally arrive at becoming capable of stopping re-entanglement by wanting to define good and evil and instead began to achieve practical results for their greater well-being.

In other words, they were not giving a chance to the snake whose only job is to make people become dispersed and unable to speak the same language to show them what they must do to put their trust in their unified belief to strengthen freedom so they do not have to find themselves where the Lebanese or the Cuban people are today. The awareness that they gained permitted them to recognize that there was nothing more worth living for than to increase freedom. To put it differently, they did not consider that there was a need any more for them to be searching for another intervention from God to help show them what they must do to achieve practical results for their greater well-being except to be faithful to their ideals.

The widespread censure on freedom that is ongoing in the United States and throughout the rest of the world is a great danger to the new kind of human that the United States ideals began to shape starting from 1776. If governments continue to delegate to tools or machinery the task of helping them to make people surrender freedom to them even when this action is against their will, this signifies that the United States would be allowing that a small number of the masses in this nation continue to put their trust in the wisdom of their own human ingenuity to discern between right and wrong (i.e., the individuals who develop the tools and machinery), and almost everyone else would be putting his trust in the wisdom of the people who would be developing and the ones who would be controlling those instruments.

The reason why the United States became a true modern country is because this nation put its trust in the wisdom of the mass to create the unity that helped this country to become a superpower. This strategy is the opposite of what the people of other nations were doing. In the rest of the world, the mass is putting its trust in the hands (or in the wisdom) of individuals to create unity.

If the masses in the United States continue to surrender freedom voluntarily or against their will to place it in the hands (or in the wisdom) of a small group of individuals to create unity (or to discern between right and wrong) on their behalf, this signifies that the families/dynasties who control the United States decided to shift away post-1945 from continuing to form the new kind of human that this

country (or mankind) began to shape or form starting from 1776 and began to shape or form a new kind of man that this country (i.e., the United States) expects him to be prioritizing the same characteristics of "unity, equality, and freedom" that the people who lived from 1776 demonstrated. In other words, the families/dynasties who control the United States want the new humans (i.e., newborns) to shift from continuing to put their trust in the wisdom of their human ingenuity to discern between right and wrong, which is what the masses were doing in this country from 1776 to 1945, and instead, they want the newborns to put their trust in the wisdom of the tools and machinery to aid them to discern between right and wrong (or maintain their loyalty to the idea of "unity, equality, and freedom") and, most importantly, in the wisdom of the small number of people who develop those instruments and the ones who control them. To put it differently, the families and dynasties that control the United States want newborns in this country to start creating the same unity that helped this country become a superpower, but using the same strategy that people in other nations adopt to promote "unity, equality, and freedom." This is by having the mass put its trust in the hands (or in the wisdom) of a small number of individuals to create unity.

I can't say how successful the families who control the US would be if they kept believing that making the masses trust the tools that help them discern right from wrong (or maintain loyalty to "unity, equality, and freedom") and, most importantly, the wisdom of the few who create and control those tools. This work does not aim to elaborate on scenarios related to this overarching question. The specific purpose of this work is to understand if the families or dynasties that control the United States will be able to reach their goal while human nature has not changed.

In other words, hence, there is no difference between having a person flash a card in front of a machine so the latter opens a closed door for the former or a real human doing it; i.e., they are both a tool. If the families/dynasties who control the United States continue to want to prevent the masses' human ingenuity from exploring as before and ensure a small group discerns right and wrong for the masses to follow, then the families/dynasties in power must overcome two challenges. The first is how to ensure that the emptiness generated is

replaced by a preoccupation that maintains the order of precedence, keeping the idea of “unity, equality, and freedom” inseparable from progressive ideas. Second is how to ensure that the masses, whom they want to continually be devoted to, transform the conditions and outcomes that matter to them (i.e., the idea of unity, equality, and freedom to continue to make others consider their opinion before taking action on their own) without the idleness of their human ingenuity (or behavior) driving them to lose this sense of unity. In other words, allowing divisive influences to undermine the bond that people from 1776 to 1945 successfully fostered between "the individual and the mass" is a concern.

I cannot know if the United States could surpass the challenges our predecessors seem to have failed to overcome, despite the instructions or writings of prophets, philosophers, and others. As I mentioned earlier, this work does not propose solutions for the United States to facilitate this process. The specific purpose of this work is, as I said, to interpret the likelihood that the families/dynasties who control the United States will successfully implement this process without the egotism, individual ambition, or selfishness programmed into the human mind—a quality that the United States seems to have triumphed over from 1776 to 1945, preventing the country from continuing to build on its achievements so that this nation can rescue the whole world.

Indeed, from 1945 to now, the people of the world seem to be violating the covenants that they all agreed on in the aftermath of WW2 to alter their behavior to be respectful. After seventy years of interventions by the United Nations, UN member states, and international aid organizations to create the unity that the United States managed to build between the individual and the mass from 1776 to 1945, the international order seems to be getting more dysfunctional than what it was like during WW2. The abnormal rise in intolerance, demonstrations, poverty, corruption, unemployment, betrayal, wars, etc. that emerged is totally the opposite of what the people who lived through WW2 counselled future generations to stay away from. This universal sufferance that people are exhibiting is scary, especially as a loud voice calls for enlightened and virtuous politicians to distribute productive resources equitably and establish an egalitarian economic

base. Most importantly, this abnormal rise in the number of young people who consider it a duty that they become revolutionaries to save humanity from poverty, corruption, feudalism, and plutocratic exploitation, including the repressive, brutal measures that governments are taking to avoid relinquishing control of their political regimes and to meet the demand of protestors, is making people wonder about how the future could turn out to be if this abnormal behavior continues to go on. In fact, some people are wondering if we are going through a world revolution without being aware of it. In other words, if the misbehavior that people (or nations) are exhibiting and their insistence on letting tools and machines be used to help them become tolerant and ready to respect the covenant that they know protects them from each other is a revolution that would lead to creating an international order that would be exactly like the one the people of Cuba have been living in since the 1960s. Alternatively, a global might be necessary to prevent people from building institutions and creating laws that address the conciliation, respect, dignity, and balance people are demanding, as no one appears willing to practice tolerance and respect.

If political leaders continue to be allowed to preach that each nation is required to know the reality of its history or culture, including having its own literature, beliefs, etc., this strategy helps political leaders to build institutions and laws that match the natural elements of each country and not the natural elements of the international post-world order. Henceforth, if the families/dynasties that control each nation continue to allow the international order to spiral downhill, we could expect a rise in the number of regimes that would be upholding the importance of accommodating a development strategy that matches the peculiar cultural or historical identity that those bunker under to get their way despite the resistance of others, along with an equal call to accommodate the peculiar call that many people are expressing to foster freedom of action over the collective.

The phrase "carrot and stick" is a metaphor for the use of a combination of reward and punishment to induce a desired behavior.¹⁴⁴ I have no way of knowing if the families/dynasties who won WW2 and the families/dynasties who managed to own the companies that,

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

through them, 80% of the world's trading is now handled can steer the political leaders of the different nations to start to prioritize the things that they deeply care about when, on the one hand, they are afraid to hold a stick so those who refuse to consider their opinion do not bandwagon (or unite in a defensive coalition) against them and thus lead them to see the other remain empty-handed. Likewise, if those powerful international families and the families/dynasties that control each UN member state can continue to steer the working class or the poor to do the same after they permitted the United Nations and international order to seek new markets for the products or assembly lines that they own.

A video game is an electronic game that involves interaction with a user interface to generate visual feedback on a two-or three-dimensional video display device.¹⁴⁵ Video games are categorized into genres. Action games¹⁴⁶ are a genre of video games in which the player typically controls a character. This player character, which is often in the form of a protagonist or avatar, must navigate levels and, on each level, avoid obstacles and battle enemies to get to a final goal. Each level in the game story will contain an enemy that the player must defeat or an obstacle to overcome that is typically more challenging than the one that was found in the level before.

If the families/dynasties who won WW2 and the families/dynasties who managed to own the companies that, through them, 80% of the world's trading is now handled continue to be undecided about what it is exactly that they want to hold with their two hands (i.e., carrot or stick), the next level or obstacle that seems to be developing or awaiting them appears to involve how to steer or navigate the expectations or awareness of the people that the United Nations commitment to end adversity and inequality awakened without the peculiar call by people of all social levels that they are expressing to foster freedom of action to increase their happiness, not stumbling them on events that would repeat the Cuban Missile Crisis that the United States and Russia tumbled upon in 1962. Most importantly, those powerful families/dynasties who control so much in the economic and political life of any existing nation must be able to

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

146 https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Action_game

control and regulate the universal outcry of people to develop the world's productive resources on an equal basis without such a process jeopardizing the readiness of all those who are disenchanted to be unified around collective goals rather than unilateral ones.

Cuba is a country where its people managed to control and regulate their happiness despite the unwillingness of the families/dynasties who control this country to move toward a democratic form of government. Most political observers believe that the Cuban government's ability to withstand interference from the United States, China, Great Britain, India, Brazil, and others over the past sixty years is linked to the protection extended by Russia to this nation. Then again, the people of Cuba overcame all the obstacles they dealt with and survived in the stomach of the giant fish because their leaders or people chose to practice tolerance and to be ready to control their happiness to stay alive, just as Jonah¹⁴⁷ survived for three days. This is a scenario the Lebanese people refuse to accept; for example, from 1945 to now, they have struggled to stay alive, even though they possess human ingenuity comparable to that of the Cuban people. And so, if it seems as if what could have aided the people in the United States and Cuba to construct a modern country is the decision of the people in those two countries to be tolerant to transform the conditions and outcomes that the people of each country believed in, could mankind put its trust in the wisdom of the small group of people whom the masses are delegating the right to use tools or machinery to help them achieve what the United States helped to achieve without resorting to such instruments? Most importantly, can mankind put its trust in the wisdom of this small group when the United Nations, which is supposed to be the archetypal model to save the people of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Sudan, and the rest of the world, has officials teaching people to be intolerant and corrupt in UN member states, and its administrators/judges are using the power that the United States and the rest of the UN member states granted them to crush the people who stand in the way of them increasing their personal ambition, as they did to this American national?

As I said before, the purpose of this work is not to interpret how the international order could evolve in the future if UN member states

147 <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Jonah>

continue to redefine good and evil to counteract the widespread violence and oppression and if UN member states should continue to put their trust in the wisdom of tools and machinery that make any individual give up his freedom even when it is against his will or in the small group of people whom the masses are delegating to them the right to use those tools or machinery to help them achieve what the United States helped to achieve without resorting to such instruments. I would like to highlight the ongoing debate between the United States and Russia regarding Russia's interference in the presidential election as an example of the consequences of trusting in the wisdom of tools and machinery rather than in human ingenuity.

The purpose of this work is to understand if the families/dynasties who won WW2 and the families/dynasties who managed to own the companies that, through them, 80% of the world's trading is now handled could prevent the world from continuing to spiral down to a new global war, thus thrusting our successors to define new covenants to ensure what is our turn now to protect, after their decision to allow the UN to become an economic operator. In other words, if we acknowledge that evolution is progressive, we can anticipate that people may act unwisely by choosing to trust in the wisdom of tools and machinery to enhance their happiness, rather than relying on human ingenuity to build resilience against unforeseen challenges such as famine, biological threats, and natural disasters. This scenario signifies that we could continue to assume that people would be continuing to put their trust in the small group who would be developing and controlling those instruments that people would be using to increase their happiness.

Since those who create tools and those who set their conditions are not the same (division of labor), we can expect the UN's role in determining national policies to continue.

If, as I said before, the ongoing widespread intolerance that people of all social classes are expressing is a sign to support people's unwillingness to voluntarily surrender freedom to the ideals that the United States is working on transforming, then this scenario signifies that the likelihood of people continuing to put their trust in the wisdom of the small group who would be developing and controlling the

instrument that would be making the mass surrender freedom against their will, along with the United Nations aiding in determining the policies that would be enacted and even helping in enforcing them to go on.

The Bible contains stories about the history of mankind, as well as predictions or interpretations that elaborate on the consequences for individuals or groups who refuse to adhere to the teachings presented.

Gameplay is “the specific way in which players interact with a game. It is the pattern defined through the game rules, the connection between the player and the game, the challenges and overcoming them, and the plot and the player's connection with it.”¹⁴⁸ This definition allows us to say that the Bible or Tanak, the Quran, the Vedas, etc. are all collections of different gameplay or instructions that assign to any individual a gameplay interaction genre.

A video game genre is a classification assigned to a video game based on its gameplay interaction rather than visual or narrative differences.¹⁴⁹ This means that the video game genres are a way to categorize video games by a set of gameplay challenges that are independent of their setting or game-world content. For example, if we want to classify the challenge of praying within each of the different gameplay (or religion) types that I listed, we can say that Islam presents the most significant challenge. This is because in the religion, an adherent (or a player) must pray five times a day. On the other hand, if we consider the challenge of sacrificing, the Christian religion (or gameplay) is the most difficult, as an adherent (or player) must have “the courage when a person slaps him on his right cheek to turn to him the other also.”¹⁵⁰

If video games are defined as a structured form of play or a variety of intrinsically motivated activities aimed at achieving internal or external rewards, then we can assert that American ideals represent a set of structured forms of play designed to attain the same rewards of happiness or remuneration that the American people achieved from

148 <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Gameplay>

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

150 https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Turning_the_other_cheek

1776 to 1945, when their predecessors (or adherents) chose to adhere to this genre of gameplay.

Moreover, if all the video game genres that emphasize physical challenges (i.e., the action genre) require a player to navigate through a level to reach an internal and external reward or goal, we can say that humans are a species that are not doing anything different in real life than what video game players of the action genre do in their lives to reach death.

This scenario signifies that all the gameplay instructions that are included in the Bible, Quran, Veda, or the American ideals are nothing but guidelines to avoid the challenges that an adherent encounters in his space depleting his health and life and receiving a game over signal (or death) before this unfavorable occasion happens naturally.

If the objective of any gameplay or any religious doctrine is to allow effective operation and control of reality so this information that is continually fed back into the individual aids a person to seek the intrinsic reward that he is seeking, then we can say that humans' decision to stop relying on the power of human ingenuity to avoid the challenges that an adherent encounters in his space so he does not deplete his health and life and receive a game over signal (or death) before this unfavorable occasion happens naturally and to switch to seeing that machines and tools control and regulate this process is a new genre of ideal that humans want to test with.

If humans are preferring to switch away from the genre of gameplay that relies on the power of the human ingenuity of the individual to discern between right and wrong as described in the Bible or Tanak, Quran, Vedas, American ideals, etc., this signifies that humans are in the process of changing the platform or environment in which humans execute their interactions with the natural world or with each other.

As I said before, there is no difference between having a person flash a card in front of a machine so the latter opens a closed door for the former or a real human doing it, i.e., they are both tools. This allows us to say that all that humans are doing by going ahead and choosing to stop to put their trust in the gameplay that is depicted in the Bible or

Tanak, Quran, Vedas, American ideals, etc. to help mankind discern between right and wrong and to let tools and machines navigate this process on their behalf is nothing but an admittance that mankind is no longer prepared to continue to rely on its natural skill to navigate to the reward that matters to each one, and the stronger are imposing to let those instruments that are the product of human ingenuity steer this process.

Some people believe that God created the world, while others believe that it is a concept invented by humans. The American ideal represents a system of beliefs and values that is the result of human ingenuity. Everyone agrees that the idea helped unite people to create the healthiest culture, even when they pursue greed and personal ambition. Let us set aside all gameplay that requires specific behaviors to achieve a religious reward and concentrate solely on the rewards associated with pursuing American ideals.

This approach allows one to say that there are two ways to attain the American ideals. One path is to continue to rely on human ingenuity to foster the unity between the individual and the mass, and the other is to rely on tools and machinery or a combination of both.

Humans are not permanent on earth, so we can say that the objective here is to ensure that new humans (or newborns) who cooperate with each other continue to trust in American ideals rather than reverting to a feudal or plutocratic exploitation system.

This scenario signifies that it is in the best interest of Great Britain to prevent, before it's too late, that the popularity of the American ideals does not decline with the new people that would be succeeding us to avoid those newborns perceiving that socialist, feudal, plutocratic, autocratic, etc. ideals are better than the American ideals as a gameplay to transform the conditions and outcomes that matter to them and begin to employ the tools and machinery that those would be using to increase their happiness to get their way despite the resistance of others.

I have no way of knowing if the new people who would be succeeding us would be able to continue to prioritize the American ideals if the

families/dynasties who won WW2 or the families/dynasties who managed to own the companies that, through them, 80% of the world's trading is now handled continue to hold in one hand a carrot and in the other a stick. In other words, treat the American ideals as another video arcade that gains momentum when a new video game is introduced and then its popularity declines as newer platforms become available. What I do know, however, is that only a handful of ideals managed to live since humans started to keep records, and those ideals are the ones that humans claim contain God's instruction to man (i.e., Torah or Pentateuch) and the ones that contain ideals that their authors claim that it was God who revealed them to them (i.e., New Testament, Quran). If the American ideals are not God's instructions to man but rather human inventions, as none of their creators have claimed divine revelation since 1776, then they are like any other human-made video arcade that gains popularity when new but declines as newer platforms for controlling behavior emerge.

If all the historical narratives in the religious scriptures depict humans as being the problem for the unpleasant fate that awaited those people who refused to structure and regulate their relations according to the gameplay that God has instructed, and if in all the stories that are reported in those religious scriptures we read about how the unwillingness of those actors in question to refuse to surrender freedom was leading to diverse crushing degrees for the people who were refusing to alter their behavior to adhere to the specified instruction before a new purpose to rescue the whole world rose, then if the American ideal does not become a religion to prevent the people whose doctrine would be standing in their way and prevent them from getting their way despite the resistance of others, there is a good chance that the popularity of the American ideology would continue to decline.

Similarly, because the American ideal is a game that offers no intrinsic reward in this life, unlike the promise of an afterlife made by those who surrender freedom to religion, the American ideology is immortal; it serves as a conduit, like Christianity, Islam, Judaism, or any other religion, to attain what those other gameplays promise.

When Moses, Christ, and Muhammad were teaching people to adhere to the gameplay that they deeply cared about, their adherents have been faithful to their game since the date each one began his doctrine or ideals. What we know is that the American ideals were attracting adherents (or players) with the same enthusiasm that Judaism, Christianity, Islam, and others were amassing from 1776 to 1945. From 1945 to now, a good number of the candidates who are competing to be elected president of the United States in 2020 are promoting socialist ideologies.¹⁵¹

It is unclear whether the pattern that emerged in the United States to change the political structure from a representative republic to a direct democracy¹⁵² would lead this country to practice the same democracy that Egypt has been practicing for the last seventy years; however, it definitely does not represent the patterns or strategies that the disciples adapted when they were spreading Jesus's doctrine or Mohammad's.

For example, in the letter that Paul the Apostle sent to Titus, a Greek follower of Jesus, to help him organize the church on the island of Crete, he seems to depict a mission that does not deviate at all in essence or in context from the one the families/dynasties who won WW2 or the families/dynasties who managed to own the companies that, through them, handled 80% of the world's trading in 1945 seem to have embarked on accomplishing in 1945 in the social order.¹⁵³

In fact, I strongly believe that the families and dynasties who won World War II are implementing the work program that Paul the Apostle outlined for Titus in this letter.

It seems that the work program that Paul the Apostle proposed in this epistle resembles very closely what the founding fathers of the UN proposed to the families/dynasties who won WW2.

Paul the Apostle warned Titus to ensure that he recruits helpers to help him set things straight whose way of life was different from the Cretans who were infamous for treachery, greed, and corruption.

151 <https://www.washingtonpost.com/graphics/politics/policy-2020/>

152 https://www.diffen.com/difference/Electoral_Vote_vs_Popular_Vote

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

The decision of the families/dynasties who won WW2 or the families/dynasties who managed to own the companies that, through them, 80% of the world's trading is now handled to have helpers help them set things straight while accepting that the officials of the United Nations become an economic operator begs many questions. Could Christianity survive if Titus were selling and buying in Crete in the same way the Cretans were doing?

Will the families/dynasties who won WW2 or the families/dynasties who managed to own the companies that, through them, 80% of the world's trading is now handled manage to "set in order the things that were wanting,"¹⁵⁴ when the UN administrators/UN judges are using their differential powers and denying the type of people that Paul asked Titus to recruit to help him accomplish his mission rights, as happened to this American national when he refused to prioritize his happiness over his personal ambition?

No one can be sure of the exact details that helped the Christian movement or faith survive. Most importantly, it is unclear whether Titus succeeded in his mission to encourage the Cretans to exhibit integrity and self-control or if he was assimilated by the Cretans' way of life and became corrupt himself, infamous for treachery and greed.

Regardless of Titus's actions, one of the key lessons from Paul's advice to him in this letter was how to handle the Christian slave. Paul was concerned that those Christian slaves would use the equality status that whoever became a Christian immediately benefited from as a right to organize a slave rebellion, which would then weaken the Christian movement and lead to its collapse. In fact, we should not underestimate that the Christian slave could use the idea of becoming a Christian as a license to rebel against their masters as well.

The abnormal rise in intolerance, demonstrations, poverty, corruption, unemployment, betrayal, wars, etc. that emerged in the world post-

154

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Epistle_to_Titus#Traditional_view:_Pauline_authenticity

1945 could be interpreted to mean, as I said before, that mankind is going through a world revolution without being aware of it.

If the ongoing social upheaval, disobedience, violence, political and sexual corruption, and wars indicate a need for enlightened and virtuous politicians—behaviors typically associated with revolutions—this suggests that we may be experiencing a complete shift in ideals or power from one group to another without realizing it. This situation is very serious and worrisome.

The founding fathers of the UN did not propose that the UN become an economic operator who runs bodies, institutions, unions, coalitions, etc. that compete for financial aid in the countries that this organization is interfering with.

If the UN officials are using their unique position to teach the poor and the working class about equality and, at the same time, the right that was granted them post-1945 to become an economic operator makes them discredit the UN objectives and goals, this signifies that this rise in intolerance could be a result of all the mindfulness that the UN has prompted to make the poor or the working class become aware to interpret the UN ideological objectives and not to transform people to attain those ends. This situation is very serious and worrisome.

The Christian community, which collected information about the work and results achieved by early Christian leaders, states that Titus became the first bishop of Crete.¹⁵⁵ The Catholic Church canonized Titus as a saint. The process to become a saint involves opening an investigation by the Church to determine if there is sufficient evidence to support that the person who would reach sainthood served God during his life and lived a life of heroic virtue and sufficient holiness.¹⁵⁶ Evidently, Saint Titus was an outstanding Christian who dedicated his life to Jesus and the values that mattered to him, demonstrating that he was not motivated solely by financial gain. In other words, Saint Titus was not providing guidance and teaching to the Cretans by asking their leaders to deposit money in the church's bank account so he could withdraw 12% and then return the rest to the

155 https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Epistle_to_Titus#Recipient

156 <https://www.bbc.com/news/world-europe-27140646>

leaders, as UN officials were doing in the DRC (see part II in this work). Saint Titus was also upholding the financial rules and regulations of the Church, unlike the UN officials in Sudan (to please the government of Great Britain and gain the fee from this business). Most importantly, Saint Titus did not accuse people of being a threat to the Church houses to distance them for his own business, as the UN treated the American national; nor did he operate courts to deny his victims' rights because they practiced what he was teaching.

There appears to be a significant difference between how Saint Titus acted to transform the conditions and outcomes that were important to him and how UN officials are currently approaching this issue. Most importantly, it looks as if the financial aid that the United States is providing to the United Nations can help this organization transform the conditions and outcomes that matter to it by paying for this sudden change in people's willingness to tolerate how natural and legal rights should be distributed and managed. In other words, the financial aid that the United States is injecting is not going to make the people around the world change their way of life, so it starts to look similar to the American way of life; rather, this country is injecting its money to finance a den of thieves who are using American ideals as a license to make the people whose lives they are interfering in rebel against this great and very generous country. This situation is very serious and worrisome.

If we could be undergoing a revolution without knowing it, it would be important to know if the resulting transformation would be a complete change of ideal or power from one system to another or just a modification.

In other words, since we have no way of knowing if the families/dynasties who won WW2 would continue to allow the following:

- i. Governments to assimilate wrong ideas about US ideals (or UN goals) and to compare them to other religious or political doctrines to get their way, making it difficult for those in power to see that American ideals are about truth so they could be ready to surrender freedom to create real change.

ii. The UN is an economic operator who is in the leadership business to make money, including being granted rights to enjoy privileges and immunities plus running its own judicial system;

This signifies that we could end with two scenarios if those powerful international families do not do something to deal with this status quo.

1. The first is if the social order would spiral down to a new global war to achieve a new balance.
2. The second is to achieve a new balance without spiraling down to a global war.

Moreover, depending on which method the families/dynasties who won WW2 or the families/dynasties who managed to own the companies that, through them, 80% of the world's trading is now handled decide to achieve balance, those powerful international families would have to pick between two options to determine and enforce policies.

1. The first is through the UN becoming the common political authority for all of humanity,
2. The second is through the current global governance system, which consists of distinct political structures called states, whereby the UN acts as the formal organization coordinating activities.

Most importantly, depending on whether the transformation that would result would entail a complete change of ideal or power from one system (or hand) to another or if the changes that ensue would be a modification, we could expect two scenarios:

1. The first will entail the families/dynasties who won WW2 or the families/dynasties who managed to own the companies that, through them, 80% of the world's trading is now handled, surviving the shocks and remaining in power.
2. The second will entail the emergence of new families/dynasties.

In as far as the ideal that the families/dynasties that will survive would pick to structure and regulate the social order on its principles, this choice could be classified in two scenarios.

1. The first depends on the use of the US ideals or doctrine.
2. The second is any pre-1945 political doctrine.

I have no way of knowing if the families/dynasties who won WW2 or the families/dynasties who managed to own the companies that, through them, 80% of the world's trading is now handled could be able to control this period of moral chaos that their own actions prompted or if, without this apparent counterculture, those powerful international families would be driven to give up pursuing the things that matter to them using the American way of life and to choose any one of the pre-1945 doctrines to secure their survival. In other words, the decision of the families/dynasties who control so much in the economic and political life of any existing nation to choose what Saint Titus did not do in Crete, and that is to pick unwise or corrupt leaders to help him to enforce the things that matter to him, led to the cultivation of new humans who consider it a duty that they become revolutionaries to save humanity from poverty, corruption, feudalism, and plutocratic exploitation instead of forming ideal citizens who are peace-loving, generous, obedient to authorities, and known for pursuing the common good.

The Bible, Quran, TaNaK, Veda, etc. are all books whose longevity is owed to the wisdom that they contain. The New Testament's account of Judas betraying Jesus teaches how to avoid betrayal, but it also shows that even the Son of God can't be sure of what awaits him. The objective is to orient human actions to be continually set in motion to achieve practical results for the greater well-being of society instead of using the division of labor paradox to crush those who chose to surrender freedom to prioritize unity, as UN officials who denied this American national rights were doing (see part II in this work).

If the families/dynasties who won WW2 or the families/dynasties who managed to own the companies that, through them, 80% of the world's trading is now handled continue to allow the UN to be an economic operator who enjoys privileges and immunities, including running its

own judicial systems, the moral chaos that this choice would be prompting would make it impossible to be able to sustain the new human that the American ideals helped build, thus spiraling mankind back into the Dark Ages. If the families/dynasties who control so much in the economic and political life of any existing nation do not stop the UN from continuing to be an economic operator and to use the American ideals as a ladder to transform the outcomes and conditions that matter to sustain the individuals who are using this operator to spread moral chaos (i.e., are in it just to make money), the American ideals would need rescuing, and the new man that the American ideal helped build would be degenerated. In other words, if the families/dynasties who won WW2 or the families/dynasties who managed to own the companies that through them 80% of the world's trading is now handled do not go back to converting the UN into becoming a formal international organization responsible for coordinating the activities of UN member states as the founding father of the UN intended this global council to be and replace all the regimes that are not governing based on the principles of equal rights, the privileges and immunities that those two actors (i.e., the UN and governments) benefit from by being two operators who operate at the grassroots level will continue to deepen the world's havoc.

This status quo will continue to prompt the families/dynasties who control so much in the economic and political life of any existing nation to treat the symptoms with the wrong cure. This will prompt political, social, and economic experts and scholars to be devoted to doing exactly what the prophets and poets were doing in the Bible in the Old Testament, accusing each other of the tragic human conditions. In other words, they would be accusing each other of all the evil.

I have no way of knowing how long our predecessors in antiquity waited for the day that God would finally interfere in their lives to make them destroy the evil that has lured them into self-destruction.

Saint Titus and all the apostles of Jesus were preaching that Jesus will appear again. This activity is exactly what all the other people who subscribe to different faiths are also doing. They are all awaiting the arrival or return of the person who would be saving mankind from all the ongoing evil that people are waging.

Personally, I do not know what Jesus's return and/or the return of other prophets that people of other faiths are also waiting for their reappearance would be adding to help newborns be ready to surrender freedom to attain the ends that are stipulated in the preamble of the UN charter that Moses, Buddha, Jesus, Muhammad, Confucius, Socrates, Ali ibn Abi Talib, and many others did not speak of.

Then again, if the families/dynasties who control so much in the economic and political life of any existing nation continue to let the UN be an economic operator and corrupt leaders be in charge of pursuing the common good, our successors would have to wait until God interferes, or they would manage to have the courage to do what the American people who lived from 1776 to 1945 managed to do to prevail over their egotism and selfishness to help construct a new humanity. This situation is very serious and worrisome.

Based on the writings that are included in the Bible, every time God interfered to help mankind overcome its challenges, the person who he chose to save man from continuing to live a life of truth managed to influence the attitude of people to reconcile, but he was made to pay a big price. He died for the sins of all humanity. This situation is very serious and worrisome. This is because we have no way of knowing if it was God who instilled in the people who built this great country the practice of tolerance so that its people managed to use their humanity and ingenuity to foster unity between the individual and the masses, or if this conviction was a product of their own conviction.

If, as I mentioned earlier, the world is now inhabited by both real humans and those created through human ingenuity, we cannot determine whether the new humans (i.e., robots and artificial intelligence) will succeed in preparing people to remain bound by their personal power and conscience, or if the real humans, who initially posed the problem, will ultimately prevail.

This scenario means that if the families/dynasties who control so much in the economic and political life of any existing nation continue to set things straight, leading the international order to continue to spiral down, there is a good chance that God interferes and redo exactly what

he is throughout the entire Bible doing. This is to send prophets who would crush evil to be crushed by it later. Then again, since we cannot know whether he chose in 1776 to interfere through the masses to crush evil rather than through individual people as in past interferences, what mankind might be wagering on is the idea of freedom that the people of the United States were generous to sacrifice part of their happiness to see more people enjoy. This is serious and worrisome, as humans are mortal, and if the families/dynasties that control so much of a nation's economic and political life continue to hold the stick in one hand and the carrot in the other, this status quo could mean that ongoing intolerance is forgoing the idea of freedom. For the idea of freedom to stop becoming an obstacle in the ongoing search of the families/dynasties who control so much in the economic and political life of any existing nation to maintain their survival or balance of power, this means that they would have to support pre-1945 ideological doctrines. Freedom is essential for any nation that wants to be civilized or have power. If the international order continues to spiral to seeing freedom being restricted, this scenario means that Welch's appeal to his political leaders in the years immediately following the creation of the UN to get the UN out of the US and the US away from the UN is very serious and worrisome if the UN continues to be an economic operator.

If, as I said, it could very well be that God in 1776 decided to interfere to prompt people to practice tolerance through fostering his usual habit of bailing humanity from continuing to ruin human progress through the masses instead of doing it through his usual method (i.e., through individuals), this scenario means that humans' precarious attitude would go on. Moreover, since it is highly unlikely that if people's dynamic behavior continues to go on and God chooses to interfere, he would be doing it as in previous times, i.e., through prophets who teach people to turn the other cheek when a person does wrong to another (Jesus) or to surrender to God (Mohammad), but to adopt a stricter method since his kind approach did not work out, then we can expect that any of the pre-1945 political doctrines that humans tested would be what he would choose. This is very serious and worrisome if governments appear to be adopting policies in recent years that are more and more restricting freedom; and if man is not leaving anymore any option for God other than to consider adopting restricting freedom

to save humans from continuing to be divided between one group building what the other knocked down and the other knocking down what other people are constructing, then the extrapolations that scholars make about the unattraction of people to the idea of democracy could be a sign that the United States is degenerating without being aware of such an ongoing process. This situation is very serious and worrisome, because if the conjecture is really what is going on, then we have no way of knowing if the families/dynasties who would be controlling so much in the economic and political life of any existing nation would choose to let the UN become the common political authority for all of humanity or to keep the current global governance system, which consists of distinct political structures called states and whereby the UN acts as the formal organization coordinating activities.

Most importantly, we could expect that the heirs of the families/dynasties who control so much in the economic and political life of any existing nation now would be the ones who would be exercising this power, or new families would be doing it all together.

Of course, I don't have the answer to any of the above questions, but I could attempt to interpret whether the heirs of the families/dynasties who currently control so much of a nation's economic and political life would continue to exercise this power, or if entirely new families would take over. This question is very important, of course, because if new families who end up controlling so much in the economic and political life of any existing nation happen to be Chinese, Lebanese, Mexican, etc., there is a good chance that they may outlaw the Anglosphere progress of the last millennium and begin to want that the human progress be rewritten in Chinese, Spanish, Hebrew, Arabic, Russian, etc.

If from 1945 to now, people appear to be divided rather than unified in attaining American ideals (or UN ideological objectives), and if the UN is not a staging ground to unite people but instead teaches devotion to material pursuits, prompting people to ensure they never perceive themselves as last, then this strange and destructive behavior, very different from American customs and practices, should not be a surprise. If the UN, along with international aid organizations,

continues to trap people in finding ultimate significance in egotism and selfishness, it is likely that UN officials will begin to use their power differential in this ongoing revamp of the social structure to violate people's rights in the same way they treated this American national. If the UN continues to deny more people rights and traps them hopelessly in this right that the families/dynasties who won WW2 or the families/dynasties who managed to own the companies that 80% of the world's trading was handled through were granted to this organization to enjoy privileges and immunity, this would make it impossible for all humanity to have doubt about the purpose of those powerful families from wanting all people to cooperate economically.

Deism is a "philosophical position that rejects revelation as a source of religious knowledge and asserts that reason and observation of the natural world are sufficient to establish the existence of a Supreme Being or creator of the universe."¹⁵⁷ The equation of the line states that if you have a point on a line and you know its slope, it is possible to determine a second point.¹⁵⁸ If we know the final outcome we want to avoid, we can determine, by interpreting current events, whether our actions will lead to that undesired outcome.¹⁵⁹ If the UN continues to be an economic operator and its officials use this organization to deepen egotism and selfishness, including denying people rights as they did with this American national, then we can expect that the social order will continue to spiral down toward the end that the families/dynasties who control so much in the economic and political life of any existing nation want to avoid. This is to let their actions prompt the destruction of the power or authority of their heirs and, most importantly, that the people who are now happy or ready to be loyal to the social contract that ties them all together begin to withdraw support.

To give an example, Great Britain is a unitary parliamentary democracy and constitutional monarchy.¹⁶⁰ This country (or this family/household) has an elaborate succession scenario that supports that the people in this country do not have any plan to convert this

157 <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Deism>

158 <http://www.webmath.com/equiline2.html>

159 Maloof, S. *Human Security and Social Improvement: Collateral Damage*, 2005

160 https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/United_Kingdom

country into a direct democracy political system and remain a unitary parliamentary democracy and constitutional monarchy.¹⁶¹

If this family/household (i.e., country) is programming to remain a unitary parliamentary democracy and constitutional monarchy and is recruiting at its embassies officials who are not fully trained on what the families/dynasties who won WW2 are trying to build around the world, there is a good chance that the same type of officials who were prioritizing their personal power and conscience (i.e., they were providing the financial aid) and not doing what the American national was doing in Sudan (i.e., prioritizing the outcomes and conditions that the families/dynasties who won WW2 deeply cared about) will become easy bait or victims in the hands of the UN officials who are prioritizing their personal ambition after the UN becomes an economic operator (i.e., they are in it for the money, or they consider the UN a place to make their living from). If this

If more British officials continue to be trapped in pursuing their personal power and conscience and if the UN continues to be an economic operator so its officials are the serpent that is in rebellion with what the families/dynasties who won WW2 are trying to build around the world, then there is a good chance that the international order will continue to spiral down to a global war that the same families/dynasties who won WW2 may find themselves, or let me say, obliged against their will to support to secure their survival. In other words, if the UN judges heard that the UN officials were involved in acts that violate the UN Charter and even heard that this US national practiced exactly what the families/dynasties who won WW2 told him to do post-1945, and that is to practice tolerance, but then the UN judges denied him the right to compensation because he practiced what those families/dynasties told him to do post-1945, and that is to surrender freedom to the rule of law, then I strongly believe that all the rescue programs that those powerful families are pursuing to maintain their strength and stability are in vain. I strongly believe that what awaits those families/dynasties is the same end that awaited this American national and those UN officials/judges if they do not reopen the case of this American national to set things straight and reform the United Nations to go back to operating in line with what the United

161 <https://www.royal.uk/succession>

States proposed and they approved. Here is the justification that on its premise I base my claim:

Let us divide the manner that all people have been influencing positively or negatively each other to change matter into two timelines: pre-1945 and post. Let us also divide the world's social space in two parts: the western hemisphere and the eastern hemisphere. Let the Western Hemisphere refer to the area of the earth where North and South America are located. Let the Eastern Hemisphere refer to much of Europe, Africa, Asia, Australia, and the islands of Oceania.

The United States was founded in 1776. Historians claim that in 1823, the United States declared that any efforts by European nations to control any independent states in the western hemisphere would be viewed as the manifestation of an unfriendly disposition against the United States.¹⁶² Let us say that the zone of influence of the United States extended over most of the Western Hemisphere.

In 1913, at its peak, Great Britain, in the Eastern Hemisphere, is said to have controlled most of the social space. Actually, it is also correct to say that Great Britain controlled the entire world, because the social space on Earth consists of small and large islands, and Great Britain dominated the seas. Let us say that the zone of influence of Great Britain, along with the rest of the western European powers, extended over most of the Eastern Hemisphere till the outbreak of WW2.

If we compare the domestication method that the Americans employed to harmonize their actions from 1900 until the outbreak of WWII in 1939 to the one that was adopted in the Eastern Hemisphere by Great Britain and the rest of the Western European nations, most historians would concur that the people who lived in the Western Hemisphere were much happier. The powerful special interests who control so much in the economic and political life in the United States or the Americas were not recognizing each other or their dependents in the same way the ones who were living in the Western Hemisphere were doing it.

¹⁶² https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Monroe_Doctrine

If the American government managed to induce an environment that aided in making most people who were living in the Western Hemisphere voluntarily surrender freedom in exchange for the protection of their remaining rights, but the same was not happening in the Eastern Hemisphere for the same period, this signifies that the American people were prioritizing the importance of the moral over the material. In other words, the people in the Eastern Hemisphere were prioritizing their personal power and conscience over a sense of righteousness.

In 1941, the United States proposed that the people who are effecting change in the eastern hemisphere address their disenchantment by abandoning their continuous resort to their personal power and conscience in the determination and protection of their rights and begin to domesticate each other, based on the method this country was using in the western hemisphere to make its own citizens happy.

All that humans do from birth to death is create change in matter. The only change that the United States proposed to the people who live in the eastern hemisphere to start doing to increase their happiness post-1945 is to harmonize their actions in the socio-politico-economic field based on the principle that this country employed, which emphasized cooperation and mutual support among nations to foster collective well-being. The only work program that the United States proposed was stipulated in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which all people claimed they care deeply about.

If human nature has not changed from 1945 to now and everything is relative as Albert Einstein claims, the disorder that emerged in the world could only be due to a rule that the people who live in the Western Hemisphere began to attach lots of interest to post WW2 (in other words, the people who were living in the Western Hemisphere were not attaching lots of interest to it or prioritizing from 1776 to 1945). Likewise, if the people who lived in the eastern hemisphere started to spiral in deeper uncertainty or insecurity post-1945, the motive for this intolerance that people are exhibiting in this social space could only be due to a rule that Great Britain and the rest of the western powers were not harmonizing their actions on its premise pre-

1945, but then they found themselves beginning to deeply care about the aftermath of WW2.

I have no way of knowing what this rule is, but I cannot think of any other motive that could have prompted this abnormal rise in intolerance that emerged in the Western Hemisphere (i.e., the Americas) post-1945 than that the people of this continent began to prioritize power or material over morals. In other words, doing the contrary of what they were doing pre-1945. Likewise, I could say the same about what could have prompted this abnormal intolerance that emerged in the Eastern Hemisphere post-1945. The people who live in the Eastern Hemisphere (i.e., Europe, Africa, Asia, Australia, and the islands of Oceania) started to prioritize moral over material. This deduction is serious and worrisome. It is also at the same time irrational or anti-logic.

The purpose of getting all the people in all the lands to collaborate in the economic field post-1945 was to increase happiness (i.e., materially). All that people do from birth to death is explore to accelerate their happiness and access to material things. When material things increase around a human being, this outcome does not make a person sad right away but cheerful. In fact, every human being feels a form of mental climax when his access to material things increases. All people, when they buy a new bicycle, computer, vehicle, pen, etc., become initially very moved and happy, but then their interest in the new thing that they strived to obtain diminishes. Could the UN and its member states have accelerated the number of people living in the mental climax phase and the unmoving phase that follows, leading to this abnormal rise in intolerance that emerged in the world post-1945? In other words, the families/dynasties who won WW2 allowed the UN to teach people to find ultimate significance in material things rather than teaching people to find such significance in practicing tolerance, which is what the Americans did from 1776 to 1945, the Cubans have been doing from 1960 to now, and the Iranians are now in the middle of doing.

I cannot determine whether the principal cause of the frustration that emerged in the world post-1945 is a failure by the families/dynasties who won WW2 or by UN officials who are selling themselves to the

highest bidder in understanding the relationship between utility, happiness, and cost. As I said before, the purpose of this book is not to provide suggestions on what the families/dynasties who control so much in the economic and political life of any existing nation need to do to understand the relationship between utility, happiness, and cost. The purpose of this book is to understand if the families/dynasties who controlled so much in the economic and political life of any existing nation in 1945 would be able to prevent their collapse when the number of people who do not understand the relationship between utility, happiness, and cost rises in the world. In other words, when those families/dynasties fail to consider in their planning that a person's happiness requires forgoing another's happiness, and, most importantly, assign blind people to protect their interests. In my book, *Social Improvement and Human Security: Collateral Damage*,¹⁶³ I present what I refer to as the global human security problem in mathematical form and demonstrate how individuals can enhance their happiness while reducing anxiety and worries.

In the book *Social Improvement and Human Security: Collateral Damage*, I elaborate on what I define and call the global human security problem in mathematical form to later show that if the UN member states (or the families/dynasties who control so much in the economic and political life of any existing nation) do not pause the intergovernmental organization that the UN member states named the United Nations from being an economic operator, people's loyalty to the values that the UN is teaching would go on (i.e., poverty eradication, social justice, etc.), which are all a knife with two edges; hence, they make a person become intolerant to increase his happiness until people's patience with each other runs very low, and it would become necessary that a global war be waged to establish a new balance. For this reason, I know that it is important to regulate and structure the knowledge that distances the human body from fulfilling the role that this physical aptitude may have been programmed to perform within the natural world to stop the knowledge that people gain from accelerating the life-death cycle. I do not mean here preventing knowledge that aids mankind in extending longevity (i.e., which basically means making no knowledge unlawful) but rather

163 Maloof S., *Social Improvement and Human Security: Collateral Damage*, 2005.
www.globalhumansecurity.com

depending on strategies that encourage the understanding that, although vitamin pills can supplement energy, being a farmer is still necessary to keep one's body active, which is what extends longevity.

If the UN continues to teach people to find ultimate significance in products that are the creation of human ingenuity rather than to give allegiance to American ideals. This scenario signifies that we can expect people to go on being devoted to increasing their allegiance to their personal power and conscience to discern between good and evil or put their trust in the wisdom of the American ideals (i.e., UN ideological goals defined by the founding fathers of the UN and not UN goals expressed post-1945 with ambitions that fix dates to end poverty, injustice, etc.).

In the Bible, it is stated that after God placed Adam and Eve in the Garden of Eden, he warned them "to not eat from the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, for when they would eat from it, they would certainly die."¹⁶⁴ The Bible claims that what prompted God to ban Adam and Eve from the Garden of Eden was the decision of those two to be intolerant (i.e., trusting their wisdom instead of trusting God). All the history and religious books that were written from the date when God banned Adam and Eve from the Garden of Eden, passing through Jesus and Muhammad¹⁶⁵ (570 AD - 632 AD), claimed that he was visited by an angel who revealed to him the Quran, up to 1945, stating that all the insecurity that mankind knew occurred as a result of the unwillingness of those predecessors to be tolerant or to put their trust in their wisdom and not in the wisdom of those prophets or philosophers.

From 1945 to now, the UN and the UN member states want us to believe that all the violence and wars that are taking place are a result of more people putting their trust in the wisdom of Islam, their own wisdom, population growth, automation, and environmental degradation, and few want to put their trust in the wisdom of the United States and begin to relinquish power to cooperate with each other based on the principles of equal rights to help transform the conditions and outcomes that matter to them (i.e., happiness) to be

164 <https://www.biblegateway.com/passage/?search=Genesis+2&version=NIV>

165 <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Muhammad>

identical to what the American people managed to achieve for this matter.

I have no way of knowing what could be augmenting people's frustration and violence around the world from 1945 to now, but I can conjecture that if humans are not by nature a species that does not know how to distinguish between what is right and what is wrong, then the motive for this rise in intolerance could be only due to a rise in the number of people who are led to believe that if they increase their satisfaction or utility from material things while still holding to their own beliefs and values rather than trading them with the American ideals, this would make them happier. This is very serious and worrisome, because after the UN has become an organization that benefits from the rise of crises and conflicts in the world, it is highly likely that people of other faiths would be considered a threat for the rise of intolerance if Islam became unlawful to be practiced as a faith or the people who practice this faith became persecuted.

If people's pursuit of added happiness does not bring added comfort as people think but brings temporal happiness only, then we can say that if the families/dynasties who control so much in the economic and political life of any existing nation do not pause the UN from teaching people to be intolerant and to favor increasing their utility, they could be prompting their own collapse. This is very serious and worrisome. To give an example and show how it could happen, let us take Saudi Arabia, which has been a totalitarian absolute monarchy since this country was founded.¹⁶⁶ Islam is the state religion of Saudi Arabia, and its law requires that all citizens be Muslims. Neither Saudi citizens nor guest workers have the right of freedom of religion in Saudi Arabia.”¹⁶⁷

The family that rules Saudi Arabia does not want to relinquish the power of the regime in the country to the voting public. However, mounting internal and external pressure recently led the country's rulers to open “halal nightclubs” and “halal bars” in this country.¹⁶⁸ Even if the ruling family in Saudi Arabia legalizes the serving of

166 https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Saudi_Arabia

167 https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Saudi_Arabia#Religion_in_society

168 <https://www.moroccoworldnews.com/2019/06/275751/saudi-arabia-halal-nightclub-disco-mbs/>

alcohol or grants people the right to practice any religion, the three options facing the families that control the country are as follows: The first option is the political system in Egypt or Lebanon, which are both republics without democracy or political freedom. The second is the one that exists in the United Arab Emirates.

No one knows for how long the families who own large businesses in the United Arab Emirates would be tolerant of this country maintaining a federal constitutional monarchy made up of seven hereditary tribal absolute monarchies,¹⁶⁹ but we can say that it is only a matter of time before those politically styled system structures would have to convert into forming a single or multi-unitary parliamentary democracy and constitutional monarchy.

If Saudi Arabia and the rest of the UAE are likely to adopt a political structure similar to that of future Egypt or Lebanon, or transition into a single or multi-unitary parliamentary democracy and constitutional monarchy, then it is reasonable to conclude that those families will choose the latter system.

I have no way of knowing if the world could afford for new constitutional monarchies to rise besides the ones that already exist. If my memory serves me correctly, Germany was a constitutional monarchy before WW1.¹⁷⁰

If it does not matter that when a country is an absolute monarchy, constitutional monarchy, democratic republic, etc., whenever a person refuses to be tolerant, he could face the same fate that awaited Jamal Khashoggi¹⁷¹ (1958 – 2018), a columnist, when he challenged the ruling family in Saudi Arabia, this signifies that if the UN continues to be an economic operator and continues to develop power, this organization will be a threat to the families/dynasties who control so much in the economic and political life of any existing nation. This is because what prompted the agents of the Saudi government to

169 https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/United_Arab_Emirates#Politics

170

https://encyclopedia.1914-1918-online.net/article/governments_parliaments_and_parties_germany

171 https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Jamal_Khashoggi

assassinate Khashoggi was not to overtake his wealth or military power but to stop his disloyalty.

If the disloyalty that a person can manifest can prompt to provoke a person in a position of power and wealth to yield to the same fate that Khashoggi dealt with, and if whenever a person is loyal to his beliefs, he also faces the same fate (i.e., American soldiers fallen in combat post-1945 or the American national, but to a lesser degree), this then signifies that if the families/dynasties who won WW2 continue to allow the UN to be an economic operator in the different UN member states while enjoying privileges and immunities (UN Charter Article 105) and while possessing the right to perform their duties without having to seek or receive instructions from any government or from any other authority external to the organization, they are not worried about this organization possessing power on a global scale.

Then again, if, as I said, the reason for this abnormal rise in intolerance that emerged in the world post-1945 is due to UN member states defining governments' ambitions for their own role in the world that are different from the ones the US ideals espouse, this signifies that the families/dynasties who won WW2 could be underestimating the big challenges that could confront them if the UN continues to establish power at the grassroots level.

In other words, if UN member states continue to use the spiraling adversity and inequality, entrenched poverty, the climate crisis, etc. to identify necessary reforms to serve systems and structures that aim to strengthen national interests (i.e., national defense, security, and development), then, as I said, the problem could be rooted in people in the Western Hemisphere having stopped being ready to prioritize moral over material and the people who live in the Eastern Hemisphere stopping with prioritizing material over moral; governments could be setting up the families/dynasties who won WW2 for a crisis that is much bigger than the one they are now facing where everyone member of the human family seems to want to play a leading role in shaping the global response to how national and legal rights should be distributed and organized."

To put it differently, there is a big difference between social revolutions that dissidents like Guevara, Fidel Castro, Nasrallah, Khashoggi, etc. motivate and cashing in the increased awareness that they gained from putting their trust in their wisdom and believing it could help them and help the people who believe in the ideas that matter to them to achieve the conditions and outcomes that they deeply care about and the real problem that I believe exists now on earth. This is that the world is now inhabited by two types of humans. Real humans, which is us, but our species does not know how this mass appeared on earth. A new human that is the product of the human imagination of the real humans. The real humans developed the new human (i.e., technology) to help this species to begin to put its trust in the wisdom of this new human, because it does not want to put its trust in the wisdom of God or the wisdom of a species of its own kind. However, since the real humans want to be doing exactly what some believe God has been doing since man appeared on earth, and that is to want to rule the world through real humans, which we know are the problem, we now have two problems. First, God is invisible, and the real humans that want all mankind to begin to put their trust in the wisdom of the new human are not, and therefore, this approach does not resolve the problem. Second, real humans are the problem, this second problem is more serious than the first. The only way for the new humans (i.e., technology) to be able to stop the real humans from continuing to be short-sighted and headed all the time for self-destruction is if the new humans phase out or get rid of the real humans (i.e., because they are, as I said, the problem).

This issue is very serious and worrisome. In other words, unless the families/dynasties who won WW2 truly adhere to the principles of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the continued rise in people's awareness will lead them to perceive that those families are failing to fulfill their part of the agreement, and mankind could continue to spiral down the international order into more insecurity. Alternatively, the families/dynasties who won WW2 would need to control the rise in egotism and selfishness.

Moreover, because humans increase their egotism and selfishness through increasing morality and vice versa (egotism and selfishness

decrease when people decrease their pursuit of morality),¹⁷² this signifies that the longer the families/dynasties who won WW2 take to stop the UN and UN member states from continuing to use the human rights idea as an instrument to make more people put their trust in the wisdom of their work program, which they say would lead to creating an egalitarian world, instead of the wisdom of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the faster the world would be spiraling down into deeper insecurity due to their inaction.

This scenario also means that the longer the families/dynasties who won WW2 take to make people start to interrelate on principles that are different than the ones that are stipulated in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the longer it would take for the real humans to put their trust in the wisdom of the new humans (all the technology) that those powerful families/dynasties claim can satisfy the best interests of society. This scenario also means that all the measures that governments take to make their dependents increase camaraderie or to put their trust in their ongoing efforts to ensure welfare while maintaining individual freedom under the rule of law would not help. The only way real humans can get their way despite others' resistance is to eliminate the families that won WW2, as they rely on new humans (i.e., technology) for protection. This is because it is the families/dynasties who won WW2 who exercise power at the highest levels. In sports, people compete to break the world record of the title holders, not the record of their rivals. This is very serious and worrisome.

In other words, if humans continue to be divided and disagree with each other about how to alter their custom and practice to start to interpret the work program that is stipulated in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and continue to allow the UN to interpret that the coming together of nations post-1945 is to empower people to increase their awareness about the need to increase morality, the tensions that this deviation or process would be creating would never result in humans becoming unified. To put it differently, if people or nations continue to cooperate in an environment tainted by deception, corruption, and larceny, where the primary focus of actors

172 Maloof S., *Social Improvement and Human Security: Collateral Damage*, 2005.
www.globalhumansecurity.com

is on amassing power to survive or avoid greater instability, the security dilemma created by such a reality could be devastating for everyone. Simply put, because the UN interpreted that the purpose of the coming together of nations is to pursue explosive, relentless growth by people or nations, we now have a situation 70 years later whereby the United States (along with the nations that are located in the Eastern Hemisphere) cannot go back to prioritizing moral over material policies, because this practice could put at risk its (their) own stability and strength when everyone else is cutting the other to increase his happiness. Likewise, if the nations who are based in the Eastern Hemisphere go back to prioritizing the the material over the the moral in a world where their members are all devoted to increasing their happiness at the same time, the international order would relapse back to pre-1945 programming. All these factors mean that if the families/dynasties who won WW2 fail to stop people or nations from being trapped in the spiral of equal rights and morality to achieve significance, they could be running out of time if they continue to allow specific families, governments, banks, or organizations to partner with them to transform the conditions and outcomes that matter to them.

In other words, if certain families, governments, banks, or organizations keep thinking that the power of the families that won WW2 can be treated like a sport where the goal is to dethrone the champion to gain his status, or to become as rich or powerful as those families, everyone will be trapped in a cycle of sin and selfishness. This scenario is because when more people start to discover ultimate significance in created things to become as powerful or as wealthy as their neighbor, those who would be trapped in this conviction would begin to focus on how to let the created things from which they achieve ultimate significance convert them into becoming as ambitious as the families/dynasties who won WW2 expect to take place indefinitely. The families/dynasties who won WW2 expect that the power, wealth, and status that they exercise over the international order will go on indeterminately and that this role that they played in getting human progress to the degree of development that exists is a task that they should play forever. When more people become obsessed with establishing world domination over every material element or product created by human ingenuity, the world will

resemble a highway congested with stalled vehicles, hindering the flow of traffic. In everyday life, the more stalled vehicles drivers encounter on a road, the higher the frustration of the drivers that are on the roads becomes and the faster road workers act to remove the stalled vehicle from continuing to block the way. Can the families/dynasties who won WW2 stop people from pushing them to be resized after they allowed the UN to teach people that they should practice intolerance to foster unity between the individual and the masses instead of being devoted to ending poverty and social injustice to become a permanent obstacle in the path of others?

It looks as if the families/dynasties who won WW2 did not make it totally clear to the people in the different countries who helped them to defeat the families/dynasties who were challenging them for the control of the international order that when all people (or nations) begin to cooperate on the basis of the principles of the work program that is stipulated in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, it becomes very difficult to pursue expansion that does not find ultimate significance in what this universal declaration dictates. Alternatively, the leaders of the different countries who helped the families/dynasties that won WW2 decided to not tell their dependents that when every member of the human family becomes devoted to establishing world domination over every material of terrestrial elements or a product that human ingenuity produces from those elements, this practice would put lots of stresses on the international order. This behavior splits people into becoming devoted to giving ultimate allegiance to the different material things from which they get significance instead of becoming devoted to finding significance in fostering unity between themselves and their neighbors. In other words, we now have a situation in which the families who exercise power at the highest level within the different countries perceive that their role is to act as custodians in this ongoing process in which people are giving ultimate allegiance to the different material things from which they get significance to increase their happiness instead of being actors who are devoted to ruling by example or in accordance with the work program that is stipulated in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights so their dependent people start to have confidence in the UN ideological objectives.

4

The Penalty

The families who exercise power at the highest level within the different countries continue to perceive to this date that the purpose of the coming together of people to collaborate in the social, political, and economic fields post-1945 was to increase material things in the hands of their dependent people without the awareness that their dependents are gaining, prompting them to put into question why this social class category is not practicing what it is preaching. To make matters worse, the families who exercise power at the highest level within the different countries have no objection to allowing the UN and international aid organizations to teach their dependent people why they should not be tolerant.

I have no way of knowing how the families/dynasties who won WW2 reasoned and reached the conclusion that when they have different families wielding considerable economic and political power at the country level, they could become like them, devoted to liberating mankind from all evil and working on achieving this goal without this exercise interfering in the leadership role that they want to play throughout this process when the idea of bringing people together to collaborate in the economic field was to teach people to recover, manage, and distribute the material of terrestrial origin and the product that human ingenuity produces from these materials based on the principles of equal rights. It is important to add that post-1945, the UN is working to see that the material of terrestrial origin and the product that human ingenuity produces are recovered, managed, and distributed on an equal rights basis and not on the principles of equal rights. The two principles are entirely different from one another.

The strategy that the families/dynasties who won WW2 adopted to promote global social and economic integration without worrying about the impact that such action could pose on their strength and stability is strange. Surely, the indifference that the families/dynasties who won WW2 manifested when they tolerated that families around the world gained considerable political or economic power without this successfulness being reached in accordance with how the Universal Declaration of Human Rights stipulated that all people should be cooperating, like post-1945, reflects a pattern that former powerful families/dynasties tested with and proved fatal for them.

For example, the families/dynasties who were playing the role of custodian of the destiny of the Greek empire tested with a social order that they hoped could achieve for this realm the same aspirations that the families/dynasties who won WW2 decided to transform at the global level. The families/dynasties that controlled the Greek empire expected that everyone would be altering his behavior to secure the ambitions that those powerful families/dynasties deeply cared about, despite the existence of lower-tier families that were like them, deeming that their legitimacy to exercise power runs according to God's will. The framework adopted by the families and dynasties that controlled the Greek empire later created significant gridlock for those powerful families, according to historians.

The problem the families controlling the Greek empire faced was implicitly connected to a revolt against the ideas' legitimacy, as these families and the lower-tier families they empowered had to end all evil on the islands for new families to take over. I strongly believe that the principal challenge stemmed from many people in the empire claiming that God inhabited their bodies to legitimize their rights, ensuring their authority to pursue their desires without constraint, even against others' resistance.

It looks as if the preoccupation of the families/dynasties who controlled the Greek empire with how to intercept any attempt that seeks to depose them from their power while tolerating that people exercise power over the material of terrestrial origin (water, food, and elements) from which humans sustain their survival needs or satiate their earthly desires resulted in the balance of power becoming equal.

To put it differently, in political science, “legitimacy is the right and acceptance of an authority, usually a governing law or a regime.”¹⁷³ Authority is “the legitimate power that one person or group possesses and practices over another.”¹⁷⁴ Law is “commonly understood as a system of rules that are created and enforced through social or governmental institutions to regulate conduct.”¹⁷⁵

Humans create laws to regulate how their response to internal and external stimuli should happen or be carried out. The internal and external stimuli can only refer to how to interact with the objects that exist in reality and are located on the outside of the physical boundary of any human being; hence, all the internal objects regulate themselves naturally. This means that humans create laws to regulate how they should deal with the material things that exist on the outside of their physical frame, both animate (i.e., objects with life) and inanimate (objects with no life).

If authority grants and justifies the right to exercise power over animate or inanimate objects, and if the term "power" grants the right to make decisions related to how animate or inanimate objects should be recovered, managed, and distributed to accomplish an authorized goal, and if all the animate and inanimate objects are located on the outside of the physical boundary of the human body, then for as long as humans rely on laws to legitimize how to protect each other from each other, we would be living in a world that cannot depend on a central authority to get its way.

If we seem to live in an anarchic world, meaning survival is a struggle to attain power to make decisions on how animate or inanimate objects are regulated, including determining legal frameworks and actions to exercise this right, then the pursuit of interests that aims to allow any individual, government, corporation, or organization to bend the landscape so the wisdom or the will of those people who conjecture that the world would be better off if it were transformed in accordance with their perception is a dangerous game. In other words, when the

173 [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Legitimacy_\(political\)](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Legitimacy_(political))

174 <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Authority>

175 <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Law>

landscape depicts a culture whose members become fixated on how to orient the focus of its members to become diverted to dominate a given material of terrestrial origin and/or the product that human ingenuity produces from those elements, this strategy makes it very difficult to rely upon a given individual, government, corporation, or organization to guarantee one's own survival. This is because the power takes a horizontal posture instead of a vertical one.

It looks as if the decision of the families/dynasties that controlled the Greek empire to tolerate their dependents pursuing social relationships that allowed everyone to put his trust in the wisdom of his human ingenuity to increase their happiness instead of those families/dynasties putting their trust in the wisdom of the stories that are reported in the first five chapters of the Pentateuch (i.e., the first 5 chapters of the Bible) prompted their collapse. Similarly, the decision made by the families and dynasties that won World War II to allow their dependents to pursue social relationships has resulted in their current inability to encourage people in various nations to act according to the principles they value. To show how serious the problem is, I will show how another species built a culture that allowed it to trust and work together, and why we can't, despite our historical efforts.

Honey is a food substance made by bees. The bees that produce the honey are called honeybees.¹⁷⁶ Melittologists (or apiologists) study bees and conduct apiculture research.¹⁷⁷ Melittologists claim that honey bees live according to a social system that is not any different than the one humans use.¹⁷⁸ The honeybees construct nests by producing natural wax, which they use to protect themselves from the elements and other predators, including as shelter to produce and store honey.

Melittologists state that all the honeybees work together as a group to produce wax and honey. There is normally only one adult queen in a honey bee colony or hive.¹⁷⁹ The queen bee does not directly control

176 https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Honey_bee

177 <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Melittology>

178 <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Melittology#Subdivisions>

179 https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Queen_bee

the hives.¹⁸⁰ The sole function of the queen bee is to serve as a reproducer. A virgin queen replaces the queen when the latter dies. Virgin queens are all the time rivaling each other, competing for the chance to mate and become the new queen of the hive.¹⁸¹ All the other bees who live in the hive are normally split between worker bees, or foraging bees; drone bees; and bees whose job is to fiercely follow the queen and to protect her.

Based on this brief overview of honeybee life, it appears that the daily routine of the queen bee and the other working bees revolves around giving rather than receiving. All the bees remain faithful to producing wax and honey. The bees use their programmed knowledge to build a hive (or shelter) from wax as a honey storage silo that can store all the honey the colony produces in one cell. The bees do not use their programmed knowledge to explore ways to distance themselves from their lifelong dedication to producing beeswax and honey, nor do they consider starting to domesticate other insects or species to perform this work for them. The bees do not explore how to produce tools, so they can delegate to them the task of aiding them in building hives. The bees do not explore to switch their behavior and to start to produce apples, rice, etc. because it is more sustainable for their survival than honey. The bees produce honey using nectar or pollen, not from rice, sugarcane, etc. The bees only use wax to build their hives; they do not use wood or cement. Likewise, the bees refrain from using the natural wax or honey they produce, and instead add value to it or promote it to other insects or animals as a great added value.

The daily life that humans uphold is more enriching than the one bees dedicate their entire lives to, and that is to collect nectar or pollen to produce beeswax and honey. Humans do all the things that bees are not doing. The first humans steal the honey from the bees. Then, they cut the honey with cheap substitutes. Humans adulterate honey by diluting this product with cheap syrup to increase profit. Humans produce candles from wax, soap, lip balms, and other crafts. Humans associate honey with natural products to enhance the value of other natural products and use their ingenuity to explore various possibilities and techniques.

180 https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Queen_bee#Daily_life

181 https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Queen_bee#Virgin_queen_bee

The cultures that bees and humans pursue are two worlds apart. The decision of the bees to trust in the wisdom of wax and honey to sustain their survival or food supply during the winter aids them in maintaining a vertical hierarchical structure. To the contrary, humans' decision to use their programmed human ingenuity to look for ways to explore how they can take beeswax or honey, for example, and make it a new product or see how it can add value to another natural product makes it impossible for mankind to put their trust in the wisdom of one specific task to allow this species to maintain a vertical hierarchical structure. An unlimited number of materials of terrestrial origin exist on the outside of the human body. If every person wants to explore to monopolize a material of terrestrial origin, including the product that human ingenuity produces from each one of those elements and relating how any natural or manmade product gives an added value to another natural product, then this scenario could explain why mankind never managed to sustain a vertical hierarchical structure. If every person is devoted to dominating every material of terrestrial origin, including the product that human ingenuity produces from each one of those elements and relating how any natural or manmade product provides an added value to another natural or manmade product, this then makes us devoted to building a horizontal hierarchical structure instead of a vertical one. The culture that humans adopt helps explain why no authority has succeeded in gaining the trust of its dependents and why the concept of democracy often fails. In fact, this social relationship that humans follow explains why humans struggle to trust each other's wisdom for collaboration, unlike bees, ants, and many other species.

Unless humans regulate what possibilities they can explore to stop rivaling each other or are ready to stop delegating to tools or instruments the role that their human body may have been programmed to serve in the natural realm, all self-help to prioritize what the other deeply cares about would have to be determined by one's own power or wisdom. In the case of a nation, it would be the state's military, economic, and political capabilities that would gauge its power.

A honeycomb is a mass of hexagonal prismatic wax cells built by honey bees in their nest to contain their larvae and stores of honey and pollen.¹⁸² Before the invention of removable honeycomb frames, beekeepers used to sacrifice the entire colony to conduct the honey and wax harvest.¹⁸³ The honey producers used to replace the entire hive of honey every season.

It looks as if the method that honey producers were using in antiquity to harvest honey is exactly the same method that humans have been using historically. Every family/dynasty that tries to tell another family/dynasty that is also devoted to obtaining its power not necessarily from competing to dominate the same material of terrestrial origin (i.e., honey production); product that human ingenuity produces from each one of those elements (i.e., sugar, medicine, etc.); and/or is relating to creating a new product to give added value (i.e., honey-roasted peanut, etc.) but sacrifices other elements or ingredients to stop the other from telling it what to do.

Since all the doctrines, laws, ideas, etc. that people come up with to prompt each other to be tolerant would remain disguised to get all the people who are all putting their trust in the wisdom of their human ingenuity to be aggressive and obscure instead of aiding people to work together as a group, we can say that the framework that the families/dynasties who won WW2 adopted to make the goals of the global war that they fought to be about how to increase social cohesion is a decision that they would regret if they continue to be holding the stick in one hand and the carrot in the other. In other words, if the families/dynasties who won WW2 do not decide to determine what it is exactly they want, their passive behavior and indifference about this abnormal rise in intolerance that emerged post-1945 instead of the opposite happening could be a prerequisite to a much more perilous condition that mankind can anticipate if people do not start to calm down.

A bee smoker (usually called a smoker) is a device used in beekeeping to calm honey bees.¹⁸⁴ Beekeepers usually smolder the area near the

182 <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Honeycomb>

183 <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Honey#Collection>

184 https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bee_smoker

hive or bee nest to calm the bees down. Humans do not know why smoke calms bees down. However, the smoke creates an opportunity for beekeepers to open the beehive to harvest the honey. Smoking does not cause the same reaction in humans as it does in bees. In other words, humans do not generate a hormone that makes them calmer when their senses transmit to their brain the existence of a threat or a potential threat. Inattentiveness is a remedy that triggers humans' calmness in times when they are not under threat. When people become absent-minded, their degree of attention becomes low. When humans' attention is distracted, people's focus diminishes.

If the families/dynasties who won WW2 would like humans post-1945 to delegate to tools the role that the human body may have been programmed to serve in the natural world (i.e., to focus on how to sustain survival needs instead of being hyper-focused on thoughts or events that are irrelevant to this goal), and on top, want that the intergovernmental organization that they proposed to coordinate the attainment of the conditions and outcomes that matter to them post-WW2 stop being absent-minded or unconscious about the need to foster human rights to create an egalitarian world, then one of two scenarios could have prompted this conduct that they took.

The first is if the families/dynasties who won WW2 find joy pursuing intense experiences without regard for physical, social, legal, or financial risk (i.e., are adrenaline junkies¹⁸⁵) and then engage in such sensation-seeking behavior to determine if they could get out of it intact. The second is if the families/dynasties who won WW2 are overestimating how much control they may have (i.e., the illusion of control¹⁸⁶).

I have no way of knowing if adrenaline-prompted hormonal components led the families who won WW2 to exhibit tendencies of overconfidence to the extent of feeling that they could control the outcomes and conditions that matter to them, which demonstrably they do not influence, and if illusory superiority¹⁸⁷ and optimism bias¹⁸⁸ effects make them believe that they can transform the conditions and

185 https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Adrenaline#Adrenaline_junkie

186 https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Illusion_of_control

187 https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Illusory_superiority

188 https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Optimism_bias

outcomes that matter to them without this process impacting negatively their power, status, or safety.

Certainly, the abnormal behavioral outcomes and conditions that have emerged in the world since 1945 could result from the reorganization that the families and dynasties who won WW2 view as necessary to achieve the results they deeply care about. But they could also easily be the events that the families/dynasties who controlled the Greek empire traversed before their collapse. As I said before, in antiquity, people were devoted to dominating every material of terrestrial origin, including the product that human ingenuity produces from each one of those elements, and relating how any natural or manmade product provides an added value to another natural or manmade product by claiming that it was God who was granting them this right. Post-1945, people are adopting similar patterns to declare themselves as permanent custodians or authorities over the rights of others involved in such work programs, but they are asserting that their power to dominate is derived not from God, but from the rule of law. If everything is relative and nothing changed on earth from antiquity to now, we could say that there is a good chance that the families/dynasties who won WW2 should face the same end that the families/dynasties who controlled the Greek empire traversed before their collapse.

Power is like a knife with two edges. In other words, a person may experience a deadlock and collapse in the legitimacy of their power if they tolerate conditions that lead to transformations they deeply care about (such as human behavior after WW2) while simultaneously not tolerating conditions that lead to transformations they also deeply care about (such as human behavior before the outbreak of WW2). The families who won WW2 are facing the same conditions as those who ruled the Greek empire. In other words, only one condition could prevent the collapse and disintegration of the families/dynasties who won WW2. This condition is a function of the ingenuity of the families/dynasties who won WW2 to make people become ready to cooperate based on the principles of equal rights and to perceive that everyone is cooperating on the basis of these principles. I like to mention here that the capacity of the families/dynasties who won WW2 to control for how long a family/dynasty could become a

permanent force needs to be integrated. In other words, if many families/dynasties compete to become like the permanent families/dynasties who control the different religious movements, the same process of elimination would go on when a particular family grows to the point of making other families feel that their happiness is being regulated by what others deeply care about.

However, people would be unwilling to surrender their freedom to cooperate based on the principles of equal rights if this idea were not supported by concrete actions. It would be irrational to suppose that the international order would be less dynamic in the future, particularly since the families/dynasties who won WW2 chose to let the UN raise the awareness of people about the importance of being devoted to fostering human rights to create an egalitarian world.

Hence, the families/dynasties who won WW2 would not be able to cooperate based on the principles of equal rights post-1945, because if they cooperated based on such principles before this global war erupted, they would not have been rich or powerful enough to take on the families/dynasties who wanted to resize their wealth or power to be the ones who would dominate the international order. Then again, if for as long as the families/dynasties who won WW2 allow any person, corporation, bank, business, government, organization, etc. to put his (its) trust in the wisdom of human ingenuity to find ultimate significance in created things, the symbiosis that exists between economic (or philosophical) power and political power would make the conditions and outcomes that await those powerful families/dynasties who won WW2 not any different than the ones that awaited the families/dynasties who controlled the Greek Empire or other empires, then we could say that it is a matter of time before the families/dynasties who won WW2 would have to yield to such a similar fate.

Indeed, this global social and economic integration strategy that the families/dynasties who won WWII adopted to ensure lasting peace backfired when those powerful families/dynasties chose to back up the pursuit of their goal with corresponding acts, such as prioritizing their wealth and influence over genuine cooperation and equal rights. In other words, the WW2-winning families/dynasties knew they couldn't

cooperate on equal rights, so this act shows how far they're willing to go to change what matters to them. But those families/dynasties knew they couldn't show the same courage as Jesus, yet they still held the carrot in one hand and the stick in the other. In other words, they were unable to hide their egotism and selfishness in the same way the people who dedicate their lives to the service of God manage to do it to get their way despite the resistance of others. The failure of the families/dynasties who won WW2 to be an honest broker while all people are pursuing how to be a permanent broker of every material of terrestrial origin, including the product that human ingenuity produces from each one of those elements and relating how any natural or manmade product gives an added value to another natural or manmade product, made it very hard for anyone to imagine how those families/dynasties would manage to make people alter their behavior to achieve the conditions and outcomes that matter to them when everyone is not cooperating or interacting based on the principles of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which those families proclaimed is the work program that would lead to attaining the international postwar order that they designed.

The incapability of the families/dynasties who won WW2 of preventing people from using their wealth and affluence to stop this growing apathetic behavior that a large number of people are manifesting toward this global social and economic integration strategy that they proposed in the aftermath of WW2 signals their ineptness to prevent this idea from continuing to be compromised. Evidently, the reason why most people are not remaining faithful to the aspirations that were proclaimed in the UN ideological objectives and are withdrawing their support can be due to two motives. The first could be because most people are interpreting that not all the positions or decisions that the families/dynasties who won WW2 are taking are moral. The second could be due to the unwillingness of the families/dynasties who won WW2 to accept that their decision to let the United Nations and international aid organizations interpret that the coming together of nations post-1945 was to foster human rights and create an egalitarian world could be among the principal multifactor criteria that prompted this increased deviation by people to support the outcomes and conditions that everyone was determined to secure in the aftermath of WW2.

"Symptom" is defined as "a physical or mental feature that is regarded as indicating a condition of disease, particularly such a feature that is apparent to the patient."¹⁸⁹ The abnormal rise in intolerance that emerged in the aftermath of WW2 are symptoms that resulted from an increased sensitivity to certain combinations of biological, social, and environmental processes on the perception of the state of being of most people.

The danger of signs indicating undesirable situations or deviations is that humans cannot detect which problem most affects their quality of life because symptoms are multifactorial. In other words, these symptoms encompass both reversible and irreversible deviations or undesirable situations. Hence, an individual has no way of knowing if the symptoms that the person is noticing are just temporal symptoms or a cause of alarm; the families/dynasties who won WW2 could be considering this abnormal rise in intolerance that emerged in the world post-1945 to be part of the normal experiences that are manifesting as a result of this ongoing reorganization of the international order and not necessarily an indicator of severe undesirable conditions growing that would affect their strength and stability.

Then again, for as long as the families/dynasties who won WW2 fail to make people cooperate based on the principles of equal rights and/or use their military power to broker righteous outcomes and not biased ones so people start to put their confidence in their wisdom, it is only a matter of time before the same fate that the families/dynasties who controlled the Greek empire in antiquity yielded to also happens to them. This statement is also to say that it is not important to know if the stresses that are prompting people to withdraw their support to secure the observations that are stipulated in the work program of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights are due to the families/dynasties who won WW2 being unwilling to admit that the UN and international aid organizations could have prompted this rise in intolerance, or if other noncausal symptoms are prompting this irrational behavior. In other words, it is unimportant to know if the fear of stigmatization, embarrassment, or the expectation of other adverse reactions or consequences from society could be contributing to the

189 <https://www.lexico.com/en/definition/symptom>

unwillingness of the families/dynasties who won WW2 to admit that the UN and international aid organizations could have prompted this abnormal rise in intolerance or if any future inputs would contribute to this erratic behavior.

Hence, if any “system is said to be a causal system if its output depends on present and past inputs only and not on future inputs,”¹⁹⁰ and we already know that the families/dynasties who won WW2 would like it so that all the future inputs (i.e., behaviors) that people would prompt in the system (i.e., on earth) would not result in the accompanying transformations bearing any pressure to delimit or resize the custodianship role of the international order that they would like their heirs to continually permanently play, we could say that any future input that does not behave in accordance with the Universal Declaration of Human Rights could put the stability and strength of those powerful families under great risk. Moreover, since the stability and strength of the families and dynasties that won World War II depend not only on future inputs such as population growth and environmental changes but also on the behavior of existing individuals within the system, we can conclude that if these families and dynasties continue to allow the UN to act as an economic operator, they may face a fate similar to that of the families and dynasties that ruled the ancient Greek empire.

Many questions this begs. For one, can the families/dynasties who won WW2 prevent their collapse when the UN is stressing and leading people to believe that ending adversity and inequality begins by resizing the power of those same powerful families/dynasties who formed this intergovernmental organization in the first place? Most importantly, could the families/dynasties who won WW2 prevent people from eventually resizing them when the UN is protecting its interests and increasing its profits instead of domesticating people worldwide based on the Universal Declaration of Human Rights to reduce dependence on lying, dissembling, and maneuvering? The abuse of power that the administrators of the UN manifested when they dismissed the application of this American national to protect the credibility of this organization is clear evidence to support that the officials of this organization who behaved as such perceive that they

190 <https://www.quora.com/What-are-causal-and-non-causal-system>

are above the idea(s) that those powerful families/dynasties who won WW2 proclaimed would be the common standard of achievement for all peoples and all nations to enable a perfect union between the poor and those same families/dynasties.

The families and dynasties who split from the British Crown in 1776 intended to create the United States, as summarized in the Preamble of the US Constitution. Those founding fathers said that their goal was to "*form a more perfect union, establish justice, ensure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty for ourselves and our posterity.*"¹⁹¹

The founding fathers of the US, along with the other families who collaborated with them, successfully transformed their society from 1776 onward to create a safe, peaceful, healthy, well-defended, and, most importantly, free nation. Can the families/dynasties who won WW2 secure the same outcomes that the founding fathers of the US did if the UN administrators and UN judges who are supposed to be faithful to them (or their ideas) are using the UN ground to sell and buy in the same way Jesus found happening when he visited a temple before he was crucified and are imitating what drug dealers do to increase profits instead of what the disciples of Jesus were doing to make Christianity succeed? To put it differently, can the families or dynasties that won WW2 manage to prevent all the people whom the UN officials are teaching to cut pure products with inexpensive filler to increase volume from resizing them when we know that "one rotten apple spoils the bunch"¹⁹²? Most importantly, can the families/dynasties who won WW2 manage to prevent the UN administrators and UN judges from using their powerful differential to revert them to a simpler form in the same way they reverted this American national to one if the UN officials are violating the contract that protects them?

Machiavelli claims that "we should not be appalled by how sly and dishonest people in positions of power could get and think of such people as immoral and simply bad for lying, dissembling, and

191 <https://www.thoughtco.com/preamble-to-the-us-constitution-3322393>

192 <https://idioms.thefreedictionary.com/rotten+apple+spoils+the+barrel>

maneuvering, because it is not the person who is friendly, honest, and kind who guarantees a state's survival, but the ones who know how to defend, enrich, and bring honor to the state.”¹⁹³ If the families/dynasties who won WW2 do not mind that the UN becomes an economic operator who is devoted to “cutting pure product with inexpensive filler to increase volume” and to bear rights to decide along with them on how the international order should be steered, this signifies that those powerful families believe that what Machiavelli claimed to be a path that could aid to attain the things that they truly care about. A person (or nation) does not need to be concerned about those in power who rely on deception and corruption to achieve their own interests, because those who are skilled in defending, enriching, and honoring their state will ultimately prevail. In other words, it is not totally unlawful that a person (a nation) resort to darker arts to defend, enrich, and bring honor to achieve a goal that everyone deeply cares about.

Indeed, the decision of the families/dynasties who won WW2 to tolerate that UN officials lie, betray, and backstab has maintained people's disappointment and confusion about what exactly those powerful families/dynasties wanted to achieve from making people become united in support of the UN's ideological goals, as the last 70 years stand to be good evidence to support that peace and security have not improved.

The families/dynasties who won WW2 are fine with many people sharing in deciding how the international order should be steered, as long as any organizational shift maintains their power to defend, enrich, and bring honor to themselves (or the people that depend on them). This scenario signifies that the families/dynasties who won WW2 do not believe that it is important that people cooperate based on the work program that is stipulated in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights to perfect an enlightened culture. They must believe instead that any person (or nation) who possesses wealth and affluence can reign as their permanent custodian over how each material of terrestrial origin should be recovered, managed, or distributed, including the ones that human ingenuity produces from those elements.

193 https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=AOXI0LI_t9s

The Medici family, also known as the House of Medici, was the Italian family that ruled Florence and later Tuscany during most of the period from 1434 to 1737, except for two brief intervals (from 1494 to 1512 and from 1527 to 1530).¹⁹⁴ Historical chronicles recount that the Medici family went to Florence in search of fortune in the year 1000. The founder of the family was a doctor by profession (Medici is the Italian word for "doctor"). The family began to work in apothecaries and other commerce. In 1348, one of the Medici was selected as part of the government, or Signoria. The wealth and power that the Medici family accumulated over the centuries enabled them to produce popes and become bankers of the Vatican, including becoming one of the richest Florentines in the early fifteenth century and throughout Europe.

Some historians claim that the Medici family's increasing financial power came from mingling with the underworld, but the family was famed for its support of the arts and humanities. This achievement signifies that this family managed to address a central problem of politics. This was how to balance between the humanities and their greed or ambition to stay in power. They managed to not let the power struggles that people in positions of power face, and that is to be a benevolent ruler with their ongoing ambition to gain power and prestige.

Perhaps Machiavelli's survival when the Medici family was in power could be what aided him in formulating how a "prince" could use his role to improve the quality of life without letting the darker arts that the "prince" uses to defend, enrich, and bring honor absorb the families that depend on his skills to surrender freedom to cause him trouble. But at the same time, Machiavelli recognized that a "prince" cannot celebrate his power if his reputation and the management of those around him are ruthless.

If the families who won WW2 think that they could continue to hold a stick in one hand and a carrot in the other so they could be theoretically loved and obeyed, then those powerful families are thinking that good governance and good ethics are two ideas that could

194 <https://www.florenceinferno.com/the-medici-family/>

be achieved based on what Machiavelli considered a good “prince” should also be prioritizing to get his way. This was to embrace wisdom, strategy, strength, bravery, and, when necessary, ruthlessness to keep people in check.

Evidently, this concept that the Medici family is best known for helped them to make Florence a thriving cultural center but did not prevent their collapse. If Machiavelli lived, he would have seen that, despite how vigorous and astute the Medici family tried to be to maintain its grip on power, the wisdom, strategy, strength, bravery, and, when necessary, ruthlessness that they exhibited did not prevent other ruling families or houses from wanting to weaken their power. In fact, all the families who offered their aid failed to help them succeed at realizing their grand project of unifying all of Tuscany.

If for as long as greed and personal ambition exist in the hearts of people, a "prince" cannot expect that his heirs would be able to celebrate his ambition permanently; this scenario signifies that when the families/dynasties who won WW2 permit that the UN ground become a market to buy and sell, they are not worried about the weak and soft character that this action would be portraying them to be to have any effect on shortening the life span of their power. This statement also signifies that those families/dynasties think that they have everything under control and that even if the accumulated ruthlessness that the UN officials are committing drives the social order into becoming entangled in a new global war to create a new balance, this tragic event would not weaken their power.

Verse 40 in Surat Al-Haj in the Quran states that if God did not cause people to need each other in all aspects of life differently, then total destruction would be engulfing the earth.¹⁹⁵ If the families/dynasties who won WW2 are permitting the wealthy and affluent people to limit the different skills that every person is programmed with or is supposed to complement the other with to create a balance (i.e., pursuing what the Quran cautions against not doing), then those powerful families must believe that their wisdom in combination with the wisdom of technology and the people who they are trusting at the UN to determine policies on their behalf can transform outcomes and

195 <https://quran.com/22/40>

solutions that are much more socially and economically merciful to everyone than the wisdom prescribed in the religious scriptures.

I have no way of knowing if the families/dynasties who won WW2 would manage to stabilize the international order to bring order without the corrupt UN officials whom they are employing to help them to get their way; consider them a threat and resize them. Most people around the world split their convictions or loyalties related to what they believe is right from wrong based on natural and manmade distinctions linked to features such as race, color, sex, language, religion, political or other opinions, national or social origin, property, birth, or other status. If the families/dynasties who won WW2 continue to tolerate wealthy and affluent people letting the UN and international aid organizations make people emphasize the importance of distancing the human body from fulfilling the role that this aptitude may have been programmed to serve in favor of satiating or satisfying the propensity of the human imagination, this would lead to more people becoming worried about what their neighbor is doing instead of becoming only worried about how to fulfill the role that their human body may have been programmed to serve. Wars and plagues can help to stop people from becoming worried about what their neighbors are doing and to make everyone dwell on things that are more serious, but unfortunately, wars and plagues do not stop greed and personal ambition from dwelling in the heart of people because those two aptitudes were programmed by man in the human body.

If wars and plagues do not aid in reducing greed and personal ambition, and in addition, we do not know if we were programmed to explore and/or to pursue what our human imagination is pushing us to believe that we were programmed to serve for the natural world, i.e., explore, this means that people's preoccupation with what their neighbor is doing should rise when people delegate to technology the role that the human body was programmed to serve or rely on wars and plagues to weaken the defense mechanism of each other.

The more the human body becomes idle and the more the human body is driven to yield to tragic events such as wars and plagues, the more the human imagination and human ingenuity start to have more time to prioritize distinctions linked to features such as race, color, sex,

language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth or other status to get its way despite the resistance of others. This scenario means that the more people create bodies, institutions, unions, coalitions, governments, nations, etc. to help in aiding in bringing people together, the harder it gets to make people cooperate without the distinction that, on its premise, human imagination builds coalitions so anyone can get his way despite the resistance of others. Likewise, the more the human body becomes idle and the more the human imagination expects this aptitude to delegate to technology the role that this feature may have been programmed for on earth, the more people become incapable of cooperating except on the basis of distinction. This signifies that to avoid violence and wars, there would be two scenarios ahead of mankind. The first is to return mankind to living under domination, exploitation, or subjugation. The second is to tolerate that every member on earth starts to have a say on how legal and natural rights should be legitimized, which could lead to a more democratic and equitable society, but also risks creating conflicts over differing interpretations of these rights. Those two scenarios signify chaos.

The objective of the coming together of all the nations post 1945 was to build a postwar international system that would be structured on freer exchanges of trade principles, self-determination, disarmament, and collective security to ensure lasting peace. This idea is also understood to mean that the purpose of coming into being among the living post-1945 should be to implement the work program that is stipulated in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights to foster unity between the individual and the mass and not to explore how one can get his way. It would be irrational to assume that the families and dynasties who defeated their rivals for control of the international order during World War II intended to enhance the well-being of people anywhere in the world; instead, they now face a larger challenge 73 years later. Once again, this is how to stop people from continuing to prioritize or meddle in how natural and legal rights should be managed and distributed, thus preventing mankind from rewriting the history of mankind, leading to the social contract that exists.

Once again, the purpose of this work is to provide solutions for stabilizing the international order, not to suggest what to do to the families or dynasties that won World War II after they decided to partner with the rest of the world population to end socialism or collectivism and make newborns start to prioritize themselves. This work aims to see if the families/dynasties that control much of a nation's economy and politics can keep their power and stability while UN workers break the rules that let them do so despite resistance.

I think that the consciousness that the families/dynasties who won WW2 manifested was programmed to make people collaborate together in the economic field post-1945 to increase socialism or collectivism in the world so the well-being that all people would enjoy could aid in making people recognize how benevolent they are and in this way tolerate their role, and it was not to make people begin to fight socialism or collectivism so we find the health of the international order in the state that we are in.

In other words, if, for example, the health of the international order has gotten to the point of having UN judges hear that senior UN officials were involved in conduct that violates the UN rules and regulations, yet instead of the UN judges condemning the UN officials who were committing such immoral acts, they dismiss the application of the UN employee whose supervisors accused him of being a threat to distance him from the office to do their business and denied him rights because he did not act below standard and challenged the UN within 60 days for the non-renewal of his contract as per the rules to influence a different decision and in this way qualify for an effective remedy, this signifies that we have two authorities who are competing for power on earth. Those two are the UN and the families/dynasties who won WW2.

Ramiro de Lorca¹⁹⁶ (1452 – 1502) was a Spanish condottiero in the service of Cesare Borgia¹⁹⁷ (1475 – 1507) during the Italian Wars. Ramiro and Borgia were excellent friends. Ramiro defended Borgia during the Italian Wars, and when Borgia appointed him a governor of the Romagna, Ramiro became known as a ruthless ruler. Ramiro

196 https://historica.fandom.com/wiki/Ramiro_de_Lorca

197 https://historica.fandom.com/wiki/Cesare_Borgia

imposed a relentless regime of torture and executions in public that earned him the fear and hatred of the population. Historical chronicles recount that Cesare then turned on Ramiro himself and had his body split in half and placed in the public square, just to remind the people of Romagna who the true boss was.

If the UN officials and judges continue to use the UN grounds to buy and sell, including denying individuals who prioritize the rights of the UN charter over their own interests, as they did with this American national (see Part II of this work), their wealth and affluence will continue to grow. If the UN member states continue to expand the activities of the UN in commerce and banking as the Medici family did in Florence starting from the 15th century, there is a good chance that the UN could start to play a role in determining who could be elected the new Pope or compete to become the bankers of the Vatican, Mecca, the city of Jerusalem, etc.

Girolamo Savonarola (1452 – 1498) was an Italian Dominican friar who was known for Christian renewal.¹⁹⁸ In 1494, he helped Charles VIII to expel the Medici family from power and established a democratic republic in Florence. Regrettably, when Savonarola rose to power and began to denounce clerical corruption, despotic rule, and the exploitation of the poor, his success did not last. The Vatican tried him when he refused to join Pope Alexander VI's¹⁹⁹ Holy League against the French, and on May 23, 1498, the Church and civil authorities condemned and hanged him.

I have no way of knowing if the Church is still involved in holy wars, as was the case in the last millennium. However, I think the international order can only tolerate a few families relying on the same virtue that Machiavelli claimed can enhance the power of any "prince" to have dependent people surrender freedom to him, including tolerating that he be granted a life tenure decision-making role on how the international order should be organized. Let us not forget that the "prince" must be able to ensure that his heirs maintain this right. This situation is really very serious and worrisome.

198 https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Girolamo_Savonarola

199 https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Pope_Alexander_VI

If we have three authorities who are using the same tactics to make people dwell on conduct to enhance the well-being of people anywhere in the world, but two are doing it based on prioritizing how to achieve this goal through prioritizing happiness and material things during a person's own lifetime, this scenario means that one may have to show the other who is the boss in the same way Cesare Borgia did with Ramiro de Lorca during the Italian Wars.

In the ancient world, the Achaemenid Empire is recognized for its achievements in human rights, politics, and military strategies.²⁰⁰ This strategy enabled the Achaemenid Empire to influence the achievements of many cultures that existed in the ancient world, thus making it the largest empire in history.²⁰¹

I have no way of knowing if the families/dynasties who won WW2 would be able to denounce the corruption that the UN officials are involved in and the despotic rule that they are adopting to deny their victims' rights, thus making people of different customs and religions embrace their benevolent ambitions to enhance the well-being of people anywhere in the world in the same way the Achaemenid Empire managed to be best known for. Alternatively, if the privileges and immunities that the UN officials are enjoying while being an economic operator would overshadow their commitment to be faithful to the families/dynasties who won WW2 (i.e., heirs), they could start to gain the most advantageous terms for themselves in the same way Pope Alexander VI did for Cesare Borgia and Girolamo Savonarola.

I have no way of knowing if the heirs of the families and dynasties that won World War II would be able to achieve the conditions and outcomes that their current forefathers believe are important to them while competing against the officials of the formal organization to which they entrusted the responsibility of fulfilling the aspirations outlined in the UN Charter. Those officials prioritize their beliefs over their masters' or subjects' interests, which contradicts the UN charter. It is important to note that the government prioritizes "the best value for money" rather than adhering to the rules and regulations of the UN Charter, as DFID did in Sudan (see Part II of this work).

200 https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Cyrus_the_Great

201 https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Achaemenid_Empire

Al-Husayn ibn Ali ibn Abi Talib (626 – 680) was a grandson of the Islamic prophet Muhammad and a son of Ali ibn Abi Talib and Muhammad's daughter Fatimah.²⁰² Al-Husayn is an important figure in Islam, being the third Shia Imam.

Historical accounts claim that a man once approached Al-Hussayn to ask him for advice. During the discussion, Al-Hussayn said that there are four types of brothers (or relationships)²⁰³ that any person can maintain with another human being. The first type is the one in which the two brothers care for each other. Both brothers understand that agreements benefit them both, while contradictions are detrimental to both. The second type is the one in which one of the brothers sacrifices his life for the other. This type of brother would get rid of his greed and desire to prioritize his brother's needs. The third type is the one in which one of the brothers cares only for himself. This third type represents the one in which a brother is always lying to his brother and is envying him. The fourth type is characterized by the inability of the two brothers to agree due to the hatred that resides in each of their hearts. Husayn claims that God has filled this fourth type of relationship with foolishness.

It seems that the families who won WW2 or own the companies that handle 80% of the world's trade will have to choose what type of relationships they want to prioritize from the four that Hussayn claimed can only exist. This scenario means deciding between wanting to continue to channel their money through a UN organization that is using the UN ground to buy and sell; through organizations that prioritize "the best value for money," as the government of Great Britain was doing in Sudan; or through people who prioritized their best interests (i.e., the UN charter) so they continue to get "their way despite the resistance of others," as per how this American national acted. Likewise, it seems as if those families/dynasties are going to have to decide if they want to continue to let the UN be an economic operator who enjoys privileges and immunities without the right

202 https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Husayn_ibn_Ali

203 http://shiaonlinelibrary.com/%D8%A7%D9%84%D9%83%D8%AA%D8%A8/1153_%D8%AA%D8%AD%D9%81-%D8%A7%D9%84%D8%B9%D9%82%D9%88%D9%84/%D8%A7%D9%84%D8%B5%D9%81%D8%AD%D8%A9_0?page=247

checks and balances, because humans are a species that backstab, double-cross, and betray to increase their happiness. In other words, if those families/dynasties who won WW2 want to continue to let the UN interfere in the social order while its workers are granted rights to enjoy privileges and immunities, this means that the UN officials would not be behaving any differently than how people on the outside of the UN fence behave. If humans are a species that backstab, double-cross, and betray to increase their happiness, and the UN workers are prioritizing their self-interest and allowed to generate their own income to pay their salaries instead of prioritizing the aspirations that are stipulated in the UN charter, this scenario signifies that the chances of the families/dynasties who won WW2 being reverted to a simpler form would rise. This is because it is on UN ground where politicians are bought and sold. Let us not forget that throughout history, the most trusted allies or partners have often been regarded as the biggest threats when greed and personal ambition infiltrate their hearts.

No matter which type of relationship from among the above four that Al-Husayn claimed exists, the families/dynasties who won WW2 end up picking, there is a question that those powerful families/dynasties would have to decide upon. Albert Einstein raised this question (some commentators attribute this quote to an anonymous source).²⁰⁴

Einstein is generally quoted for having said, "The definition of insanity is doing the same thing over and over again and expecting different results." It looks as if all the promises that the UN has been making on their behalf about ending poverty, injustice, etc. by specific dates are increasingly becoming an expectation that the poor around the world are demanding explanations for the reasons why it is taking long to occur. Could the families and dynasties that won World War II expect a different fate than those that previously controlled significant aspects of economic and political life, if the UN and aid organizations continue to interfere in the social order by promoting human rights and striving for an egalitarian world? Most importantly, if the UN continues to come up with goals and established dates to end poverty, injustice, etc., as if those two ideas were a bottle of milk that a consumer must consume before a specific expiry date, can the

204 <https://www.history.com/news/here-are-6-things-albert-einstein-never-said>

families/dynasties who won WW2 control people's expectations when more people become aware of what death means?

I have no way of knowing if the families/dynasties who won WW2 would be able to continue to defend the ideas they proclaimed in the UN Charter from collapsing when UN workers are prioritizing their best interests and the best interests of their clients to earn their income. Similarly, when UN member states prioritize violating UN rules and regulations to achieve the "best value for money," as the government of Great Britain (i.e., DFID) did in Sudan (see part II of this work), it raises concerns about their commitment to the UN's principles.

If the families/dynasties who won WW2 are indifferent about letting the UN become an economic operator and UN officials enjoy rights and privileges that grant them the right to run this intergovernmental body in the same way Jesus found taking place on the ground of a temple that he was visiting, then this signifies that the definition that Einstein gave about why a person who repeats the same thing over and over again expects the same result may not be totally erroneous. Moreover, if humans are a species that engages in backstabbing, double-crossing, and betrayal to increase their happiness, then the families and dynasties that won World War II may be overestimating their own qualities and abilities compared to those of others. In other words, families/dynasties who won WW2 could be channeling their money through venues that may not produce the outputs that they expect would occur.

As I mentioned earlier, humans are not programmed to predict the future; instead, they are designed to examine and analyze past and current events in the hope that the perspectives generated can aid in understanding the future based on constructed patterns.

If humans systematically use inputs to construct patterns that they believe represent final outputs, then we can say that the conduct that the UN officials purported to use against this American national to increase their happiness is not a subjective reality but one that was grounded in empirical observations and experimental data.

If when a UN official observed the ideas (or norms) that those powerful families/dynasties wanted everyone to keep in mind and to practice pursuant to WW2, the UN reverted the individual who adhered to those principles to a simple form, then there is a good chance that if those powerful families/dynasties keep on allowing the UN to be an economic operator, this intergovernmental organization will revert the families/dynasties who proclaimed those ideas (or norms) to a simple form as well. This conclusion is because there is no difference between having the American national take actions on the ideas (or norms) that those powerful families/dynasties proposed and having a family member do it personally himself. It is the idea that creates the outcome and not the body.

If the families and dynasties that won World War II lack evidence to ensure that the UN officials they are entrusting with maintaining representations in each country will remain faithful and wise servants, then they may be overestimating their qualities and abilities in comparison to those of others. In other words, the families and dynasties that won World War II might be underestimating the benefits of maintaining authority based on residency rather than solely on wealth or military power. How can we be sure the UN would not compete to revert governments to a simpler form? Most importantly, how could we be sure that the UN would not revert the families/dynasties who won WW2 to a simpler form if its officials are prioritizing how to use their power, which is based on residence, to increase their wealth and transform the outcomes that matter to them?

In psychology, the valence effect is a concept that alludes to "the effect of valence on unrealistic optimism."²⁰⁵ Valence, or hedonic tone, is the affective quality referring to the intrinsic attractiveness or "goodness" (positive valence) or averseness or "badness" (negative valence) of an event, object, or situation.²⁰⁶ This principle signifies that to prevent UN officials from developing cognitive biases that could lead them to misuse their power for personal gain or to underestimate their responsibilities, it is crucial to regulate their ambition. However, since the families/dynasties who won WW2 decided to let the UN become

205 Valence affect unrealistic optimism?". *Psychology, Health & Medicine*. 17 (1): 105–115. doi:10.1080/13548506.2011.582503. PMID 21745029

206 Nico H. Frijda, *The Emotions*. Cambridge(UK): Cambridge University Press, 1986. p. 207

an economic operator, thus underestimating the valence effect, we can say that because most humans believe that the greater their ability to reason and to make choices that motivate added happiness, the more this perception would be evoking more positive valence for people. Now, because the only way to increase positive valence around a person is by increasing wealth, this conclusion means that it is not possible to avoid that a person feels negative valence if a person does not possess lots of material things. Hence, the UN officials teaching people to observe the work program in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights are not wealthy; they have a limited understanding of themselves, which prevents courage from guiding their emotions instead of fear. Humans' behavior is more often guided by negative valence than positive valence. If most people are theoretically driven by negatively valenced emotions or behaviors while striving to increase their happiness, it can be concluded that UN officials are likely to rely on greed and personal ambition to engage in unlawful behavior.

If the valence effect can lead to tendencies that would make UN officials engage in unlawful behaviors, this scenario then signifies that if precautionary measures are not taken to stop the UN from continuing to enjoy privileges and immunities pursuant to this organization becoming an economic operator like any business that is buying and selling, the families/dynasties who won WW2 could be using the UN to dig their own grave. This is because the mental processes that humans use to form judgments, make decisions, and find solutions to complex problems under uncertainty are estimated based on how likely individuals are to think in stereotypical categories rather than focusing on their actual targets when making comparisons.^{207,208,209} If the degree to which any cognitive mechanism relies on making judgments about the probability of an event under uncertainty is based “on how closely an event aligns with a person's overall idea of that specific event,”²¹⁰ then the families or dynasties

207 https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Heuristics_in_judgment_and_decision-making

208 https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Representativeness_heuristic

209 Weinstein, Neil D. (1980). "Unrealistic optimism about future life events". *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 39 (5): 806–820. CiteSeerX 10.1.1.535.9244

210 Shepperd, James A.; Patrick Carroll; Jodi Grace; Meredith Terry (2002). "Exploring the Causes of Comparative Optimism" (PDF). *Psychologica*

that won World War II may have two primary influences encouraging the UN to promote human rights and create an egalitarian world. The first is if they know this strategy works because it was tested in antiquity by our predecessors, and the outcomes enabled the families/dynasties who spearheaded it to reach their goals. The second reflects an ambition or a “judgmental shortcut that generally gets us where we need to go—and quickly—but at the cost of occasionally sending us off course.”²¹¹

Hence, it is unnecessary to examine and analyze what mental process could have driven the families to accept that the UN becomes an economic operator devoted to teaching people dissatisfaction and a prioritization of materialism, because we already know how history’s outcome could look; those future inputs are not needed to formulate an opinion. We can say that the organizational objectives that the families and dynasties who won WW2 are sponsoring through the UN can result in a social order that would not be any different than how Spain was governed under the Catholic Monarchs²¹² in the 15th century and the one that John Lackland²¹³ (1166–1216), King of England, adopted at the start of the second millennium, whose successors continue to this day to build on his astuteness to enhance the well-being of people anywhere in the world. The fallacy in the planning the heirs of the families/dynasties who won WW2 are permitting would determine if their power and authority would last as long as the power of the Catholic monarchs lasted or the one that John Lackland produced.

Emile Abdel Ahad (1938 – 2012), a Lebanese educator and philosopher, claimed that there are five A's (or families) that would not fade from the social order.²¹⁴ Four of those aces are the four aces that make a standard 52-card deck, and the fifth is the British ruling family. In 1945, the British ruling family played a key role in shaping the international order. It is normal to consider that this family/dynasty has

Belgica. 42: 65–98. CiteSeerX 10.1.1.507.9932. Archived from the original (PDF) on 2011-11-25.

211 Gilovich, Thomas; Savitsky, Kenneth (1996). "Like Goes with Like: The Role of Representativeness in Erroneous and Pseudo-Scientific Beliefs" (PDF). *Skeptical Inquirer*. 20 (2): 34–40

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

213 https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/John,_King_of_England

214 From discussion with Emile Abdel Ahad in 1990.

a succession plan. As we consider the state of the international order today, which appears to be progressing toward becoming more and more harnessed around the idea of the “self” rather than the collective, we can say that if the ongoing dissatisfaction or disenchantment with the ongoing pace at which the UN and UN members are producing “results that matter,” more tribal and ethnic factions within what were once a unified body would continue to grow.

For example, if the UN continues to promote human rights in order to create an egalitarian world, it is highly likely that individuals may feel compelled by the common values and goals taught by this international organization to suggest that Queen Elizabeth II,²¹⁵ who serves as the Head of the Commonwealth of Nations, should symbolically cease her role permanently so that another person can assume this position based on equal rights. The Commonwealth of Nations²¹⁶ is a voluntary association of 54 nations, which promote democracy, human rights, good governance, rule of law, equality before the law, etc. If all the people living in the 54 Commonwealth nations believe that Queen Elizabeth II should continue as the Head of the Commonwealth, yet also think that this position, despite lacking political or executive power over any Commonwealth member states, should be rotated, it indicates a concern that allowing a single individual to hold this role could lead to ambitions that threaten Queen Elizabeth's position in the association. Therefore, to prevent this, newborns must be discouraged from imagining or dreaming. This is because it is imagination/dreams that prompts any individual to have ambitions and to explore.

We don't know whether our ancestors passed down the desire to imagine or if the human body programmed this aptitude. Many powerful people tried to control and regulate the behavior of their dependents to try to limit what they should be allowed to imagine and what not, but eventually these trials failed. Religion is a vision that managed to outlive all the efforts that humans' sheer love of power tried to limit across the centuries.

215 https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Elizabeth_II

216

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Member_states_of_the_Commonwealth_of_Nations

s

Furthermore, it's unclear if religion survived because it helps individuals focus away from what society deems important—like wealth and power—or because those in power use it to encourage dependency (postpone their pursuit of wealth, power, happiness, money, etc. until after death to minimize rivalry).

I strongly believe that among all the religions and philosophies that people rely on to create a sense of unity between individuals and society, only Islam offers concise guidance for its adherents on how to prevent their imagination from being influenced by concepts such as tribalism, human rights, democracy, good governance, the rule of law, or equality before the law—ideas that many use to gain power and pursue paths that could make them a threat. Likewise, for the people who do not believe that God created the world, I strongly believe that the United States Constitution (i.e., the work program that exists in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights) is the other philosophy that achieves the same outcome.

Unfortunately, from 1945 to now, the people who claim that they are Muslim refuse to practice tolerance to enable the families/dynasties who won WW2 to deliver on the goals that they promised they would be devoted to securing. Likewise, since 1945, those who have been relying on the United States Constitution while engaging in what Machiavelli described as "criminal virtue" are increasingly showing the negative effects of their actions, causing more people to become wary of their behavior.

If the only religion/philosophy known to man has enabled a person's imagination to stop using the ideas of tribalism, human rights, democracy, good governance, rule of law, and equality before the law as tools to pursue dreams, then a rule must exist that those who practiced Islam or the ideals stipulated in the US Constitution did not do what we are now doing. Let us take Islam to check what that rule might be.

Islam is a religion that started in the 7th century.²¹⁷ Its founders managed to form an ideal government initially. Later, the people who were in positions of power began to stray away from the ideals that

217 https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/History_of_Islam

were fostered and began to focus inward and use their power for their own well-being and the well-being of their heirs, leading to a decline in the moral and ethical standards that had initially characterized the governance of the early Islamic community. The Grand Imam of al-Azhar is a prestigious Sunni Islam title and a prominent official title in Egypt. Some Muslims regard the Grand Sheikh of al-Azhar as the highest authority in Sunni Islamic thought and Islamic jurisprudence.²¹⁸ In early 2020, the Grand Imam of al-Azhar expressed in an interview that what remains from the way of life or the form of government that the initial founders of Islam managed to build is the law of inheritance and the laws of Islamic marriage and divorce jurisprudence.²¹⁹

I cannot determine what the initial founders of Islam were doing to establish an ideal form of government, but if that were the case, then those early leaders must have interacted with each other based solely on the pursuit of ideals such as justice, equality, liberty, life, happiness, fairness, and unity.

I believe that the values that the British ruling families prioritized in the aftermath of WW2 are not any different from the values that the founders of Islam were prioritizing initially. If the only values that remain from the teachings of the Islamic faith, according to the Grand Imam of al-Azhar, are the laws of inheritance and the laws governing Islamic marriage and divorce, then the reason people may be overly attached to material possessions could be that they prioritize created things over theological doctrines that lead to true happiness. This is very serious and worrisome.

The Catholic Church banned Machiavelli's work for 200 years because he argued that theological doctrines were incompatible with being a good leader. But as Machiavelli said, we can't be good at everything, so we must choose one thing over another. This situation signifies that if the British ruling families continue to go along with the UN being an economic operator who is teaching people to value corruption, as its officials were doing in the DRC and the Sudan, this apathetic behavior signifies that this ruling family is indifferent to the UN's judgmental

218 https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Grand_Imam_of_al-Azhar

219 https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=dWCJur6v_Go

decision to send the international order off course. This is very serious and worrisome.

If corruption, greed, and personal ambition are not behaviors that are unique for any time, meaning that this essential formula will continually exist, this scenario means that it is not a matter of whether this destructive behavior would distort the international order, but it is a matter of time for it to occur. In other words, if corruption is like a virus, some societies can find the will to jump it, but it is also like a virus constantly infesting and mutating; this means that the risk of corruption could be a phenomenon that behaves like a virus. Usually, when a virus undergoes a minor mutation, the associated risk is low; however, occasionally, a significant and deadly mutation can occur, leading to devastating effects on humanity. If corruption mutates like a virus, there is a good chance that all the teaching that the UN is pursuing to make people find ultimate significance in created things will cause this phenomenon to rise in entropy, and hence corruption is not like a virus that can jump between people. This scenario means that it is a matter of time until the destructive behavior that the UN is infecting people with at the grassroots level would make it very hard for people to be tolerant or go back to being tolerant. This scenario is very frightening.

To put it differently, the British Royal Family could be conjecturing that the current global governance system, along with the unlimited number of bodies, institutions, unions, and coalitions that are working in each nation to foster the transformations that the founder of the international post-world order proclaimed, if modernization (accelerating people's detachment from the natural world to delegate to technology the role that humans may have been created to serve) and liberalization do not produce the behaviors that are comparable with religious behavior, then mankind could be doomed and not only the international order. Put differently, this also means that if the British Royal Family and all the rest of the families/dynasties who control so much in the economic and political life of any existing nation continue to interpret good governance as focusing on exploring and limiting action, knowledge, and feeling rather than balancing them, their efforts to produce behaviors comparable to religious behavior may not always succeed. The values that remain from Islam are a good example of

what could happen to a culture that begins to find ultimate significance in created things.

Moreover, if we consider that all human bodies are naturally balanced, meaning they are programmed with the same functions and have approximately the same weight, height, and features, then slowing the human body to make it less dynamic allows awareness or human imagination to prioritize knowledge and feeling. This phenomenon occurs because when the human body is less dynamic, the mindedness level of a person becomes reciprocally equally high. In other words, people become more intrusive in their neighbors' affairs. If the British Royal Family and the families/dynasties controlling a nation's economic and political life support the UN's push for human rights, this signals their acceptance of delegating bodily functions to technology. This tactic will result in both positive and negative outcomes. The positive outcome includes boosting the happiness of the poor or rich. The negative consequences are not easily eliminated. When the rich make it easier for the poor to meet their survival needs, the breathing space gained by the poor helps them explore ways to align their feelings and knowledge with those accessible to the rich. If the rich want the poor to delegate to technology actions the human body can perform, so technical progress is not wasted, this means the rich want the poor to understand why being devoted to increasing happiness is important and to use the time they gain to invest in becoming equal to them.

I made reference earlier to an opinion that Isaac Asimov held when asked about the problem of planning fallacy. Asimov said, "*It would have been so much better if we had built our cities with the automobile in mind instead of building cities for a free automobile age and finding we can hardly find any place to put the automobiles.*"

It looks as if the challenges that the families/dynasties who control so much in the economic and political life of any existing nation are confronting to make people give up their natural freedom and to respect the work program that they adopted in the aftermath of WW2 resemble very closely the challenges city planners are putting up to find a solution to automobile overcrowding. In other words, instead of the families/dynasties that control so much in the economic and

political life of any existing nation not minding that technical progress runs to waste to spare themselves from the challenges that they have to confront due to all the idling that delegating to technology the actions that the human body can perform creates, the obsession of this select group with increasing its wealth makes its members not mind that a large number of human imaginations do not become distracted and idle.

Hence, the objective of the families/dynasties who control so much in the economic and political life of any existing nation is not to increase the purchasing power of the poor to eradicate poverty but rather to match the increase in productive potential; this select group is dealing with the same problem city planners are facing with automobiles overcrowding. Presently, city planners are obliged to divide existing roads into a lane for buses, a lane for bicycles, a lane for a vehicle with more than 3 passengers, two passengers, etc., instead of building new cities that accommodate the potential overpopulation creates. A similar approach is being applied in the social order to control the poor. Instead of the families/dynasties who control so much of any nation's economic and political life distracting people with labor-intensive work methods to reduce idleness or deprivation, those powerful families/dynasties want the poor to take on jobs that increase their awareness or rational judgment, but without motivating them to share equal rights principles for natural and created things.

I have no way of knowing what will come exactly from having the UN teach people about fostering human rights, democracy, good governance, rule of law, equality before the law, etc., but without the awareness that this organization is raising in the minds of people, pushing them to have dreams. Throughout history, the world has been an experimental theater for mankind. Always, the ideas that existing people tested with provided a work program for newborns to resolve, suggesting that the lessons learned from past experiences can guide future generations in addressing contemporary challenges.

If the families/dynasties who control so much in the economic and political life of any existing nation consider that they could be distracting people from being aware of the need to foster human rights to create an egalitarian world while this teaching leads to permanent

shifts in political and economic power, then they must be thinking that they are invincible.

If the heirs of all the power brokers that the world has known knew how to recover from setbacks or adapt to change, including knowing how to keep on going in the face of adversity, we could all be living under the Achaemenid Empire (550 BC – 330 BC) that Cyrus the Great created.

If no policy successfully established a permanent government to benefit its subjects, we can say that the families/dynasties controlling the economy and politics permit the human body to increase productive potential, avoiding wasted progress; this strategy is bound to lead to the same fate as other powers. This is because if people could emphasize the importance of human reason over the unimportance of human imagination or greed,²²⁰ we could be all living under the Achaemenid Empire, as I just said.

Moreover, human imagination drives technical progress forward and enables people to have dreams and aspirations. Families and dynasties controlling much of a nation's economic and political life choose to build societies whose members focus on helping their neighbors instead of working for the natural world, which may hinder distributing the benefits of technical progress. Idling people with activities such as watching TV, driving in driverless cars, assigning them jobs that focus on installing surveillance cameras, or preoccupying them with wars does not help them understand each other; instead, it leads to the opposite outcome.

It appears that the decision made by the families and dynasties who wield significant influence in the economic and political life of any existing nation to support the UN in teaching people about human rights—aimed at preventing the waste of created technical progress—serves primarily as a strategy to increase wealth. This concept overlooks the broader context. It seems that it is only a matter of time before the values prioritized by the families and dynasties that won

220 Maloof, S. *Social Improvement and Human Security: Collateral Damage*, Book, 2005.

World War II dwindle to the level currently seen in Islam, according to the grand imam of al-Azhar.

After a plague strike, those who survive do better because of labor scarcity and the untimely death of relatives. However, plagues create a major shortfall. They wipe out know-how. For example, the edifice of Winchester Cathedral in England is “a mixture of elaborate pre-plague stonework mixed with basic lines after the Black Death wiped out scores of master craftsmen.”²²¹ The Black Plague arrived in Western Europe in 1347 and faded in the early 1350s.²²²

Historians claim that up to the date when the Black Plague struck, people accepted unquestionably the doctrine of the church, but after the plague struck, people determined that it was necessary to strike a balance between the doctrine of the church and the world of ideas or reason.

By examining the relationship between social upheaval, plagues, and the world of ideas, we discover that they share similar drawbacks. They both take away know-how, thus increasing people’s vulnerability rather than aiding it, which can lead to a decline in critical thinking and self-sufficiency among the population. This work aims to review the UN’s role as an economic operator that uses its power to deny rights and promote greed, not to address the effects of delegating to technology the role that the human body may have been programmed to serve in the natural world. Can the British Royal Family or any other wealthy family guarantee that the UN would not plot to take away their most precious possession (i.e., power/wealth) after this organization has become a rat’s paradise and while existing humans are busy unloading or passing to robots and machines the know-how that this species used to hand to its newborn to uphold and to be in charge of its management and distribution?

Evidently, up until a new renaissance emerges that would be ready to become aware in ways that had not been apparent, we could say that man’s ambitions to be the measures of all things would continue to

221 <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=UA4Gd8tyJeA>

222 <https://www.historyextra.com/period/medieval/black-death-plague-guide-bubonic-facts-when-how-many-died-death-rate/>

prevent mankind from striking a balance between this species' aspirations towards achieving greater enlightenment and the risks that such practice carries as people become less and less vitally dependent on human ingenuity for everyday survival.

In the meantime, it looks as if for as long as existing humans thrust newborns into believing that becoming among the living is an inexorable march of progress towards distancing the human body from fulfilling the role that this aptitude may have been programmed to serve for the natural world, this conviction makes human ingenuity incapable of balancing its own expectations of life with societal demands. This scenario signifies that for as long as human imagination thrusts human ingenuity to robots and machines, the know-how that this aptitude used to hand to real humans (i.e., newborns), including delegating to such instruments the task of determining and taking action on their behalf, the more this process would be diminishing the real know-how that is usually gained as a result of knowledge or experience. For example, as people increasingly assign tasks that require thought or rational judgment—such as planting food, working as machinists, or shoemakers—to robots and machines, the happiness derived from human imagination may increase, but this comes at the cost of diminishing real knowledge and experience. In other words, if a person has all the information that shows how to plant, harvest, and store wheat in a book, a computer, etc., and then those two storage tools get damaged, that person would become powerless because this process did not get passed on from human ingenuity to another.

Evidently, the scenario in which humanity finds itself stripped of all its know-how is highly unlikely to occur without a natural calamity, such as a meteor hitting the Earth or the use of weapons of mass destruction that could wipe out human progress. However, there is one type of know-how that I am specifically interested in understanding: its impact on weakening the strength and stability of the British Royal Family or any other wealthy family in this scope of work. This know-how is loyalty.

Throughout history, when a pandemic struck mankind, the first thing such an incident wiped out was loyalty. If the families and dynasties that control significant aspects of a nation's economic and political life

do not care that the UN becomes a center for spreading corruption rather than protecting their dependents from such a mental disease, it indicates that these powerful families and dynasties are unconcerned about the impact of rising corruption on the loyalty of their dependents. In other words, if the families and dynasties that control significant aspects of a nation's economic and political life believe that loyalty is merely another human activity that can be transferred to robots and machines, it indicates that these powerful families and dynasties think they can maintain this process without individuals acquiring this knowledge through real-life experiences.

To put it differently, loyalty, faithfulness, allegiance, etc. are ideas that a person gains from reading about how to express them or from learning to develop them through mental conditioning (i.e., the army) or through real-life experiences. Humans depend on those ideas to garner and strip power from each other. Winning wars, abating crises, and combating plagues require those ideas. Moreover, people in positions of power maintain their strength and stability by relying on the knowledge that their dependent people gained from those ideas to avoid becoming size-less. In the past, when those in positions of power did not subject their dependent people to stressors like wars to gain their loyalty, the dependent people learned the importance of loyalty through maintaining close relationships with one another. In other words, the necessity for individuals to work or cooperate together allowed existing people to transfer knowledge and loyalty from one generation to another. The people read about how to build a water canal from the books that their predecessors wrote on the subject, and they were doing the construction with their hands. The people were performing tasks to sustain their own bodies that their human bodies could serve, rather than delegating those tasks to tools or making tools responsible, as mankind started extensively doing post-1945.

If the current families and dynasties that wield significant influence in the economic and political spheres of any nation believe that reducing people's reliance on human experience in favor of tools and machines is a more effective strategy for maintaining their power despite opposition, it indicates that these powerful families and dynasties value the significance of these created instruments more than the loyalty they could receive from human ingenuity alone.

It is unknown whether reducing people's dependence on each other or on human ingenuity would affect the loyalty that humans express toward the ideas that the most powerful ones uphold and expect others to respect and/or depend on to get their way despite the resistance of others. Historians report that when pandemics or natural disasters struck, most people stopped being loyal to each other, and every person started to prioritize their self-interests. If the UN has become a rat's paradise and all governments are diminishing the importance of human ingenuity in fostering loyalty, it is crucial to assess whether the UN can be trusted as more people learn to be loyal independently or through reduced interaction with one another and increased interaction with machines. In other words, if the UN has become similar to most existing governments by coordinating activities that prioritize its own greed and personal ambition rather than acting in the best interests of the families or dynasties that won World War II, such as the British Royal Family or other wealthy families, it is crucial to consider whether those families can prevent the UN from plotting to take away their most valuable asset: power and wealth. Evidently, if all those powerful families/dynasties do not mind that the UN coordinates, determines, and enforces activities between states on a global scale, including becoming an economic operator who does business while enjoying privileges and immunities, then those powerful families must believe that the UN does not pose any threat and that they can clip its wings whenever they want.

Again, no one can predict what the future holds. What we do know is that if the UN continues to act on behalf of the families and dynasties that won World War II, while its various subsidiary organizations implement permanent changes that alter our relationship with the external world, there is a good chance that as people's reliance on technology grows, this trend will lead to increased physical distance between individuals, even as virtual connections remain strong. When people become physically farther from each other, the distancing makes a person feel complacently safe. But this social distancing approach would trap governments in having to figure out how to build solidarity and in how to please their dependent people to get them to voluntary consent to give up their natural freedom to obtain the benefits of the political order. This is because to build solidarity it is

necessary that people look past their differences to be able to agree on the existence of a common threat. If people are on their own and from their own enclosed space determining what is right from what is wrong, it becomes very difficult to limit powers or to build consensus when people are turning inward and are searching for autonomy and control of their own fate. When it becomes difficult to balance powers, the efforts that humans make to limit the possibility of arbitrary excesses also become challenging to control. When it becomes difficult to check and restrain human ambitions, it becomes equally very difficult to manage interdependence. When the capacity to manage interdependence becomes weak, this condition will force the international order to cascade into new pragmatic approaches to control rivalry, such as forming alliances or establishing new diplomatic frameworks that prioritize cooperation over competition. Moreover, because loyalty is the only idea people cannot afford to destabilize due to its impact on the happiness they can enjoy, humans would have no choice but to trust their government/military to diminish polarization within societies.

Since mankind began to rely on the state as a model for promoting respect for human rights, no political system has successfully prioritized the benefits and profits of all its citizens; instead, the solutions implemented have focused on increasing the happiness of those in positions of power before addressing stability and well-being for the general population. Humanity tested many political ideas to limit the possibility of arbitrary excesses by people in positions of power and arrive at effectively safeguarding liberty and freedom.

If humans have no choice but to allow political power to become concentrated in the hands of governments or the military in the future to safeguard liberty and freedom, then the current political structures in Egypt, China, India, Russia, Saudi Arabia, Turkey, and others serve as examples of potential dogmatic systems into which humanity could regress.

Many nations with prevailing one-party political systems, despite claiming to secure the aspirations of the UN Charter, are actually moving away from authoritarian or totalitarian regimes to a political

structure where everyone can compete for power, as their continual political reforms support.

For instance, Egypt is a country whose military has directed all its planning since independence. The prevailing trend indicates that the families and dynasties controlling Egypt do not plan to relinquish their power any time soon, leading people to feel that they are free. As of 2013, the Egyptian government attempts to convince the population that the country is highly open, prosperous, and free; however, the human rights repression sponsored by the military and police makes the political situation resemble a sinking passenger ship that is dragging everyone on board down with it. The refusal of the country's rulers to transfer control of their regimes to the voting public, along with their reluctance to allow the private sector to develop supply chains and distribution networks instead of relying on the military, poses a significant challenge. The decision of the individuals who rule Egypt to refuse to relinquish control of their regimes to the voting public if good governance prevails in the country challenges key aspects of the post-war international order. This behavior disrupts the balance of the ideals of justice, equality, liberty, life, and the pursuit of happiness, fairness, charity, unity, etc. that the post-war international order stipulates are incumbent on each UN member state to secure. Conversely, the ideals of the post-war international order, which extend from the tenets promoted by various faiths, contribute to the frustration of the people who are governed by those individuals unwilling to relinquish control of their regimes to the voting public.

In my opinion, the social uprising in Egypt in 2011 was not caused by the military establishment's failure to control the population's disenchantment or the public's dissatisfaction with the government's performance, but rather by a weakness related to how members of the Egyptian institution were balancing truth. In other words, the breakup did not occur because the military establishment failed to incentivize the Egyptian officers; rather, the collapse happened because of the frustration that the officers were dealing with to balance the arbitrary excesses of the government with the truth. Moreover, I strongly believe that the pledge the ruling individuals in Egypt made to avoid stabbing, betraying, and crisscrossing each other again, rather than the

government's tight surveillance since 2011, will prevent the military establishment's rapid relapse and breakup like in 2011.

I am uncertain whether the families that emerged victorious in World War II could prevent the governments they depend on from being disloyal after deciding to utilize technical progress and opting for the UN to achieve their objectives.

If the decision of the families/dynasties who won WW2 or the families/dynasties who managed to own the companies that, through them, 80% of the world's trading is now handled, to go along with the UN work program to foster human rights along with delegating to technology the role that the human body may have been programmed to serve in the natural world would not change fundamentally the conflictive nature of world politics or usher in a new era of global cooperation, we could say that the two social models that mankind could expect relations to sprout into as a result of having tested during the past 70 years with making people stop being content to place significance in created things can be a choice between the model that exists now in Lebanon or in Egypt. The only difference between the two is that in Lebanon, political corruption and arbitrary excesses by government officials are conducted openly, whereas in Egypt, these behaviors occur out of public view.

The existing Lebanese or Egyptian model, which could serve as a potential outcome for the socio-cultural evolution of other UN member states, addresses the social changes that are expected at the state level. In other words, this socio-cultural change describes how interdependent relationships could evolve at the state level. Humans do not rival or resize each other within their local culture only but expect that the neighboring cultures consider their opinions before taking actions of their own.

Nations lacking a large geographical social space or military capability to influence themselves and close their borders, as the Japanese rulers did in 1631 for 220 years to avoid interference in their socio-cultural evolution, are evidently less fortunate than those that possess these attributes. As such, nations that lack the geographical social space or material resources necessary to close their borders and develop

independently will have no choice but to rely on a platform like the United Nations to help prevent any one nation from attempting to dominate all others.

If the families/dynasties who won WW2 or the families/dynasties who managed to own the companies that, through them, 80% of the world's trading is now handled continue to go along with the United Nations being an economic operator and a council that determines and enforces policies at the highest level, this signifies that this intergovernmental organization would be in competition with them.

The international order can tolerate cultures like those in Lebanon, Egypt, Russia, China, Saudi Arabia, India, and many others managing internal interdependence based on principles that are undemocratic or inconsistent with the UN Charter, as long as each nation's territorial integrity is respected. The same cannot be said when the corruption, betrayal, backstabbing, crisscrossing, etc. are happening at the highest level.

If UN officials are not “ruling by example” and are using the ideals that are stipulated in the UN charter as a ladder to get their way despite the resistance of others, this signifies that if the families/dynasties who won WW2 or the families/dynasties who managed to own the companies that, through them, 80% of the world's trading is now handled continue to let the UN deputize for them to attain the UN goals, we can say that the backstabbing, betrayal, corruption, favoritism, discrimination, nepotism, partisanship, etc. that the officials of this organization would be carrying out or adding would be done either explicitly or implicitly.

On the other hand, the UN divided the UN member states into developed nations and underdeveloped ones since 1945. The political, economic, and social solutions that various subsidiary organizations of the UN claim to be implementing for the nations classified as underdeveloped aim to help the people in those nations reach the same developmental level as those living in developed nations.

Recent studies were published about the degree of satisfaction of the people who live in developed nations with the idea of democracy, and

the results that were shared revealed that people's dissatisfaction was high.²²³ If the confidence of the people who live in developed nations with the idea of democracy and with how their happiness is progressing signifies that people's intolerance of each other should rise, the UN would be making more people foster human rights to create an egalitarian world.

People have always competed to see who could be happier first. For example, at the start of the second millennium, the founders of the existing British monarchy dealt with events that were essentially similar to those that the families/dynasties who control so much in the economic and political life of any existing nation could deal with if people were dissatisfied with the postwar international order that the families/dynasties who won WW2 proposed. When the English nobility and the clergy began to challenge the British monarch, the monarch responded by recruiting poor people and crusaders to create difficulties for the nobles and clergy. The survival of the English monarchs until the present day is vivid evidence to support that the political leaders who were ruling England from the start of the second millennium to WW2 were capable of creating a stabilizing relationship between them, the nobles, the clergy, and the poor, thus allowing the behavioral shift that is usually always dynamic not to push anyone to eliminate the other or to get it to shift to serve the interests of a competing niche.

So many questions this begs. For one, would it be possible for the British monarch, along with the monarchies of Spain, Belgium, Norway, Sweden, Denmark, the Netherlands, and others, to save their thrones at the start of the third millennium, given that the political situation in the world is similar to the one that the English monarchs faced at the start of the second millennium?

If we compare the method that the English monarchs used at the start of the second millennium to help them control the nobles or the clergy to the one the families/dynasties who won WW2 proposed to supposedly help the poor nations that they granted independence, we find that the two are not any different. The families and dynasties that won World War II permitted the intergovernmental organization,

223 <https://www.bbc.com/news/education-51281722>

which is meant to act on their behalf at the highest level, to recruit poor individuals and place them in various nations, making it very difficult for the wealthy and clergy to control their dependent populations.

If the families/dynasties who won WW2 continue to allow the UN to deputize on their behalf and allow this organization to become an economic operator who is using its power differential to deny people rights as was done with the American national, those powerful families/dynasties could anticipate one of two outcomes happening to them: The first is that their heirs could suffer the same treatment that the UN administrators' abuse of their power prompted in the life of this American nation when he refused to prioritize greed or his personal ambition over righteousness. The second is that their heirs can manage to control the UN so they would be able to continue to transform the conditions and outcomes that matter to them in the same way their predecessors did, starting from the second millennium until now.

I have no way of knowing which fate could await the heirs of the families or dynasties that won World War II, or those who owned the companies through which 80% of the world's trading is currently conducted. However, what I do know is that after the deaths of Moses, Jesus, Muhammad, etc., the people (or followers) who took it upon themselves to keep the teachings of those three alive were comprised of two groups. The group that preached the ideas of those three individuals immediately after their deaths was rightly guided and behaved in accordance with the values that each specific philosophy was teaching. The group that followed this first tier did not lead by example and instead began to transform the movements established by their predecessors in a manner similar to how the UN currently operates—using UN ideals as a means to further the personal ambitions of its officials, which included exacerbating wickedness and greed in the world.

Narrating or relating to support how the social order will evolve in the future is unnecessary if the families/dynasties who won WW2 continue to go along with the UN converting the UN ground into a market to buy and sell from. The UN's goals extend the values outlined in various religious texts. The religious scriptures and lots of history

textbooks show what happened to those who used the teachings of Moses, Jesus, Muhammad, and others as a ladder to serve their personal ambition.

In this context, I believe it would be useful to discuss whether the families or dynasties that won World War II could stabilize the international order in the same way that British monarchs did throughout the second millennium to prevent the postwar order they proposed after World War II from deteriorating. Next, they find themselves having to wait for the return of the Son of Man from heaven as Moses, Jesus, or Muhammad all prophesied would take place when the teachers of the law begin to not practice what they preach.

The Olivet Discourse is a biblical passage found in Matthew 24 and 25, Mark 13, and Luke 21.²²⁴ In those biblical passages, Jesus tells his followers that when people begin to use the idea of God to deceive and deny each other rights, the temples that the teachers of the law would be using to deceive others will crumble on their heads and on the heads of the people who are dealing with them in those buildings.

If the families/dynasties who won WW2 or the families/dynasties who managed to own the companies that, through them, 80% of the world's trading is now handled are allowing the UN to be a ground to buy and sell, including a place that its officials are using to deny the people who are acting in accordance with the way the UN charter stipulates rights, as happened to this American national when he refused to practice what he was not preaching, then there is a good chance that the buildings from which those UN officials are spreading wickedness will be toppling on their heads and on the heads of those powerful families/dynasties who appointed those false teachers to deputize for them.

Georgy Gause (1910–1986) was a Soviet biologist who developed Gause's law based on the competitive exclusion principle.^{225,226} He claimed that in ecology, two species competing for the same limiting

224 https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Olivet_Discourse

225 https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Georgy_Gause

226 https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Competitive_exclusion_principle

resource cannot coexist with constant population values. According to Gause, when “one species has even the slightest advantage over another, the one with the advantage will dominate in the long term.”

The collapse or decay of any system can exist from forces that are generated inside the system or ones that are acting on the system, such as competition for resources, environmental changes, or external pressures that disrupt the balance of the ecosystem. In 2014, Paul Novosad and Eric Werker published a working paper that was titled *Who Runs the International System? Power and the Staffing of the United Nations Secretariat*.²²⁷ The two authors asserted that “national governments often manipulate the appointment of their citizens to senior positions in international institutions.” Novosad and Werker claim that they “examined, over a 60-year period, the nationalities of the most senior positions in the United Nations.” Those two experts then state that “the most overrepresented countries are small, rich democracies like the Nordic countries” and other western European countries.

The UN officials who used their power differential to deny American nationals their rights come from western European countries (see part II of this work). In fact, a significant number of these officials were senior government officials before joining the UN.

If Jesus’s prophecy about the toppling of the buildings that false teachers would be using to teach the law or get their way despite the resistance of others is true, and if Gause’s law on the competitive exclusion principle is also true, this signifies that those senior UN officials, UN judges, etc. could be a serious threat to the families/dynasties who won WW2; the families/dynasties who managed to own the companies that, through them, 80% of the world's trading is now handled; the British Royal Family; and any rich family/dynasty.

If the UN officials and UN judges are not working to keep those who are doing what they were asked to be doing starting from when WW2 ended protected to ensure that the international order does not become

227 https://www.hbs.edu/faculty/Publication%20Files/15-018_2c844a36-d1b3-48e4-8c68-0e207b1e7a4d.pdf

disintegrated, this signifies that all the financial aid that the families/dynasties who won WW2, the families/dynasties who managed to own the companies through which 80% of the world's trading is now handled, the British Royal Family, and any rich family/dynasty are channeling through the UN to attain the UN goals could not be serving to aid them to make more people be ready to obtain the benefits of the political order but rather to lose faith and withdraw their obligation to obey. The questions that this begs are once again many. For one, will the kingdoms in Western Europe be able to maintain their strength and stability after allowing some of their most trusted nationals to occupy senior UN positions, despite apparently lacking a clear vision of what they are supposed to achieve?

I have no way of knowing if the Western European UN officials who run the international system, according to Paul Novosad and Eric Werker, would manage to achieve stable coexistence between different species to gain advantage and stay in power in the same way the Kingdom of England managed to do from the start of the second millennium to now.

In early 2020, Salim Saadeh²²⁸ (1949), a Lebanese economist and politician, described the political situation and financial reform that the Lebanese government was proposing to improve the social and economic situation in the country. During his speech, he described the political situation in Lebanon using the metaphor of “a person who is up to his head in mud and he is brushing his teeth.”²²⁹

I can only hope that the families or dynasties who won World War II are not burdening themselves by allowing short-sighted UN officials to act on their behalf. When the Titanic ship sank, everyone on board, regardless of their wealth or status, drowned. In fact, the wealthy individuals who managed to board a lifeboat discovered that the power and wealth they had previously displayed or exercised on the ship or mainland were now restricted by the size of the lifeboat. It also covered the small number of people who were sitting next to them.

228 https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Salim_Saadeh

229 <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=HfD4pDGnCfg>

In the Olivet Discourse, Jesus claims that a wise master is one who puts in charge servants in his household who are faithful and wise. This signifies that the families/dynasties who won WW2 or the families/dynasties who managed to own the companies that, through them, 80% of the world's trading is now handled can continue to let the UN drown the international order on the hope that when things get out of control, they will be able to stop this organization from using its power to resize their heirs. Alternatively, they could go back to adopting what the founders of the UN counseled this organization should be created to serve, including letting the United States help them domesticate their dependents so they could be content and happy in the same way this country managed to do from 1776 to 1945.

The last chapter in the Bible is titled Revelation.²³⁰ The author of this chapter claims that Jesus counselled his followers that they are going to need to choose between compromise or faithfulness to address the challenges that would be prompting the crumbling of the movement that he initiated.

It appears that the families or dynasties who won World War II will have to choose between allowing their servants to conduct business on UN grounds or restricting commerce to outside the UN grounds. In other words, do as Jesus did when he entered the temple and found people having installed tables to change money and benches to sell doves and drove them out, thus managing to keep this religion alive until now.

Temptation is defined as “a desire to engage in short-term urges for enjoyment that threaten long-term goals.”²³¹ It appears that the families or dynasties who won World War II will have to choose between allowing the UN to continue making decisions on their behalf while its officials engage in buying and selling or reverting to the work program established by the UN's founding fathers. I have no way of knowing which option among the aforementioned two can help those powerful families or dynasties achieve long-term enjoyment.

230 <https://www.biblegateway.com/blog/2016/11/the-bible-table-of-contents/>

231 <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Temptation>

Endurance is defined as “the ability of an organism to exert itself and remain active for a long period of time, as well as its ability to resist, withstand, recover from, and have immunity to trauma, wounds, or fatigue.”²³² One conclusion that can be drawn from the Bible is that those who demonstrate endurance will ultimately be the winners. In fact, the Bible illustrates that being faithful to the law leads to victory.

No one knows whether the families or dynasties that won World War II can rely on the faithfulness of UN officials to change the conditions and outcomes that are important to them, especially given that this organization has become corrupt.

However, what we all know is that human nature has not changed pre- and post-1945. The only change that emerged after 1945 is that the families and dynasties who won World War II created UN subsidiary organizations and development aid agencies, which they embedded among the poor to encourage them to react and cope in order to eradicate poverty and fight injustice and inequality.

Historians assert that the urban revolution, which led to state formation, marked the earliest emergence of civilizations. V. Gordon Childe (1892-1956) was an Australian archaeologist who specialized in the study of European prehistory.²³³ In his 1936 book, *Man Makes Himself*,²³⁴ Childe claims that civil officials absorbed a major share of the concentrated surplus and thus formed a “ruling class. ” Childe argued that the concentration of power in the hands of the ruling elite was based on residence rather than on local kinship.

The New Testament of the Bible claims that Jesus and the disciples who were teaching his ideals were preaching in Jerusalem and among the rural populations initially. In Jerusalem, Jesus and all those who were devoted to teaching Jesus' philosophy were prosecuted. Jesus was crucified, and his disciples were chased. It was in the rural populations that their teaching was gaining momentum and is believed to have created the change that Christianity spread. The power gained by the

232 <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Endurance>

233 https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/V._Gordon_Childe

234 <https://archive.org/details/ManMakesHimself>

people or disciples working with Jesus was based on residence in the rural populations rather than on local kinship.

Rip current, undertow, and riptide are three types of ocean currents. The formation mechanism of each is completely unique, but all three are very dangerous types of ocean currents. For example, rip currents are strong offshore flows and often occur when breaking waves push water up the beach face. The piled-up water must escape back to the sea as it seeks its own level.²³⁵ If a swimmer is caught in a rip current, the rip can be a strong force and very hazardous because it could easily carry floating objects, including people, out beyond the zone of the breaking waves.

What if the disciples created a ripple effect by making the rural populations invest in reactive coping until ultimately the pool of new people who converted to Christianity managed to rise against the power that was concentrated in the hands of the Jews, Greeks, Romans, etc., leading to their collapse and reverse to a simpler form so the new, flourishing Christian religion could rise?

Could the political leaders who succeeded the UN's founders be phasing out their power so that the ripple effect of the UN officials' idea of creating an egalitarian world will lead to a governing elite that will harmonize people's actions??

In my view, the decision of the families/dynasties who won WW2 to collaborate with the UN in creating UN subsidiary organs or development aid agencies and spreading them in rural populations is a good idea to change their faith, but it does not teach them to stop being content with their way of living in order to be devoted to fostering human rights and creating an egalitarian world. Likewise, the idea of permitting the UN to be an economic operator and even creating a self-financed UN is definitely a good idea to supplement the UN earnings, particularly since this global council was initially designed to be financed from voluntary and assessed funds, but the danger with adapting this strategy to attain the UN goals is that it makes the UN become part of the ruling class.

235 <https://www.surfertoday.com/surfing/the-differences-between-rip-currents-undertows-and-rip-tides>

When the English monarch rationalized at the start of the second millennium that it was in their best interests to prevent the poor from developing awareness—preferring to establish peace with the English nobles and the clergy rather than with the poor or the crusaders, whom the monarch was enlisting to pressure the nobles to be democratic and pay taxes— what the English monarch was doing was pausing the poor or crusaders from becoming part of the ruling class. In other words, those political leaders sought to prevent the poor or crusaders from becoming powerful, to avoid having them use their power differential to deny the English monarch rights. They most probably knew about what Gause, Herbert Spencer, or Charles Darwin claimed about “the survival of the fittest”²³⁶ on this much earlier date.

The families or dynasties that won WW2 must ponder and answer one question: Can those powerful families/dynasties who are financing the UN prevent the officials of this organization from becoming part of the ruling class if they are using the privileges and immunity that they are enjoying to gain advantage in a way that is not any different than how organized crime operates or as per the way Jackall described some managers are doing in his book *Moral Mazes*?

In conclusion, no one knows what the future will hold. This work has demonstrated that the decision made by the families and dynasties who won World War II to support the United Nations in its role as an economic operator, which takes independent actions to promote consumerism, is highly complex. The work also showed that there is a lesson to draw when we compare how the Vatican survived for centuries and how the UN is preparing mankind to confront another global war. There is also a lesson to learn from how the English monarch rationalized saving the monarch at the start of the second millennium and how the families/dynasties who won WW2 are unable to stabilize peace and security after 70 years of efforts. There are few conclusions that one can draw from this work:

If the urban revolutions ongoing in the nations remain unstable and power is not reinvested in governments, the UN will continue to blend in with the social impression. The more the UN subsidiary organs

236 https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Survival_of_the_fittest

continue to blend in the social impression, the more power will start to be concentrated in the hands of the UN officials. When power concentrates in the hands of UN officials, the more the UN becomes part of the ruling class. This scenario would occur because the UN is more organized than the governments and local communities it is assisting. The more the UN subsidiary organs continue to form part of the ruling class, the more a state organization based “now on residence” rather than on local kinship is most likely to emerge. At the same time, as people continue to progress toward a world where they would be harmonizing actions and relationships based on technology and not kinship as they have been doing since antiquity, including accepting that the UN derives new “goals” to eradicate poverty, injustice, and inequality, the more the UN teaches people to foster human rights to create an egalitarian world, the more people's intolerance will be accelerating, thus engulfing the world in more urban revolutions.

The more urban revolutions the UN ignites, the more the demand for its services increases. As the UN's services grow, more producers will want to work with it due to its expertise and knowledge of the countries it operates in. The more income UN officials generate, the more power they will concentrate in their hands. The more power its officials had, the more they would work to protect their interests from the rich. At this point, individuals who do not prioritize the best interests of the UN would be charged as threats to those interests and would be denied rights in the same manner that UN officials treated this American national (see part II of this work). At this point in time, the UN would be enhancing its leverage in the same way it acted to dismiss the application of this American national by relying on multilateralism and its power differential, thus increasing conflict, which could lead to further alienation of member states and exacerbate tensions within international relations. Everyone who refuses to return to a state of nature to protect their rights would be hoping for one of two events to occur. The first scenario would involve hoping for a new global war to erupt, as the families or dynasties that emerge victorious could support resizing the UN before it is too late. In other words, before the ongoing urban revolutions weaken or completely break the powerful nations, a domino effect may occur. If the powerful nations do not do something to resize the UN, there is a good chance that the

world will continue to fall back into one of the dystopic states that authors portray. The reversal of more nations to a simpler form would usher in the rise of a new authority or era similar to the Anglosphere.

The second is that people are mortal and nations come and go. The challenge for the families/dynasties that won WW2 is to resolve how to prevent the power concentrated in a handful of nations from collapsing, allowing a new, expanding power to rise. I believe the real challenge is how to ensure that this Anglosphere idea (which the American culture embodies) relative to the world at large does not decline and collapse. Likewise, if it happens to slip from the internationalists who are now holding to its values and principles, the new caretakers would ensure that it is preserved, because, as I said before, it represents the frontier of man's evolution through individual and group striving.

The conclusion is to abolish all the UN subsidiary organs (i.e., stop them from maintaining any relationship with the UN) and to allow them to operate as private organizations like all others that exist and are doing business on the outside of the UN grounds. Any development aid needs to go to develop the capacity of the government. All the development aid agencies that wish to remain operational compete for contracts. All the people or nations who feel generous could deposit their funds at the bank account of the World Bank/IMF.

This game changer that emerged post-1945, and in which the political leaders who succeeded the founding fathers of the UN agreed to switch from continuing to see that newborns are domesticated to the idea of giving as per how most religious teachings stimulate them to be organized around how to take (or individualism), is a complex taming method because it makes a person focus on prioritizing the senses over the importance of ethics. This approach makes a person incapable of abandoning the distinction (i.e., such as race, color, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth, or other status) to prioritize ethics because a person depends on such distinction to get his way despite the resistance of others. In other words, whenever a person lacks the courage to accept the second best when the first best is unattainable, that individual must rely on such

distinction to get his way. Since a person cannot separate the self from the distinction that one senses, this argument signifies that people can never achieve practical results for the greater well-being of society while people are allowing the manmade distinctions such as religion, language, politics, and other statuses to be amalgamated in the social order. If we add that mankind does not have the power to prevail over the weakness of the will because of all the manmade and natural changes that are ongoing around us, this signifies that for as long as humans are distinguishing between what is right and what is wrong to distance the human body from what this aptitude may have been created to serve in the natural world, we could be condemning this species to deal with the circumstances that we are knowing and that before us our predecessors dealt with and so forth.²³⁷ [Maloof 2005]

The idea of making people come together to attain a world free of want and fear was buttressed by the idea that people would be ready to abandon their distinction when such a conception or axiom is made marginal. But as we saw from 1945 to now, people are not able to abandon their tribalism and are continuing to depend on such biases to resize each other up. This scenario means that we could be dealing with a much more complex problem than we suppose. This is because the international intergovernmental organization that mankind is depending on to coordinate activities between states on a global scale is not one in which its agents are from one nationality or one race, but it is one of a multitude of distinct races, colors, sexes, languages, religions, political or other opinions, national or social origins, properties, births, or other statuses. It is those agents who are from a multitude of distinct races, colors, sexes, languages, religions, political or other opinions, national or social origins, properties, births, or other statuses who are teaching the poor to foster human rights to achieve an egalitarian world and not the UN staff who hail from the Western European countries and who are occupying the senior positions at the UN, as Novosad and Werker claimed.

If UN agents in the field continue to grow and become part of the ruling class, we will not be cultivating a group of individuals who embrace the principles of collaboration based on equal rights and self-

237 Maloof, *Social Improvement and Human Security: Collateral Damage*, 2005

determination; instead, we will be fostering a class that focuses on how factors such as race, color, sex, language, religion, political opinions, national or social origins, property, birth, or other statuses hinder their ability to create an egalitarian world. This situation is because those UN agents are themselves victims of what the rich people or the rich countries are also denying them. This is access to power, prestige, and wealth. However, the more the UN agents (or organizations) become part of the ruling class, the more the rich will have no choice but to rely on their organizational apparatus to coordinate activities, which may lead to a shift in power dynamics and influence over global governance.

Any ascent to power must include horizontal coverage and a vertical progression. The people enforcing policies in the field derive the power of any central government. When the horizontal power coverage of different UN agents or organizations becomes strong, they will have no choice but to compete hierarchically against those who are preventing them from realizing the full development of their personalities. This situation is very serious and worrisome, because as I said, the UN agents are not from a single race.

Since it is not possible to predict which race, color, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth, or other status would manage to concentrate power in its hands, because, as I said, the UN or the current global arrangement is made of people who are made up of many distinctions, this scenario signifies that there is a good chance that this process could culminate in the appearance of a ruling class that would not be an extension of this Anglo kinship that, on its basis, mankind has been building the ethical idea of civilization on its premise since the 5th century, but one who would want to establish its own language, legal system, or philosophy.

This scenario also means that if the theory of relativity that Albert Einstein developed is true and the historical event that anthropologists and archaeologists claim about how Christianity started as a small movement and emerged into becoming a great power is true, this means that we could be working on phasing out power from the people who have it concentrated in their hands so a new expanding power emerges if we continue to allow the UN officials to make people invest

in reactive coping to foster human rights to create an egalitarian world. Then again, because this new governing body cannot be concentrating its power democratically but by domination and exploitation, because it could only rise or emerge out of squashing distinction, this scenario means that mankind could be on its way to reconstructing the inbound world events in reverse order. In the book *Progressive Regression*, I try to show how the socio-cultural patterns that emerged post-WW2 reflect such a regression. In other words, domination is required to extinguish the ongoing bottleneck for power.

Is history repeating itself? No one knows the answer to this question. However, it is highly unlikely that the founding fathers of the UN intended for this organization to function like a country in exile, where its agents conduct business while enjoying privileges and immunities or operate their own judicial system. This game changer could empower the United Nations inappropriately, as this association of nations was granted the right to become an economic operator, which may lead to conflicts of interest and undermine the UN's original mission of promoting peace and cooperation among nations. Disaster management is about prevention. The families or dynasties that won World War II could reshape the UN and allow the United States to take the lead in building a new international system, which the country pledged to develop in partnership with the new UN and the new World Bank/IMF. Alternatively, they could let their heirs' successors address the dynamism that the UN subsidiary organs and all the development aid agencies created in the world after those powerful families/dynasties chose to deviate away from the work program that the founding fathers of the UN counseled be adopted to establish lasting peace, which may involve reevaluating the original goals of the UN and ensuring that development aid aligns with the principles of sustainable peace and cooperation.