

Word Lost

The Changing Anglosphere
Under the United Nations

**Man, The Ultimate Source
of War and Peace**

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., World Lost: The Changing Anglosphere Under the United Nations, 2022

This is a work of non-fiction.

Salim Maloof
WORLD LOST:
The Changing Anglosphere Under the United Nations

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 Eie Abou Haider

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: Man, the Ultimate Source of War and Peace

1. Mirror of reality 27
2. Unstoppable chaos 50
3. Assassinating the concept of diplomacy 73
4. The price of greatness is responsibility 108
5. Even the sun must leave the sky 152

Part TWO: The Human Jungle

1. Impulsive hypocrisy 27
2. Doctrinal dishonesty 45
3. Disordered vertical and horizontal deprivation 69
4. Navigating slippery noble cause corruption 91
5. Power as a vocation for salvation 126

Part Three: A World shaped by stiff-necked people

1. The genie out of the lamp 27
2. Survival of the fittest 45
3. Burning Bridges 73
4. Blind leading the blind 124

Part Four: Conforming reality to our categorization

1. Runaway response reaction 27
2. Hope is in Chaos 56
3. Jigsaw 86
4. Flight to nowhere 127

Part Five: Dreaming Wild

1. Fast and Loose 27
2. Wicked as they come 61
3. The crooked way 100
4. Flood Tide 147

Part Six: Chaos is Everywhere

1. A Matter of Choice 27
2. Salt of the Earth 58
3. Ball of Fires 110
4. Dead Dawn 149

Part Seven: No Road Back

1. The dance of life 27
2. Corridor of mirrors 56
3. Wrong assumptions 98
4. Castle in the air 132

Part Eight: Bitter Harvest

1. Time without pity 27
2. Creating Patterns in Chaos 63
3. The wind cannot read 105
4. Hell is a city 146

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

People deny being created in the image of God and that their supreme mission is to refine their own ferocious human character, rather than their neighbor's, while leaving theirs undomesticated or uncultivated. This dilemma has prevented mankind from establishing virtuous values that are capable of producing a complete and perfect virtuous character. This situation has left human relations incomplete, fragmented, and incapable of rising to the level that certain beasts managed to attain, which highlights the irony that despite their potential for virtue, humans often fail to achieve the moral standards observed in some animal behaviors.

In mathematics, curve fitting is “the process of constructing a curve, or mathematical function, that has the best fit to a series of data points, possibly subject to constraints.” Humans have taken it upon themselves to explore how to align each other’s behavior with manmade ethical values, without knowing if those values are the exact answers to the outcomes and conditions that matter to them. Only when people aligned their behavior with the fixed principles or truths found in philosophical and religious texts, which are typically given to all newborns and are believed by many to be divinely ordained, did they manage to create ordered relations.

Regrettably, all the new ideas that both existing and new people have tested to align each other's behavior with man-made natural and legal rights (data points) have failed to cultivate virtuous characters who are willing to conform their actions to the laws or standards legitimized (i.e., legislated laws or human rights treaties).

The unpreparedness of people to fit each other’s behavior to the fixed principles or truth suggested in philosophical and religious books has caused people to hurt each other's feelings and to fail to uphold the principles of trustworthiness, honesty, and gentleness in all daily interactions. This situation has kept peace and security worldwide filled with extreme, rapid changes, including alternating highs and lows, just as happens when a person turns and twists in a roller coaster.

The intensity of this erratic and frightening relation that people have been enduring from one generation to the next to refine the character of their neighbor while keeping their own character undomesticated or uncultivated has changed in function of the readiness of the individuals involved to let their mental convictions and anxiety dictate scenarios. Two phenomena have consistently repeated themselves, particularly among those who focus on monitoring their neighbors' actions within any group, rather than solely on refining their own character. The first is the failure of the individuals involved to manifest a discerning heart to govern, and the second is to distinguish between right and wrong. The drawback of such an outcome is that it prevents the individuals involved from transforming the conditions and outcomes that matter to them or improving peace and security.

For instance, until 1945, basic rights were legitimized based on what religious dictates established. There were no human rights, freedom, or social justice. People were convinced that social and economic inequality was natural (or, as some thought, God-given).

In addition, the height of joy, success, and excitement that rulers, kings, chiefs, judges, priests, military officers, bankers, etc. enjoyed before 1945 depended on the ability of the governance system instituted to make citizens (i.e., the weak) live in the past instead of the present. They acted as if the past were superior to the present, as if the way of life our predecessors experienced in the past were the absolute truth, and as if the present were fundamentally wrong. This plan, in which individuals took it upon themselves to focus on their neighbors' actions to maintain their superiority before 1945 and attempted to "correct" the present by encouraging people to abandon contemporary political beliefs, has kept the world in a state of ignorance. Nonetheless, this strategy survived because the balance of power was resting on three independent categories of people or social pillars and not only on one, as the case appears to be since 1945 in most UN members. Those three pillars were the tyrannical, domineering ruler—one who fears neither God nor shows mercy to the people. The merchant—who profits from the marketplace, which is, in turn, guarded by that very same tyrannical ruler. Then there are the religious figures—the kind who follow the money. This group eats at the table of the tyrannical ruler and ensures that the merchants and the poor

surrender freedom to the laws that the dominating ruler legitimizes by staying living in fear.

For instance, before 1945, it was the king of England and a small number of powerful individuals who acted as the head of state, head of the armed forces, head of the church, and landlord or principal merchant over an exclusive territory and political structure called a kingdom or state. As of 1945, most UN member states are headed by individuals who are fulfilling the multi-roles that the present king of England exercises within his realm. In addition, within each state, a large number of people are also rivaling and repelling each other from power, wealth, and status to determine who could make the weakest consider the opinion of the fittest before taking action on his own.

The division of labor makes it impossible for two people to fulfill the same role or to fill the same void space. In a globalized age, as it exists presently, it is not possible to create stability within any exclusive territory (kingdom or state) when the individuals involved in any social or political sphere are all working to build an empire. When all people and societies start to repel each other politically, economically, militarily, and religiously to determine who could establish a globalized imperial system instead of to perfect a noble character, the transformations that, throughout history, such entanglement produced were mainly short-lived opportunities (in the form of feudalists and capitalists) instead of permanent ones (creating democratic civil societies).

In addition, the lack of advances in communication and transportation before WW2 did enable only a small number of people to recognize that the security of one person is the forgone security of another person. Today, many people are aware that the past cannot be the future. The future is not the past. Most people are aware that the advances in technology today are different from those that existed before 1945. It is not possible to make people accept the religious or political principles upon which states were founded in the past in the present because people's awareness differed. If the people with lots of affluence and power (rulers, kings, chiefs, judges, priests, military officers, bankers, etc.) continue to insist on keeping their superiority by building social orders that are not in accordance with the principles

of equal rights, as suggested in the UN Charter and most constitutions, and continue to insist on wanting people to live in accordance with the laws, declarations, stories, and declarations suggested in constitutional decrees or religious books instead of in accordance with the objectives affirmed in such documents, conflicts and wars in the world could become worse.

In the mathematical field of numerical analysis, interpolation is a “type of estimation, a method of constructing new data points within the range of a discrete set of known data points.”

The Book *World Lost* is an attempt to search among the almost limitless actions and ideas that people come up with to fit each other's behavior to specific convictions to achieve outcomes and conditions that matter to the fittest to first construct a perception (an imaginary curve) that readers could draw or visualize about how the victors of WW2 are permitting the international order to develop since 1945. Second, to take the perceived or imaginary curve that readers draw or visualize to interpolate (estimate) if the ideals that the victors of WW2 have been enforcing since 1945 could construct the behaviors that they believe could fit as closely as possible the ethical values that they consider define best how they would like people's interdependence or relations to be structured, or if they would lead to their demise.

To carry out the work, the author examines how certain natural events in space and time that take place within the spatial boundary of the human body could be accounted for by physics, chemistry, mathematics, philosophy, and religion. He also studies how interpersonal relationships compare to the natural relationships examined to determine if the policies and frameworks legitimized and enforced by the victors of WW2 could produce balanced outcomes, similar to those achieved by natural events that can independently yield exact scientific results. The aim is to understand if the legitimized empiricism used to persuade the weak to consider the opinion of the fittest before taking action on their own could permit the victors of WW2 to rejuvenate their power or the bleak historical events that occurred.

The book shows that people worldwide may struggle to align their behavior with the work program suggested in the UN Charter or the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR) because the victors of WW2 deviated from the suggested work program and embraced a new work plan altogether. The work supports that the errors, abuses, and discrepancies that the victors of WW2 (i.e., the old powers and their heirs) are letting their critical thinkers and servants (governments and international institutions) carry out seem to be taking the international order on a journey through which logical steps are used to bring skepticism and tensions instead of rejuvenating their power and improving peace and security in the world.

The book *World Lost* aims to demonstrate that the heirs of the old powers, by choosing to remain silent and not hold their critical thinkers and servants (governments and international institutions such as the United Nations) accountable, are causing significant harm to the Anglosphere and jeopardizing the transformation of the resulting chaos, danger, and instability into opportunities for the rejuvenation of their power, wealth, status, and world peace. The book argues that if the heirs of the victors of WW2 do not reform the international intergovernmental organization known as the United Nations and restore its role, along with that of other non-state actors like the World Bank, IMF, NATO, EU, and Red Cross—as per what the founding fathers of the UN suggested—the Anglosphere that their ancestors spent the last thousand years building could be lost to new families or dynasties that would then promote the values associated with it.

1

Mirror of Reality

Ayam Fakhr al Din¹ (the days of Fakr al Din) was a play performed in 1966 by Fairuz² (born 1935), a Lebanese singer who is regarded as one of the most admired and influential singers in the Arab world. This play is based on real events that took place in the early 17th century in an administrative region of Lebanon (known as the Chouf district), in the governorate of Mount Lebanon³. The play depicts the story of a local feudal ruler (Fakr al Din II)⁴, (1572 – 1635), who maintained order in the Chouf district on behalf of the Ottomans. However, when Fakr al Din II discovered that the borders of the Ottoman Empire were not the end of the universe, his relationship with the Ottomans deteriorated, leading to his eventual capture and execution.

The play mirrors the realities of the present day. Initially, the Ottomans were content with the way Fakhr al Din was maintaining order in the Chouf District and the way he was extorting people and generating tax revenues for them. They (the Ottomans) willfully ignored his (Fakhr al Din's) growing power, takeovers, and particularly, expansionism plans. They (the Ottomans) appointed him (Fakr al Din) as emir (lord, or commander-in-chief) of Mount Lebanon (mainly present-day Lebanon) and granted him supreme authority. However, as Fakr al Din's aspirations, and particularly his network (alliances), began to extend beyond the boundary of the Ottoman

¹[https://ar.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D8%A3%D9%8A%D8%A7%D9%85_%D9%81%D8%AE%D8%B1_%D8%A7%D9%84%D8%AF%D9%8A%D9%86_\(%D9%85%D8%B3%D8%B1%D8%AD%D9%8A%D8%A9\)](https://ar.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D8%A3%D9%8A%D8%A7%D9%85_%D9%81%D8%AE%D8%B1_%D8%A7%D9%84%D8%AF%D9%8A%D9%86_(%D9%85%D8%B3%D8%B1%D8%AD%D9%8A%D8%A9))

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

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

⁴ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Fakhr_al-Din_II

Empire to include building relations with the Europeans (the Grand Duchy of Tuscany), the Ottomans became very wary of his growing power, wealth, and status. They (the Ottomans) accused him of being a threat to their security, just as the Americans and the Western European monarchs and republics accused Saddam Hussein (President of Iraq) and many other leaders of being a threat to their security and the world in modern history. Then, just as the Americans and the Western European monarch and republics masterminded a plot to oust Saddam Hussein from power and then captured and killed him at the start of the 21st century, the Ottomans captured Fakhr al Din in 1635 and executed him in the same year.

Indeed, this aforementioned story or play brings the truth of our times to the stage. Its dialogue reflects one act in the history of the Ottoman Empire but not the full story about what happened to the families/dynasties that were controlling this empire after they assassinated Fakr al Din. In 1918, the families/dynasties that were controlling the Ottoman Empire faced the same defeat that Fakr al Din II encountered three hundred years earlier.

The circumstances that Fakhr al Din confronted and the circumstances that the families/dynasties that were controlling the Ottoman Empire faced have been repeating themselves since antiquity.

Simply put, human history has consisted of the fittest appointing outlaws in positions of power in exchange for loyalty and maintaining order in assigned territories. After the warlord turned ruler (or his heirs) tastes power, a spontaneous type of lurking to reject continuing to acknowledge the inherent rights or authority of the fittest over him equally rises. The weak at heart allow this perched force to use the same arguments that the fittest depended on to free himself from continuing to live under the mercy of the individual he was staying with and let him have more powers. For example, instead of Fakhr al Din sticking to maintaining order in the Chouf district only during his tenure, he began to listen more to this force that was whispering in his heart about why he needs to free himself and his dependent people from continuing to live under the domination and subjugation of the Ottoman rulers so he can exercise their power. Fakhr al Din was surely tricked by this force that was whispering in his heart about why he

needed to withdraw his obligations to observe the Ottomans until his heedlessness led to his ultimate capture and execution.

Then again, the same sword that Fakhr al Din used to advance the policies of the Ottomans in the Chouf district, but then pointed its sharp edge at them, ended up being used to behead the rulers of the Ottoman Empire three hundred years later. That is to say, the same force that lurks and whispers in the heart of people who taste power to abuse their authority tricked the families/dynasties that were controlling the Ottoman Empire and led them toward facing the same fate that Fakhr al Din tasted three hundred years earlier.

If the projects that the weak (Fakhr al Din) implement on behalf of the fittest (the Ottomans) through the sword do not strengthen the power, wealth, and status of the weak or the fittest but transform into a sword that causes the beheading of the individuals involved, then there is a good chance that the families/dynasties that control the international order or the money supply of the world presently taste the same outcomes that Fakhr al Din or the Ottoman rulers confronted.

For example, when we study how the power and wealth of the families/dynasties that were controlling the Ottoman Empire changed after they captured and killed Fakhr al Din, we find that this action did not improve their power in the Chouf district following the execution of Fakhr al Din but converted the inhabitants of this district into becoming their staunch enemies.

In other words, the elimination of Fakhr al Din did not enable the families/dynasties controlling the Ottoman Empire to assimilate the inhabitants of the Chouf district; instead, it turned those inhabitants and their projects into weapons that lay in wait for three hundred years to avenge Fakhr al Din and seek their freedom. The Chouf district residents in Mount Lebanon did not fight for the Ottomans in 1914, when WW1 was thought to have begun, despite pledging to do so. The inhabitants of the Chouf district in the governorate of Mount Lebanon betrayed the Ottoman rulers, and this betrayal was one of the factors that contributed to the defeat and collapse of the Ottoman Empire during the global conflict known as WW1.

I have no way of knowing how Fakhr al Din and the Ottoman rulers were quantifying their proprioception to enable them to determine if the positive (fairness, justice, integrity, humility, etc.) or negative (bias, extortion, disregard, etc.) actions that they were effecting would carry repercussions that would prove to be detrimental to their power, wealth, and status or transform the outcomes and conditions that mattered to them. What I do know is that since 1945, the victors of WW2 and the rulers, kings, and presidents they appointed to govern the exclusive territories they created and called states appear to be repeating the same history that Fakhr al Din and the families/dynasties that were controlling the Ottoman Empire lived and dealt with. Since 1945, the rulers, kings, and presidents who are perceiving that the projects that they are executing are widening their grip on power and pleasing their masters (the victors of WW2) are stumbling on the same negative events that Fakhr al Din dealt with when he was doing the same later. Actually, what is only still missing for the events that occurred in the world since 1945 to be classed as a repeat of the events that occurred from the date when the Ottomans executed Fakhr al Din to when the Ottoman Empire collapsed in 1918 is for the fall of the victors of WW2 to occur.

Put differently, if the victors of WW2 continue to use the same shortcut that the Ottomans used to dispose of and rid themselves of Fakhr al Din, when the latter let his imagination and overconfidence in his own worth or potential prompt him to overstep the role assigned to him by the Ottomans and to start to mingle and to establish relations with powers that the Ottomans were regarding as adversaries, on the rulers, kings, and presidents whom they are appointing to govern the exclusive territories they created and called states in the aftermath of WW2, then there is a good chance that they (the victors of WW2) stumble on the same negative events that the Ottomans confronted when their imagination tricked them into doing when Fakhr al Din was overstepping his role and doing the same. Accordingly, we can say that if the victors of WW2 do not want to confront the same negative events that the families/dynasties that were controlling the Ottoman Empire faced, they need to be appointing rulers, kings, and presidents over the exclusive political structure they created in the territories they called states who limit their role to maintaining order and collecting taxes. This proposed work plan would eliminate the need for the

victors of WW2 to constantly remain aware of their surroundings and to rely on force to get their way despite the resistance of others, especially since humans were not granted power to determine how outcomes fare. If everything in this world (including people) is born out of love, but people convert its utility into a bad aura, then we cannot say that the heirs of the victors of WW2 could make people around the world want to stay with them and to let them have more powers than others after they prompted the critical thinkers and servants (governments and international institutions) that they appointed in UN member states in the aftermath of WW2 to protect them to be devoted to networking and determining how outcomes should be distributed instead of to be practicing the standards suggested in the UN charter or the UDHR.

When Fakhr al Din was overextending his delegation of authority, networking, and strengthening his friendship and relation with the adversaries of the Ottomans, he was not eliminating evil and cultivating a pure and righteous mind in the Chouf district, but was teaching through the projects that he was implementing people why the individuals involved need to be hostile toward the Ottomans and why they need to rely on God and themselves only to increase their happiness, even if he was not directly saying it.

Throughout history, people defended their dreams, and a good number went to the extent of considering their destiny to be interlinked with the dreams that they were working towards. For example, Fakhr al Din refused to fight the Ottomans when they were closing in on him or about to capture him. He feared that a clash with the Ottomans would destroy what he built, so he refused to link his fate to the population that was letting him have more power than others or the territories he was managing. That is to say, Fakhr al Din did not want the force that usually whispers in the heart of people after a person tastes power or wealth from tricking him into becoming embroiled in a war of attrition with the Ottomans, so he does not destabilize or retard the mental aura that was already lurking in the heart of his dependent people and pushing them to plot against the Ottomans to be free and independent.

Saddam Hussein (1937–2006), President of Iraq, or Mu'ammarr Al-Qadhafi (1942–2011), President of Libya, did not think as Fakhr al

Din did when the Ottomans threatened to capture and execute him if he did not cease all his construction and diplomatic activities in the Chouf district, as these were considered hostile acts directed against the Ottoman Empire, and decided to take the victors of WW2 head-on, which resulted in their capture and killing, including the destruction of the human progress that they built. In other words, Saddam Hussein and Mu'ammarr Al-Qadhafi were victims of this force that usually lurks in the hearts of people after they taste power or wealth and that usually tricks the individual involved into committing immoral acts through whispering to them about how when they withdraw their obligation to obey the fittest, they can increase their happiness.

Surely, the victors of WW2 did destroy the mental aura that was lurking in the hearts of the Iraqis and the Libyans, and its whisper was prompting them to withdraw their obligation to obey them (the victors of WW2), but this inhumane conduct that the victors of WW2 carried out was nothing but another action or move that the force that lurks in their hearts tricked them into committing, thus increasing the number of people who would be conspiring against them to defeat them instead of laying down their lives for them.

In antiquity, the Ottomans failed to balance their personal aspirations with their responsibility to cultivate pure and righteous attitudes, which eventually led to negative repercussions that diminished them. I have no way of knowing if the victors of WW2 are far superior in might than the Ottoman rulers, thus preventing the evil aura that would be lurking in the hearts of people towards them each time they show bias or injudiciousness.

Perhaps the Ottoman rulers, including thinkers and philosophers, were unaware of the proverb that states, "a tooth wound heals, but the tongue's wound never heals." This lack of awareness may explain their failure to assimilate the societies they dominated or to prevent their own decline, as they relied on personal power and conscience to achieve their goals despite resistance from others in Mount Lebanon (present-day Lebanon) and other territories within the empire. The aforesaid cannot be said to apply to the victors of WW2 (the Western European monarchs and republics). The Western European monarchs and republics began conquering and assimilating weak societies since

the start of the second millennium. This long history should assist them in determining which actions could benefit or harm them in the future.

The victors of WW2 should have known that their parents spent the last few centuries making people switch and start to trust institutions (i.e., believe in other people) instead of continuing to trust and believe in themselves.

If the victors of WW2 can maintain their strength and stability only by leading people to believe that institutions can protect them from injustice, how can they conclude that making people distrust these institutions and encouraging self-reliance will not completely undermine their own authority and drive people away from supporting them?

Said differently, people can increase their happiness by putting their trust in themselves, in others (institutions), or in God. If the victors of WW2 can only maintain their strength and stability by ensuring that people place their faith in institutions rather than in themselves, then when they completely undermine people's faith in these institutions, they inadvertently push individuals to believe in themselves or in God. People can be brainwashed, demonized, etc., but they can't be made to disbelieve in God (truth). The victors of WW2 can collect all the religious and philosophical books to stop people from believing in God (truth). The question that needs to be answered is how the victors of WW2 expect to make people disbelieve in God (truth) when truth (awareness, knowledge, etc.) is not a measurable aspect of reality (a quantitative adjunctive) but an invisible force that serves as a fundamental foundation of existence? Truth (awareness, knowledge, etc.) teaches people to be bold, to question, to explore, and most importantly, to not tolerate domination and exploitation. Can the victors of WW2 prevent the desensitization that their ill actions create in the hearts of people from feeling betrayed when the policies that they have been legitimizing since 1945 are not making them put their trust in institutions (i.e., believe in other people) but in God (truth)?

When the Ottoman rulers desensitized the inhabitants of the Chouf district in the governorate of Mount Lebanon through their actions and

policies, the truth of these policies did not lead the inhabitants to trust their institutions; instead, they placed their faith in God (i.e., truth), as they were prohibited from believing in themselves. The families/dynasties controlling the Ottoman Empire managed to delay their decline and fall by prohibiting people from placing faith in themselves or God (truth), but this advantage was not sustainable. During WW1, the inhabitants of the Chouf district in the governorate of Mount Lebanon poured out all the grudges, hate, and defiance they had in their hearts toward the families/dynasties controlling the Ottoman Empire. It was people's betrayal of the families/dynasties that were controlling the Ottoman Empire that led to the fall of this empire during WW1 and the partition of its people and territories among the victors of this global war (the Allies, or the western European monarchs and republics, mainly).

Indeed, the challenges that the victors of WW2 have been confronting since 1945 to make people put their faith in them (or in the international institutions that they created to that effect) match a lot of the circumstances that are suggested in history books about what the families/dynasties that were controlling the Ottoman Empire confronted or dealt with before their fall.

All the servants (kings, presidents, rulers, and chiefs) whom the victors of WW2 revolted against across the globe since 1945 and disposed of or backstabbed when they refused to cease construction and diplomatic relations, from the ousting of King Farouk during the Egyptian revolution in 1952 to the revolution or rebellion that resulted in the ousting of Bashar al-Assad (born 1965), former President of Syria, and which occurred in 2024, were all political, economic, and societal changes that the victors of WW2 were hoping would ease people's reliance on them, on themselves, and on God and make them rely more on them (or their institutions), but as the state of the world supports, this is not the case.

The victors of WW2 can continue to forestall their decline and fall by doing as the families/dynasties that were controlling the Ottoman Empire were doing, and that is through having servants (rulers, chiefs, etc.) rise to power, but then when a ruler or chief begins to bypass the authority granted to him to exercise it, lift his protection and backstab

him or execute him. This strategy cultivates not trust but fear. Fear does not cultivate positive intention or good energy. Intentions are needed to guide energy.

People use different methods to guide energy. Laws, justice, freedom, equal rights, music, sports, etc. are all tools to guide energy. If, throughout history, the people who used laws, justice, freedom, equal rights, etc. to guide energy and achieve with such tools results that are different than what by default such instruments are naturally supposed to achieve (i.e., improve the idea of good) were later stung with various degrees of shocks or burns that were reciprocal to the magnitude of the wrongdoing committed or perpetrated, then the more the victors of WW2 defend in their work the causes of democracy, social justice, secularism, etc., but without practicing what they are preaching, the more the individuals who would be feeling threatened by their ill intention or staying with them to profit would be preventing them from achieving their goals.

If people who twist the laws and ignore their responsibilities risk facing serious consequences (like jail, death, or losing their power) similar to how they treat those who follow the law, then it's very likely that the winners of WW2 or their descendants will end up in the same difficult situation that past kings faced and couldn't escape from, which many religious texts either warn against or forbid. This order or prohibition deals with having people draw lots of decisions (see Genesis 2:17; Surah al Ma'idah 5:3). This forbidden behavior is because whenever a person decides to take action on something, he creates change. Humans were not granted power over change. This means that there is no guarantee that the change or the decision that a person takes and acts upon will produce the outcome that the individual involved anticipates. This is very serious and worrisome.

To put it differently, newborns (new people) refuse to observe the laws (standards, norms) that existing people perfected for them and stay divided into one group that preaches about the importance of cooperating in goodness and righteousness but without the majority practicing what the individuals involved are preaching and another group in sin and transgression. This conduct makes it impossible for any group to be successful.

Most importantly, because all people are divided into one group that is devoted to legitimizing laws (standards, norms) intended to make those who disobey the laws enforced but without practicing what is already legitimized, and another group that is devoted to coming up with ways to work around the laws (standards) that are legitimized, this means that all people are not devoted to observing the laws (standards, norms) that our predecessors perfected but are acting on new plans (i.e., making decisions) that rephrase the standards that are legitimized to improve freedom and social justice differently or come up with new plots to bypass laws that are already enforced.

As I said before, religious books forbid people from putting into question how the world was designed or exploring to know good and evil, because each time a person refuses to regard himself to be beholden to nature (or his own fate), he prompts a change, and change induces along probability.

For example, the insecurity that has swept the world as of 1945 is a result of the number of people who wagered on the changes that they were carrying out, producing specific outcomes or certain events that did not occur. If more people wager on change, knowing already that there is no guarantee that the transformations that would be carried out would produce the outcomes that the individuals involved anticipate, then there is a good chance that mankind could be trapped in the same conundrum that Adam confronted when he accepted to disobey God's command and listened to his wife's suggestion to gain wisdom to ultimately be like God, knowing good or evil. In retribution for his disobedience to God's instruction, Adam was punished and spent the rest of his life sweating and clearing thorns to be able to plant food.

Put differently, if people continue to hasten change (i.e., induce probability) and work toward gaining wisdom that aims to learn life's secrets or re-engineer nature, instead of slowing down and observing the laws (standards or norms) that were already perfected by our ancestors to reduce recourse to effectuate change that induces uncertainties, it would not be possible to avoid that the outcomes that people obtain behave in the same way Adam confronted when he listened to his wife or gamblers constantly stumble upon based on the

cards dealt to them—sometimes they win, and in other instances they lose.

For example, when Socrates, John the Baptist, Jesus, etc. used their energy and power to create a just environment instead of focusing only on observing the laws or standards that were perfected for them by their ancestors, their loss was very costly. The individuals who felt threatened by their teaching barred them from fulfilling their goals and imprisoned and murdered them. Similarly, when Fakhr al Din, the rulers of the Roman Empire, the Ottoman rulers, etc., abused their power and refused to observe the laws they legitimized, they stumbled on the same unfortunate events that Socrates, Jesus, and others confronted at the hands of the people who were letting them have more power than others or protecting them.

Accordingly, if to be successful a person must minimize creating change that makes others become unwilling to accept that truth is found in fate, why then are the families/dynasties that control the international order or the money supply of the world being oblivious about the risks that change induces on the maintenance of their strength and stability, thus supposing that the harm that touched Socrates, Jesus, Fakhr al Din, the rulers of the Roman Empire, the Ottoman rulers, etc., when they refused to observe the laws (standards, norms) that were perfected for them by their ancestors and preoccupied themselves with teaching others that fame and fortune (or hatred and goodwill) are not an illusion, would not happen to them?

Put differently, if in theory a person who is not exploring cannot be of harm to the individuals who believe that fame and power are necessary to be happy, why are the families/dynasties that control the international order or the money supply of the world letting their critical thinkers and servants (governments and international institutions such as the United Nations) teach people to be involved in operations that prompt them to preoccupy themselves with what their neighbors are doing or desire what their neighbor possesses when such transformations induce undesirable outcomes that not everyone is capable of dissipating its impact, as Socrates, John the Baptist, Jesus, Fakhr al Din, the rulers of the Roman Empire, the Ottoman rulers, etc., can attest to? Are the heirs of the victors of WW2 (i.e., the children of

the families/dynasties that won WW2) forsaking their power, wealth, and status by letting their critical thinkers and servants (governments and international institutions such as the United Nations) preach to people about the importance of cooperating with one another in goodness and righteousness when the only reason why the world is unsafe is because those same helpers (their critical thinkers and servants) are not practicing what they are preaching?

Then again, I have no way of knowing if the heirs of the families/dynasties that won WW2 could confront the same fate as those who failed to believe they would face the same consequences as those who abandoned the laws (standards, norms) that their predecessors completed for them or barred others from cooperating with one another in goodness and righteousness. Similarly, if the heirs of the families/dynasties that won WW2 could confront the same fate that those who accelerated practical results for the greater well-being of society faced when they threatened those who were turning others away from cooperating in accordance with the standards that they were legitimizing. What I do know is that people were granted power to observe how certain changes occur, and others were concealed from them.

For example, people were granted power to see how tides behave (rise and fall) but not how the goodness and righteousness or sin and transgression they are effecting harness (inspire) positive and negative energy in the world.

If the positive or negative transformations that people effect impact reality (the world) in the same way the tides impact the ecosystem (the environment), then there is a good chance that the level of good or evil that individuals effectuate is creating the same gravitational pull (natural oscillation) that the moon and the sun exert on the earth, as manifested in the rise and fall of tides in large bodies of water. In other words, if the positive or negative transformations that people create in reality (the world) produce the same visible natural oscillating movement or wave action (i.e., seiche) that every body of water naturally exhibits, then it is likely that the good and evil transformations that people are causing are influencing the international rule-based postwar world order that the heirs of the

victors of WW2 rely on to maintain their strength and stability to oscillate in a similar manner.

Coastal residents become attuned to the tides in areas where they are very visible. These individuals take extreme care to prevent themselves from becoming entangled in unpredictable currents. If people's ongoing refusal to observe the laws (standards, norms) that were perfected or completed by our predecessors and subsequent division into one group that legitimizes new laws (standards, norms) but without practicing the laws legitimized and another group that disobeys the laws legitimized, then there is a good chance that the constant back-and-forth pull will create oscillations (seiche waves) that are as dangerous as the ones that tides endanger in coastal areas in which the tidal cycle is very dynamic.

That is to say, if the constant back-and-forth pull that people are effecting is creating many oscillations (i.e., seiche waves) and is not behaving in the same way water bodies retract and protract as one continuum, then there is a good chance that the positive or negative changes that people are effecting are changing the relational model that the heirs of the families/dynasties that won WW2 are depending on to maintain their strength and stability in the same way the people who live in coastal areas observe the tidal cycle changing the ecosystem in their environment in new ways daily.

Socrates, John the Baptist, Jesus, Fakhr al Din, the rulers of the Roman Empire, the Ottoman rulers, etc., failed to keep under control the relational model that they suggested that people be organized under to stay with them and let them have more power than others. Can the heirs of the old powers compel people to obey and remain loyal when most are disregarding the formal systems that maintain their dominance, and everyone is proposing changes for equal rights in outcomes?

I have no way of knowing if the practical results for the greater well-being of society that the heirs of the families/dynasties that won WW2 are permitting people, on one hand, to accelerate but without the individuals who are preoccupying themselves with what their neighbor is doing practicing what they are preaching, and, on the other, to sin

and transgress to divide and rule are creating invisible energy that works in the same way tides oscillate (i.e., form seiche waves), and whenever this cycle (number of people who are doing good to evil) gets out of control, it acts like rough seas and throws off its agitator in the same way a rodeo bull or horse throws off a rider. What I do know is that if there is a connection between accelerating good or evil and the turmoil that a person can recuperate or reap as a result of standing on either side of such type of mindfulness, then there is a good chance that the mindfulness that a large number of people are expressing to hasten goodness and righteousness and the equivalent number who are acting contradictorily and barring them are levying transformations that could be hastening the breaking apart of the security and wealth of the heirs of the victors of WW2, just as happens when a thirsty person in the desert perceives a mirage as water and walks erroneously towards it. In addition, since the insecurity that has swept the world since 1945 is due mainly to the heirs of the victors of WW2 failing to create a balance between the number of people who are cooperating with their neighbor in goodness and righteousness and the number of people who are cooperating with their neighbor in sin and transgression, there is a good chance that the anarchy that has swept the world in recent years is due to all the political and economic solutions that the critical thinkers and servants (governments and international institutions such as the United Nations) of the heirs of the victors of WW2 have been legitimizing and enforcing, agitating the international order in the same way a beehive gets agitated when bees are disrupted from carrying out their natural or assigned functions.

Farmers calm agitated bees by triggering actions that slow them down, such as applying (puffing) heavy smoke, thus preventing the bees from communicating with each other or sensing where the danger or food is coming from and, consequently, retreating. Puffing smoke or interfering with the sense of smell of bees can effectively calm them down, but these methods do not work on people. Some people do not calm down when they are excited, agitated, or sense danger, and many dislike defeat or experiencing the pain, sadness, and negative repercussions that result from their bad deeds or choices. The insecurity that has spread worldwide recently is a result of many people focusing on taking preventive actions to ensure that their good or evil actions do not lead to negative outcomes for themselves.

Accordingly, since it would be naive to suppose that the heirs of the families/dynasties that won WW2 are not watchful and alert like everyone else to prevent the actions, efforts, or choices that they or others make from weakening them, then it would be equally unrealistic to assume that the heirs of the families/dynasties that won WW2 could not be open to any idea that has the potential to maintain their strength and stability, even if this action entails returning the world to becoming ruled authoritatively or engulfed in a new global war.

I have no way of knowing if the corruption that people are spreading in the land will make the heirs of the families/dynasties that won WW2 become extremely arrogant to the point of plotting to return the world to being ruled authoritatively as was the case before WW2 erupted or engulfing the world in a new global war so they could continue to have the upper hand. If the heirs of the victors of WWII decide to return to the pre-WWII authoritative rule or start a new global war to keep their power, they may be disgraced, as the Israelites were in antiquity. In addition, if we factor in the decision of the victors of WW2 to dismantle their empires in the aftermath of WW2 and to have state and non-state actors (governments and international institutions) persuade the weak to consider their opinion before taking action of their own but without the individuals involved observing the standards or norms legitimized, it does not build a culture that would be ready to stay with the heirs of the old powers (the victors of WW2) and to let them have more powers than others if insecurity rises in the land.

If awareness causes people to become unprepared to shoulder responsibilities that could potentially uphold the power of the heirs of the victors of WW2 then those heirs risk jeopardizing their own interests by permitting their critical thinkers and servants (governments and international institutions) to disregard the principles outlined in the UN Charter or the UDHR. This is because conflicts, wars, etc., do not erase awareness but create casualties and destroy human progress. The great number of conflicts, crises, and disagreements that struck the world in recent years is due to a rise in awareness in the land. The poor across the globe are now aware that the rich (rulers and political class) regard themselves as exempt from obeying the work program set forth in the UDHR and that the social contract (the political order) that the rich are always asking the poor to

embrace is simply a means toward an end—benefit the rich and their servants (rulers, political class, judges, law enforcement agents, etc.). If the heirs of the victors of WW2 decide to stop the corruption that they permitted their critical thinkers and servants (governments and international institutions) to spread in the land from continuing to threaten the rejuvenation of their power through plotting to return the world to becoming ruled authoritatively as was the case before WW2 erupted or engulfing the world in a new global war, this strategy would not make those who would survive become ready to surrender freedom voluntarily to them or to each other but would deepen isolationism between societies, as is increasingly happening between UN member societies in recent years. Since antiquity, the societies that hastened corruption and conflicts hastened along the destruction of their elites. Can the families/dynasties that won WW2 manage to avoid people humiliating them and reverting them to a simpler form after they freed all the people of the world and persuaded them to strive to seek luxuries and comfort instead of observing the standards suggested in the UN Charter or the UDHR, as their fathers suggested they should be striving doing so people would be ready to stay with them?

In antiquity, when the awareness of the societies that the Romans dominated began to point them toward how the Roman policies were not benefiting them but benefiting mainly the families/dynasties that controlled the Roman Empire, the families/dynasties involved did not overcome the barriers that people's rise in awareness was creating by fighting the rebellious individuals, or hastening the access of those who were refusing to obey them to tools or technology as the heirs of the old powers have been doing since 1945, but by peddling that Jesus appeared to a staunch persecutor of early disciples of Jesus and that Jesus commissioned him to spread his teaching to the world of non-Jewish people (or Gentiles). The strategy that the families/dynasties that controlled the Roman Empire employed to keep their dominant role when a rise in awareness prompted people to question their reality is the same strategy that the British Empire employed during its excessive expansionary policies until 1945. The families/dynasties that controlled the British Empire rejuvenated their power by spreading liberalism. The English philosopher John Locke⁵ (1632 – 1704) is regarded as the founder of liberalism and of notions of tolerance.

⁵ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/John_Locke

Locke argued in his *Two Treatises on Government*⁶ about how “all men by nature are equal,” while being, at the same time, a shareholder in the Royal African Company⁷, which supplied African slaves to the English colonies.⁸ If the commissioning of the families/dynasties that won WW2 of state and non-state actors in the aftermath of WW2 (governments and international institutions) to persuade people to observe the standards legitimized in the UN Charter or the UDHR and to buy them time in the same way the commissioning of Jesus of his apostles to spread Christianity bought time for the families/dynasties that were controlling the Roman Empire to change their policies, or the idea of liberalism equally did for the families/dynasties that were controlling the British Empire, then the longer the heirs of the victors of WW2 delay engulfing the world in a new global war to create a new reset, or to let their critical thinkers and servants (governments and international institutions) regard themselves as exempt from observing the appeal suggested in the UN Charter or the UDHR, the faster the wealth, status, and power of the heirs of the victors of WW2 will be taken away from them and handed to new families/dynasties. This is because it was the pursuit of the idea of good (evolution, progress, freedom, democracy, human rights, etc.) by the families/dynasties that controlled the Roman Empire and the families/dynasties that controlled the British Empire, but without their critical thinkers and servants practicing what they were preaching, what stopped those families/dynasties in question from continuing to get their way despite the resistance of others, so new families/dynasties start to exercise their direct power.

Also, since we know that few would have the courage to overcome the challenges of greed and the division of labor, and most would rather die than see their neighbor have the same rights, the victors of WWII's heirs' choices to rejuvenate their power are known. The heirs of the victors of WW2 can continue to bite their fingers and withhold engulfing the world in a new global war in the hope that the frustration, regret, and struggle with their own sense of control that they would be overwhelmed with would aid them to accelerate the

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

⁷ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Royal_African_Company

⁸ <https://www.nytimes.com/1984/12/25/opinion/1-john-locke-s-liberty-was-for-whites-only-172362.html>

second coming of Jesus, thus rescuing them from the complex political gridlock that they put themselves in after they permitted their critical thinkers and servants (governments and international institutions) to maintain their strength and stability while regarding themselves as exempt from observing the appeal suggested in the UN Charter or the UDHR in the same way Jesus' first coming spared the families/dynasties that were controlling the Roman Empire from engulfing the world in a global war to keep their dominant role when they acted in the same way with their own critical thinkers and servants. Alternatively, the heirs of the old powers can wager on the power of conflicts of interest over conflicts of principle, keeping people entangled in a race to determine who would get to make the weakest consider the opinion of the fittest before taking action on his own first, and in this way do the job of increasing death rates, reducing reciprocal desires, and keeping them in their dominant role at the same time.

In my opinion, the longer the heirs of the victors of WW2 test depending on divide and rule to put the international order that they appear to have already collapsed back on the right track as compared to engulfing the world in a new global war and hastening the purging of desires so they keep on transforming the conditions and outcomes that matter to them unchallenged, the smaller the chances of the heirs of the victors of WW2 arriving at preserving their power would be. Global wars divide people into two camps and make it easy to determine who is an ally and who is a foe, as WW1 and WW2 support. Actually, a global war resembles dividing a pizza pie in half and working on conquering the part where its members are withdrawing their obligation to obey.

The decision of the heirs of the victors of WW2 to rely on divide and rule (ethnic conflicts, civil wars, terrorism, etc.) to maintain their strength and stability, as they have been increasingly doing since 1945, resembles dividing a pizza pie into slices and then treating or shaping events in each slice independently. This divide-and-rule strategy never achieved the results its users wanted because people cannot be easily abused. On the contrary, most individuals dedicate their entire lives to perpetuating the struggles of their forebears. This situation leads to people from one generation to the next adding challenges rather than

emptying existing ones. For instance, nuclear weapons posed a threat to the international order during the latter half of the 20th century. In the 21st century, we have the threat of nuclear weapons still with us, plus ethnic conflicts, terrorism, climate change, and many others.

If the heirs of the old powers continue to allow their critical thinkers and servants (governments and international institutions) to create new challenges instead of addressing existing ones, there is a good chance that the political and economic policies they implement will obscure their vision and prevent them from recognizing the damage their actions are causing in the hearts and minds of people, much like how food only reveals its spoilage when it is too late for consumption.

When citizens realized that their leaders had dragged them into chaos to restore their own power rather than to uphold the truth, all the chiefs and kings who had entangled their subjects in conflicts of interest were resized and stripped of power. Many questions beg answers. Can the heirs of the old powers convince people to sacrifice their lives for them, given that their critical thinkers and servants (governments and international institutions) have, since 1945, demonstrably prioritized profiting from the standards of the UN Charter and the UDHR over actually securing the outcomes outlined within those documents?

In mathematics, a relation is considered a function if each input value has exactly one output value. For example, when a person enters an elevator and presses the button for the fifth floor, the elevator transports that person to the fifth floor and not to the sixth or thirtieth floor of the building.

If the heirs of the old powers want human relations to be organized like input and output relationships in math, they should use force (input) to reduce the threat that people's pursuit of power, wealth, and status poses to their strength and stability. The outcome should be the total abandonment of the individuals they resize from posing any threat, not the shrinking of their power in the present and then, when they recover and their power goes back to the level it was at before it was weakened, starting to rival.

The reason why the heirs of the victors of WW2 failed to improve peace and security in the world following WW2 is because the political and economic solutions that their critical thinkers and servants (governments and international institutions) are legitimizing and enforcing are not producing the functional relationships that are said to occur between input and output in mathematical relations.

The issue with using inputs like force, divide and rule, or wars to produce outcomes like the weak's readiness to consider the fittest's opinion before acting is that the individuals who are serving as inputs and responsible for producing outcomes are themselves not prepared to accept what they have, want to play the role that others in the same group are playing, nor accept that the outputs produced be shared on equal rights.

One simple way to illustrate the complex relationships that people promote is to compare them to how individuals interact with sporting rules and tournaments. For example, fighters who compete in tournaments adhere to boxing rules that classify fighters into different weight categories. Usually a fighter fights in his weight class, but some fighters fight in classes that are above their weight classification. Most boxing fighters fight in lower weight classes rather than in heavier classes because they are not built naturally big and heavy. This situation also makes the number of fighters who are fighting in lower classes greater than the number of fighters who are fighting in heavier classes, and therefore, this variation affects the way the transfer of titleship between competing fighters occurs as well. The titleship transfer between fighters who fight in the heavy league category is usually much slower than in the case of how such titleship is changing at lower weight ranks between rivals. This is due to the large number of fighters who are available at such a weight class, as I said before.

As of 1945, people are refusing to voluntarily surrender freedom to secure the outcomes suggested in the UN Charter or the UDHR but want to secure the standards suggested under fear. In other words, people want to secure the outcomes suggested in the UN Charter or the UDHR while interacting with each other in a manner similar to how fighters in boxing tournaments strive to hold the title of the best in a

specific weight class, or how Indians interacted under the caste system before World War II erupted.

Indeed, the relationships that fighters of boxing tournaments rely on for its principles to arrive at holding the position of being the best in a particular weight class are analogous to the relationships that people employ to determine who could make the weakest consider the opinion of the fittest before taking action on his own since 1945. For this reason, we have many crises and conflicts happening at the national level (i.e., low weight class level) as compared to the regional or global level (i.e., heavy weight class level).

In fact, if we examine how the heirs of the victors of WW2 are neutralizing the threat that people's rise in awareness or desires in the Middle East is posing on their strength and stability, we find that they are purging the power, wealth, and status of the families/dynasties that control the Middle East by having paramilitary and terrorist organizations dismantle the human progress or democratic institutions of the societies that knew unrest in a manner that resembles the way environmental engineers manage biological decomposition of organic materials by microorganisms to accelerate the decomposition process (also called compost). Environmental engineers mix or turn the compost pile to let oxygen and heat accelerate the decomposition process. In all the Arab societies that knew uprising, protests, and civil unrest during the epoch that became known as the Arab Spring or later, the governments that were overthrown were replaced by paramilitary and terrorist organizations or movements that the international community class as sponsors of terrorism or extremism and track to apprehend.

If the heirs of the old powers believe that if they have paramilitary and terrorist organizations or movements repel the families/dynasties, then the rise in their awareness or desires started to pose a threat to the maintenance of their strength and security in the Middle East with fugitives or extremists who were wanted for different categories of crimes before they became their new servants (to uphold the law), this then signifies that either the heirs of the old powers believe that they are invincible or the heirs of the old powers believe that their new critical thinkers and servants (fugitives turned chiefs, judges, law

enforcement officers, bankers, and educators) would not betray them or backstab them.

I have no way of knowing how the heirs of the old powers (the families/dynasties that control the western European monarchs and republics) are concluding that they can have their intelligence officers, who were gathering information about fugitives or warlords in the Middle East, start to collect, analyze, and produce information with fugitives and extremists turned intelligence and defense officers in the societies that knew uprising to prevent the further deterioration of their power in them, when until not too long ago their own intelligence and defense officers were developing defense plans to fight them. What I do know is that the decision of the heirs of the old powers (the families/dynasties that control the western European monarchs and republics) to have warlords, fugitives, or extremists become exalted and actual chiefs and judges and law enforcement agents humbled instead of having capable and trustworthy men who fear God and hate dishonest gain replace the critical thinkers and servants (chiefs, judges, public officials) who were helping them in the Middle East to rejuvenate their power and regarding themselves as exempt from the appeal suggested in the UN Charter or the UDHR means that the heirs of the old powers either believe they are far superior in might to their predecessors, or they believe that partnering with warlords, extremists, and fugitives adds strength to their strength.

Once again, I have no way of knowing how the heirs of the victors of WW2 are concluding that having warlords, extremists, and fugitives gather information about their rivals or adversaries does not make it much harder for them to keep their dominant role as compared to having capable and trustworthy men who fear God and hate dishonest gain doing it. What I do know is that throughout history whenever the fittest repelled the might of his adversaries or rival with the might of another dishonest and untrustworthy group, this action did not add strength to the strength of the fittest but hastened his collapse.

In this work, I plan to understand better if the decision of the heirs of the old powers to repel or displace the might of their dishonest and untrustworthy critical thinkers and servants (governments and international institutions) with the might of another dishonest and

untrustworthy group, other than the one that they depended on to rejuvenate their power from 1945 until now, would be making it much harder to reduce rivalry or keep the international rule of the postwar world order under control, or if their decision to have incapable and untrustworthy men protect them and improve unity would make them taste the same outcomes that their predecessors tasted when they wagered on evil (wars, conflicts, corruption, betrayal, etc.) to rejuvenate their power instead of truth (righteousness, justice, equality, etc.).

In the next chapter, I plan to investigate how the heirs of the old powers (the families/dynasties that control the western European monarchs and republics) are concluding that if they let the fittest at the local, regional, or international level (i.e., governments and international institutions) interfere in how natural and legal rights should be legitimized (managed and distributed) as compared to having all those actors observing the work program suggested in the UN Charter or the UDHR, they could be adding power (security, safety, and stability) to their power.

2

Unstoppable Chaos

The victors of WW2 (the Western European monarchs and republics) decided to use the resolve of people (UN member states) to combine efforts in the aftermath of WW2 to observe the standards suggested in the UN Charter or the UDHR to find out not who would be first at accomplishing this task, but rather to find out who would be first at arriving at using his relative economic, military, or technological power to bend the will of the weakest in his league or class in the aftermath of WW2, thus making him consider the opinion of the fittest before taking action on his own.

This aforementioned perception (strategy) that the heirs of the old powers (the victors of WW2) are using to rejuvenate their power prevents UN member states from observing the work program that the founding fathers of the UN suggested in the UN Charter or the UDHR to spare the world from the disregard and contempt that they have known during their lifetime and steers them toward relying on force (wars, famine, biological warfare, technological warfare, information warfare, etc.) to increase their happiness. When force becomes the criterion at the local scale, regional scale, or international scale to determine who manages to get the weakest to consider the opinion of the fittest before taking action on his own, the fittest cannot be the one who flexes the biggest muscles, but rather the fittest is the one who avoids stumbling on the events that Fakhr al Dine encountered before the Ottomans captured and executed him. In other words, the fittest is the one who who can force others to consider his opinion.

All those who denied other rights to increase their own propensity stumbled during their lifetime, and if not, their successors after, on the

conclusion that the writers of the theatrical play *The Days of Fakhr al Din* which Fairuz performed in 1966, used to end this production or performance. The actor who was playing Fakhr al Din told the individuals who formed part of his inner circle to not mourn him after the Ottomans capture and assassinate him. The last words of Fakhr al Din before being captured by the Ottomans were, "My death or survival is inconsequential. What truly matters are the roads, bridges, homes, castles, and palaces he built. These infrastructures will endure and assist people in rising or emerging from dormancy after my death, similar to how a rose blossoms from its bud stage." In other words, the awareness that those public works would bring to future generations would motivate them to resist the Ottomans and seek freedom from their rule.

Indeed, the inhabitants of Mount Lebanon (present-day Lebanon) remained unruly and unprepared to surrender freedom to the two powers that dominated them (i.e., the Ottomans and the French) from the date when Fakhr al Din was assassinated in 1635 till 1945, when the victors of WW2 granted them independence.

Charles Darwin⁹ (1809 – 1882), an English naturalist, and Herbert Spencer¹⁰ (1820 – 1903), an English philosopher, are best known for their contribution to the science of evolution. Those two contemporary philosophers were concerned with the empirical study of the natural world. For example, Darwin believed that certain people become powerful in society because they are innately better.¹¹ Darwin believed that “only the plants and animals best adapted to their environment will survive to reproduce and transfer their genes to the next generation. Animals and plants that are poorly adapted to their environment will not survive to reproduce.”¹² Unlike Darwin, Spencer “believed that people could genetically pass learned qualities, such as frugality and morality, on to their children. Such laws, he argued,

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

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

¹¹ <https://www.history.com/topics/early-20th-century-us/social-darwinism>

¹² https://www.history.com/topics/early-20th-century-us/social-darwinism#section_1

would go against the evolution of civilization by delaying the extinction of the unfit.”¹³

I have no way of knowing if the motives that prevented the Ottomans or the French from making the people who inhabited Mount Lebanon be ready to adapt the political, social, or economic views that those two colonial authorities were enforcing following the death of Fakhr al Din are due to the people that they were subjugating being innately better (i.e., a social Darwinism problem), or if the motive was due to the people who inhabited Mount Lebanon passing their frugal or learned qualities to their children and the Ottomans or the French favoring delaying their extinction so they maintain their superiority unthreatened (i.e., a social Spencerism problem). What I do know is that the evolution of the inhabitants of Mount Lebanon (present-day Lebanon) from the date the Ottomans assassinated Fakhr al Din in 1635 until 1945, the year when the victors of WW2 freed them, and their relations with each other and with nationals of other countries, did not change from complex, indefinite, and incoherent to simple to definite and coherent as Charles Darwin and Herbert Spencer suggested would happen when people legitimize specific political, social, and economic views (policies). Also, since 1945 (when the victors of WW2 freed the inhabitants of Mount Lebanon), the Lebanese (as they call themselves) have been less and less able to relate to each other and to nationals of other countries according to the standards suggested in the UN Charter, the UDHR, or biblical and philosophical scriptures. This is very serious and worrisome.

Put differently, if we factor in how the inhabitants of Mount Lebanon (present-day Lebanon) defied the Ottomans or the French from 1635 to 1945 on account of freedom being a merit that is worth more to them than the political order that they were commanded to follow and surrender freedom to by those two colonial authorities, but then after the victors of WW2 granted the Lebanese (as they started calling themselves) freedom to determine their own political status, they demonstrated that animals are wiser than them so far, then one of two scenarios could be true. The first scenario is that mankind is ignorant of right and wrong, despite common beliefs. The second is if social

¹³ https://www.history.com/topics/early-20th-century-us/social-darwinism#section_3

improvement (awareness) creates crises and conflicts and vice versa, as I supported in my book *Social Improvement and Human Security: Collateral Damage using Calculus*.¹⁴

I have no way of knowing which scenario between the aforementioned two is right. In Genesis, God put the first man in a garden and told him to eat from any tree but the one that gives knowledge of good and evil, for eating from it would lead to death. [Genesis 2:17]

Many people have argued that God does not exist and that the stories suggested in the Bible are a fiction. Whether God exists and created the world or not, mankind still failed to create sustainable ordered relations as mathematical numbers demonstrate they are capable of. This failure could only be due to people not knowing how to distinguish between what is right and what is wrong, or social improvement (awareness) creating crises and conflicts and vice versa.

Hence, people would never be willing to accept either one of the aforesaid motives as a reason for their failures to create ordered relations, or factor into their future programming what I suggested in my book “*Social Improvement and Human Security: Collateral Damage*” about how social improvement (awareness) creates crises and conflicts and vice versa, or start to practice what God commanded people in the Bible, in the book of Genesis, to not do to not die, or practice the relationships that Jesus suggested people practice with strangers as they do with their loved ones; the historical dynamic that is our generational turn now to experience its drawbacks would go on indeterminately. This also means that our successors would continue to be competing to determine who could succeed at telling the weakest to consider the opinion of the fittest before taking action of their own through trying to find out who could be better at fitting his own strategies within the golden rule of Charles Darwin and Herbert Spencer on natural selection (i.e., “the survival of the fittest”) to ward off his defeat, knowing that force does not make relations simple but complex.

¹⁴https://centermpa.com/wp-content/uploads/2025/08/salim_maloof_presentation_31-05-2005.pdf

For example, before Fakhr al-Din was captured and executed by the Ottoman imperial government (troops), he fled to Tuscany and Sicily in 1613 and stayed for five (5) years in Europe plotting with the European powers on how to defeat the Ottomans. In 1618, he returned to the Chouf district in the governorate of Mount Lebanon (present-day Lebanon), similar to how his present-day successor, Michel Aoun, the former president of Lebanon, returned from exile in 2005 after spending 15 years in France to encourage the inhabitants of modern-day Lebanon to launch revolutionary campaigns against the current occupiers of the country.

Historians suggest that when Fakhr al-Din returned to the Chouf district in 1618, fueled by the support of European powers and his own ambitions, a young girl presented him with a gold sword. When asked why she was giving him such a sword, she explained that it was meant to serve as a reminder of its power “to amend as justice does, bend wills to make it humble, and build with its sharpness countries.”

As the world history supports, neither Fakhr al-Din nor the Ottomans used their swords (force) in a way that corresponded with the truth suggested by this young girl in 1618 to prevent their collapse. In other words, they failed to persuade their dependent people or adversaries to voluntarily surrender their freedom and avoid plotting against them. As of 1945, the victors of WW2 and the various strongmen they appointed as presidents of Lebanon, including Michel Aoun, refused to consider the truth suggested by this young girl in 1618 when she presented a sword forged from gold to Fakhr al-Din, which was meant to prevent the complex circumstances that he and the Ottomans faced from occurring again. In other words, the various strongmen appointed by the victors of WW2 to serve as presidents of Lebanon, along with those administering the international order and global money supply, refuse to act justly to prevent their dependent people from backstabbing them, humbly to prevent the awareness of their dependent people from bending (i.e., undermining) them, or courageously to prevent the cleverness of their adversaries from reducing them to a simpler form.

Evidently, as the wars that swept the world since 1945 support, the progressive mission that the heirs of the old powers decided to adopt to

maintain their strength and stability following WW2 would not improve people's relations for the better but would constantly change in reverse order to the worse instead. In other words, the international order would be constantly shifting from simple toward complex (added entropy), as I suggested in my book *Social Improvement and Human Security: Collateral Damage*, and not toward integrated equilibrium, as both Darwin and Spencer have argued. This implies that the ongoing philosophical and scientific debate about God's existence and its role in people's lack of tolerance will persist, further intensifying the conflict. In fact, the segment of the population that believes in the existence of God would be harboring a strong desire for God to make a move (bring floodwater, send a new son, etc.) to reduce the level of wickedness ensuing between people and aid in dislodging the tension that would be preventing rulers from creating ordered relations and keeping them going in circles.

Then again, one could easily suppose that the families/dynasties that won WW2 (the victors of WW2) would be taking important steps to ensure that their critical thinkers and servants (i.e., governments and international institutions) around the world observe the work program suggested in the UN Charter or the UDHR as of 1945, so their various strongmen in UN member states would not act as Fakhr al-Din did in 1635 after he tasted power, or as a good number of his successors did, culminating in Michel Aoun when he acted in the same way from 1989 to 2022 in this same geographical territory, but sadly this was not the case. Regrettably, the families/dynasties that won WW2 (the victors of WW2) are acting as of 1945 in the same way their fathers acted in 1918 when they defeated the Ottoman imperial government and dismantled the social fabric that the Ottomans had weaved in the Middle East instead of orienting the institutions that they inherited to improve social justice and freedom so people could be ready to want to stay with them and to let them have more powers than others. Can people defend the heirs of the victors of WW2 when they have been rejuvenating their power since 1945 by adopting a plan that aims at exiling or killing first the strongman in the societies that they decide to destroy their human progress, then following this by appointing a new strongman or absolving the strongman that they exiled from his guilt and returning him to power on condition of securing their will while

following an Orwellian political work plan instead of the plan suggested in the UN Charter or the UDHR?

When the victors of WW2 defeated the Germans and the Japanese, they killed the strongmen in those societies, and as a result, their successors voluntarily surrendered their freedom to the victors instead of continuing to fight against them. In recent years, neither force nor the power of persuasion and attraction has made people around the world ready to surrender freedom to the heirs of the victors of WW2. If the heirs of the victors of WW2 continue to legitimize policies that push people away and into their own sort of coalition, then the axis of resistance that the heirs of the old powers would be nurturing could be hurting them more than helping them. In fact, the chaotic behaviors or ongoing patterns seen in some societies, like the Lebanese people since 1945—after they were freed by the victors of WW2 and invited to join peaceful nations that follow the UN Charter—support the idea that some societies are naturally weaker, as suggested by Darwin and Spencer, and that their carefulness might be slowing down the world's goal to reduce fear and poverty for everyone. This is very serious and worrisome.

Said differently, William Graham Sumner¹⁵ (1840 – 1910), an American social scientist, viewed individual competition for property and social status as a tool for eliminating the weak and the immoral from the population. If the Lebanese rulers and political class continue to operate with little respect for the obligations suggested in the UN Charter or the UDHR and citizens continue to go along and approve of the disorderly behavior of their leaders (i.e., remain desensitized), then it would not be possible to eliminate the weak and immoral of the population or get rid of “undesirables” (i.e., Eugenics¹⁶) as Francis Galton¹⁷ (1822 – 1911), an English sociologist, also argued. This is again very serious and worrisome.

To put it differently, regression toward the mean is a concept in statistics that refers to the simple fact that if one sample of a random

¹⁵ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/William_Graham_Sumner

¹⁶ <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Eugenics>

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

variable is extreme, the next sampling of the same random variable is likely to be closer to its mean.¹⁸ This is very scary.

Simply put, the “mean” in statistics represents the “center” of a collection of numbers or data. Let the word "numbers" refer to the state of peace and security in the world at the national, regional, or international levels.

For example, the state of peace and security in Lebanon can be considered as an extreme random variable within the Arab or Muslim nations at the regional level, or within the family of UN member states at the international level.

Lebanon is not a country that benefits from a working basic infrastructure system at the national, regional, or international level. Since 1975 (the year when Lebanon spiraled into a civil war), the Lebanese have refused to surrender freedom to the political order suggested in the Lebanese Constitution, the UN Charter, and the UDHR. The accumulation of poor political and economic decisions in Lebanon since 1975 has caused the Lebanese people to lose their sense of unity. All the attempts made by the Lebanese to restore their fragmented relationships, particularly regarding their views of their rulers and political class, failed to create any sense of unity. In fact, the more political structures the Lebanese created to bond citizens together without exerting the necessary effort to observe or uphold the standards required for truth to work its magic and unite people, the more the country became burdened with contradiction and corruption. In 2019, Lebanon reached a stateless state that is impossible to repair or to walk away from without either engulfing this country in a new civil war so the fittest make the weak start to consider their opinion before taking action on their own or the people of this country become recolonized. For example, the Lebanese government stole people’s money in 2019, and since that date, the lawless families/dynasties that control this country have prevented citizens from accessing their money in banks.¹⁹

¹⁸ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Regression_toward_the_mean

¹⁹ <https://www.aa.com.tr/en/economy/lebanese-cannot-access-money-in-banks-since-late-2019/2158782>

If the lawlessness and rogue political attitude that the Lebanese are increasingly demonstrating at the regional or international level can be considered an extreme random variable or sample, and the next sampling of the same random variable is likely to be closer to its mean (i.e., the world's actual global human security wave or curve encompassing all UN member states), this implies that the political stagnation that exists in Lebanon could be typifying or illustrating a noncooperation wave among many other similar noncooperation waves representing the various UN member states that are spread far away or closer to this aforesaid mean. In addition, we can say that if the magnitude or size of the world's actual global human security wave or curve that encompasses all UN member states becomes large or small, its impact could be devastating for the maintenance of the strength and stability of the heirs of the old powers. This is because none of the UN member states are carrying out the obligations suggested in the UN Charter or the UDHR.

Put differently, the anti-government protests, uprisings, armed rebellions, and wars that have been waging in Lebanon and in many parts of the world since the start of the 21st century typify or highlight the desires of the individuals involved to improve their current condition so they could increase their happiness. Perhaps a good metaphor to describe the complex political situation that the heirs of the old powers have been confronting since 1945 resembles a hungry person who read the menu that the restaurant owner advertised, and after he went in and placed his order, he found that the food served and the quality of service did not correspond to or match what he read or saw advertised on the menu. In other words, when people agreed to let the victors of WW2 have more power than others, they expected them to follow the UN Charter or the UDHR and not be hypocritical. That is to say, the freedom and space that the old powers had promised to ensure for everyone, and the democratic control they ultimately established, were not synonymous.

People did not agree to grant the old powers or their heirs rights to decide on their behalf or on their own political and economic solutions that violate the standards suggested in the UN Charter or the UDHR when securing the ends suggested in such documents. Worse, have their critical thinkers and servants (governments and international

institutions) consider themselves as exempt from the appeal suggested in the UN Charter or the UDHR, thereby compromising the very principle of community.

If for as long as the heirs of the old powers and their critical thinkers and servants (governments and international institutions) refuse to honor the right of their customers (the human family) of having them observe the standards (freedom and democratic control) suggested in the work plan outlined in the UN Charter or the UDHR while legitimizing and enforcing laws, the historical dynamic that accompanied mankind would go on, and then we would know the final outcome that awaits the heirs of the old powers if they continue to refuse to listen to what people are asking them to start doing. Throughout history, whenever the fittest permitted the weak to unify after truth or falsehood, truth or falsehood dissolved or broke the grip of the fittest on power, wealth, and status. Can the heirs of the old powers let people exercise their rights as citizens and speak up against the things that please them and the things that do not please them and be actively permitting corrupt critical thinkers and servants (governments and international institutions) to protect people and rebuild border walls between societies after tearing them down when WW2 was regarded to have ended, without this plan reverting them to a simpler form?

I do not know the answer to the aforementioned question. It looks as if the heirs of the old powers are either deliberately or accidentally refusing to admit that the world's actual global human security wave or curve encompasses the change that all members of the human family are effecting and that this wave or curve is invisible. The heirs of the old powers rejuvenate their wealth, status, and power by preventing this invisible wave or curve from tending to zero.

To prevent the world's actual global human security wave or curve from tending to zero and, in this way, keep on rejuvenating their wealth, power, and status, the heirs of the old powers ensure that the changes that people are effecting are creating a balance between those who are holding firmly to truth (law and order) and those who are holding firmly to falsehood (corruption and crime). If this balance between truth and untruth destabilizes, the heirs of the old powers

would find it impossible to make it stable without such action, causing irreparable damage to their strength and stability. If the aforesaid were false, then the command and control of the international order would have remained with the families/dynasties that were controlling the Greek Empires, the Roman Empires, etc., rather than being incorporated into another expanding civilization (i.e., the western European kingdoms and empires).

If the families/dynasties that were controlling the Greek and Roman Empires failed to recognize the extent of the changes that people were making, thereby allowing them to bypass the social contract or adaptive system they relied on to maintain their dominance, then the heirs of the old powers could be setting themselves up to face subtle consequences if they do not fully understand the situation and exploit it for their own benefit.

To give an example, if we take the stagnated political and economic situation in Lebanon as a case in point, we find that the rogue political attitude that the Lebanese have been demonstrating since 1975 has become so acute that only two scenarios could stabilize politically or culturally in this country. The first is if Lebanon is wiped out of the map of the earth, and the second is if the Lebanese begin to live fully in accordance with what is true.

Despite the perceived omniscience of nations (such as the permanent members of the UN Security Council: the United States, Russia, Great Britain, China, and France) and organizations (like the United Nations, NATO, IMF, World Bank, etc.) that the victors of WW2 (the heirs of the old powers) have relied upon, their ability to restore their wealth and status has diminished since 1945, highlighting the growing absurdity of these disparate agents. Since 1975, those agents (governments and international institutions) have not led by example, so the Lebanese have reason to maintain their obligations to obey and stop the chaos spreading and flooding their adaptive cultures.

If the Lebanese and the industrialized nations or multinational organizations that are supposed to be nearly omniscient are incapable of seeing how the truth is increasingly being distorted before their

eyes, then this signifies that people's logic, across the globe, is declining.

Evolution (progress, knowledge, awareness, etc.) is not an instrument that mankind can control. Throughout history, the societies that permitted the minds of their citizens to become narrow-minded decayed faster than they thought. In other words, societies that lost awareness of their surroundings found that when absurdity rises, the only solution is to add more absurdity.

If people across the globe continue to refuse to take seriously the invitation of our predecessors to be mindful about human rights and freedom to prevent the disregard and contempt that is spreading and flooding out social structures from getting out of control and outraging our conscience in the same way the chaos that our predecessors lived and which culminated in the eruption of WW2 outraged their conscience, then the increased decay of governance and expansion of crime, corruption, and terrorism that we are observing cannot be a result of our leaders and political class knowing how to forge a sense of self and to observe the cultural symbols that social and technical systems use to resonate with personal identity and regulate lifestyle aspects, but the opposite. This is very serious and worrisome.

Put differently, if we take the stagnated political and economic situation in Lebanon as a case in point, it would be naive to suppose that the critical thinkers and servants (i.e., governments and international institutions) that the heirs of the old powers depend on for their superiority to maintain their strength and stability are unaware that not all lifestyle aspects are possible.

The critical thinkers and servants (i.e., governments and international institutions) that the heirs of the old powers depend on for their superiority to maintain their strength and stability know that the aim of laws and political order is not to facilitate a way of life that resonates with personal identity but to instill fear and to constrain the lifestyle choices of the weak so they can continue to increase their own happiness unchallenged.

If the critical thinkers and servants (i.e., governments and international institutions) that the heirs of the old powers depend on for their superiority to maintain their strength and stability believe that they could let the warlords or powerful families/dynasties that control Lebanon deepen confusion, turmoil, crises, and suffering and not affect their strength, power, and wealth, this signifies that the heirs of the old powers and their critical thinkers and servants believe that they are capable of making people in Lebanon look past labels, tribes, and hatreds and see one another as human beings, thus permitting them to continue to transform the conditions and outcomes that matter to them. This is very serious and worrisome.

Throughout history, the individuals who supposed that their wealth, status, and power permitted them to decide on behalf of others found that the choices that they were making were not rejuvenating their power but accelerating their collapse, as I said before.

If the insecurity that swept the world in recent years is due to the critical thinkers and servants (i.e., governments and international institutions) that the heirs of the old powers depend on for their superiority to maintain their strength and stability, employing a pragmatism that ignores the opinion/feeling of citizens and factors only the opinion/feeling of the rulers and political class that citizens elect, then there is a good chance that those individuals involved will not rediscover our shared humanity and steer their masters (the heirs of the old powers) straight into an iceberg, as happened to the crew that was navigating the Titanic ship in 1912.

Accordingly, since we have no way of knowing if the reason why most of the political solutions that the critical thinkers and servants (i.e., governments and international institutions) of the heirs of the old powers discuss privately, agree on their objective, and try to find out ways to work together to achieve them fail is because values were compromised during the discussion to enhance the continuity of the superiority of the individuals involved or the reason is due to other conditions, such as the heirs of the old powers relying on the wrong kings, presidents, chiefs, etc., then two scenarios could explain what has been motivating this increased lurching or erratic and fearless

behavior that most public servants (kings, presidents, chiefs, judges, etc.) are demonstrating in recent years.

The first is if the critical thinkers and servants (i.e., governments and international institutions) of the heirs of the old powers are depending on their superiority to maintain their strength and stability, relying more on their personal power and conscience to increase their happiness than on the political order suggested in constitutions or international norms. The second is if the level of awareness and education (not technical knowledge) of the critical thinkers and servants (i.e., governments and international institutions) of the heirs of the old powers, who who depend on their superiority to maintain their strength and stability, has progressed to a point whereby the individuals involved become unwilling to accept surrendering freedom to each other if outcomes are not shared on equal rights.

In the animal kingdom, all the animals accepted that predation is a biological interaction between two living organisms, and therefore, creatures decided to not run around preaching to each other about cooperating on an equal rights basis to reduce fear and want. All the animals accepted the principle that "might makes right," and based on this understanding, they interacted with one another accordingly.

The inability of critical thinkers and servants (i.e., governments and international institutions) representing the heirs of old powers to distinguish between right and wrong without relying on force to compel the weakest to consider others' opinions before taking action is direct evidence of how humans were created in the image of animals, and it illustrates how the failure of these individuals to communicate effectively is returning humanity to its state of nature.

Despite their lives appearing solitary, poor, nasty, brutish, and short, animals manage to keep order and avoid unrest, unlike humans who are constantly embroiled in conflict. If each day produces more zealots who are ready to challenge the superiority of the heirs of the old powers and their critical thinkers and servants (i.e., governments and international institutions), then we cannot conclude that people are aligning with the heirs of the old powers to rejuvenate their power; rather, they are seeking to bring about their demise.

In other words, we understand that the ongoing rivalry among people to determine who can make the weakest consider the opinions of the fittest typically leads to predictable outcomes. Throughout history, this dilemma has resulted in the fittest reverting to a simpler form and the weak assuming their position. If the heirs of the old powers continue to let laws and order benefit their thinkers and helpers (like governments and international institutions) while ignoring the happiness of those who follow the rules, people will start to act like animals, and the plans the heirs rely on to keep their power and stability might not work out.

For example, if the industrialized nations (the United States, Russia, Great Britain, China, and France) are such that the heirs of the old powers depend on their wisdom to prevent the Lebanese, Haitians, and others from pursuing the full development of their personality (i.e., producing weapons of mass destruction, planting illicit substances, etc.) while legalizing such freedom for such industrialized nations, then it would not be possible to make the Lebanese, Haitians, and others not feel that the legitimized standards are being pushed on them to make them surrender freedom to choices that increase the security or happiness of those industrialist societies at the expense of the security or happiness of the Lebanese, Haitians, and others. The industrialized societies' (the United States, Russia, Great Britain, etc.) refusal to lead by example or to pause from preaching about how they are mindful about improving democracy, human rights, or freedom, while failing to align their own actions with what they tell others to observe, causes people across the globe to become unwilling to stay with them or to let them have more power than others, just as animals treat each other. In antiquity, the Romans believed that crucifying Jesus would quell the wave of followers he had attracted by claiming to be the Messiah and establishing order, but they were mistaken. Over time, the followers of Jesus overthrew the families and dynasties that had been controlling the Roman Empire and began to assert their own influence.

If the heirs of the old powers do not want the undeveloped and least developed societies, such as the Muslim Arab nations, to rival their wealth, status, and power and to take action on their own before

considering the opinion of their global policemen (the United States) and other aides (Russia, Great Britain, China, and France), but without this organizational relationship acting as a tool for eliminating the weak and the immoral of the population in those undeveloped and least developed societies, including in the adaptive culture of the societies that they depend on for their citizens' protection, as William Graham Sumner viewed individual competition for property and social status ought to produce, then the heirs of the old powers could risk deepening desensitization around the world. The families and dynasties controlling the Roman Empire believed that by merely crucifying Jesus and allowing his followers to remain free, they could quell the wave of competition for property and social status that they had initiated; however, their heirs later realized that their ancestors had been mistaken.

Karma is the principle that refers to the consequences that our actions have on the future and destiny. This principle says that what we put into the world, good or bad, will eventually come back to us, and when the two are balanced, everything will return to normal.

If every action, thought, and word creates an energy that will eventually return to the individual who produced them, and if the heirs of the old powers allow their critical thinkers and servants (i.e., governments and international institutions) to prioritize actions that deepen falsehood and hypocrisy, then there is a good chance that these heirs will fail to maintain their superiority and rejuvenate their power, similar to what happened to the families/dynasties that controlled the Persian, Greek, and Roman empires.

Said differently, desensitization affects people's reactions to stimuli. Desensitization makes people stop feeling shock or distress at scenes of corruption, cruelty, violence, or suffering. History has shown that when people become emotionally blunt and less empathetic to real-world problems, their desensitized state makes them stick together and get to know what they want and how to achieve it. If the persuasive exposure to falsehood, hypocrisy, etc., causes people to adopt the opposite stance that the individual that prioritizes divide and rule, falsehood, corruption, hypocrisy, etc., expects to reap from his actions, then the decision of the heirs of the old powers to let their global

policemen (the United States) and the rest of their critical thinkers and servants (i.e., governments and international institutions) desensitize people across the globe could be persuading people to generate counterarguments that reinforce their own beliefs. In other words, if desensitization triggers a defensive reaction that can make people react contrary to what the expected outcome is for the individual who heightens the sensitivity of others to a particular stimulus, then the decision of the heirs of the old powers to let individual competition for property and social status eliminate the weak and the immoral of the population could not be rejuvenating their power and strengthening the superiority of their global policemen (the United States) and the rest of their critical thinkers and servants (i.e., governments and international institutions) but would generate an opposite outcome.

Additionally, if we consider that the heirs of the old powers, their global policemen (the United States), and their critical thinkers and servants (i.e., governments and international institutions) have not been keeping their strength and security since 1945 by following the standards set in the UN Charter or the UDHR, but rather by breaking those standards, as shown by the global insecurity, then the disregard and contempt that many people around the world are showing could be similar to the complicated political and economic situations that led to WW1 or WW2. This is because the heirs of the old powers, their global policemen (the United States), and the rest of their critical thinkers and servants (i.e., governments and international institutions) are maintaining their strength and security by keeping people in developed and undeveloped nations determined to secure ideas that the individuals involved know could jeopardize their wealth and military superiority if they get transformed into real outcomes. Then, the more the heirs of the old powers desensitize people (i.e., they become less sensitive to stimulus), the more their desensitized response will be, increasing their receptiveness and vigilance to ensure that their ideas and beliefs transform into real outcomes instead of increasing their withdrawal away from it. This also means that the longer the heirs of the old powers take to make their critical thinkers and servants (i.e., governments and international institutions) observe the standards suggested in the UN Charter or the UDHR or increase death rates to reduce desires, the more they could be working toward digging their

grave with their own hands instead of transforming the conditions and outcomes that matter to them.

It looks as if the decision of the heirs of the old powers to permit individual competition for property and social status in UN member states without eliminating the weak and the immoral of the population has so far propounded a different political and economic situation in the world from that which their fathers dismantled their empires in the aftermath of WW2 to build. In fact, this abnormal rise in emotional arousal and desensitization that we are witnessing in industrialized nations (the United States, Russia, Great Britain, France, Italy, etc.) in recent years could be due to the populace in those societies withdrawing their obligation to obey and stopping to be ready to be patient. If this aggression and fearlessness that citizens in industrialized nations (the United States, Russia, Great Britain, France, Italy, etc.) are demonstrating in recent years is making citizens stop to believe in the determination of the old powers (the victors of WW2) and their heirs to reduce fear and want around the world, then the contrast effect of people's refusal to observe the political order legitimized could be impacting very negatively on their strength and stability in the future.

If this rise in insecurity that the world is knowing in recent years is due to most members of the human family becoming emotionally blunt and less empathetic to real-world problems because they realize that feeling shock or distress at scenes of corruption, cruelty, violence, or suffering does not change their situation, then the heirs of the old powers could be increasing anarchy around the world. Similarly, if the recent rise in confusion worldwide is due to a division among people between those who want the UN goals to succeed and those who wish to exploit them for division and control, then the heirs of the old powers may be deceiving themselves by attempting to play the same games as their predecessors while expecting different outcomes.

For example, the Lebanese have been divided, since 1975 especially, between those who are emotionally blunt, less empathetic to real-world problems, and indifferent towards knowing if the standards suggested in the UN goals and the UDHR get achieved or not, and those who are using the standards suggested in the UN goals and the

UDHR as a tool to increase their own propensity. This situation has left the Lebanese feeling lost and unable to work together. If the recent rise in insecurity worldwide is due to most members of the human family becoming divided in a manner similar to the Lebanese, then there is a significant possibility that people around the world are regressing toward the mean. Since people have no way of knowing what the mean looks like or how their regression towards it, or away from it, affects the average, there is a good chance that the withdrawal and intolerance expressed by people around the world indicate that the majority are clustered around the mean.

If most members of the human family are clustered closely around the mean (i.e., their behavior and attitude are showing low variability or high consistency), this implies that a large number of people around the world are unable to do things together, just as the Lebanese have been unable to do so since 1975 so far. This also means that if the heirs of the old powers keep allowing their critical thinkers and servants (like governments and international organizations) to ignore the principles in the UN Charter or the UDHR, they won't be able to create the variety (diversity) needed to make more people aware and worried if democratic ideas don't lead to real changes. As I mentioned earlier, the heirs of the old powers rejuvenate their power when fewer people are interested in seeing democratic ideas transformed into outcomes, compared to when a larger number of people are engaged in this process. Many questions beg answers. For one, how are the heirs of the old powers concluding that the division and volatility that many societies are displaying in recent years across the globe are not causing a large number of people to regress toward the mean at the same time (i.e., making them stick together and get to know what they want and how to achieve it) rather than divide and spread? Accordingly, it is impossible for them (the heirs of the old powers) to maintain their control and command of the international order without compromising their superiority when it is not possible for a human being to know if the political solutions legitimized are aiding people to speak the same language or to become unprepared to find compromise.

I do not know the answer to the aforementioned question. What I do know is that if the level of desensitization to crises and suffering that the Lebanese have been exhibiting or putting up with since 1975 in

spite of their leaders and political class “stealing” their money in 2019 can be said to reflect an extreme sample of the despair, division, and volatility that a community that adopts an exclusive cultural identity could confront and deal with, this can imply that the number of people who are not making an effort “to eliminate the weak and the immoral of the population” in Lebanon and around the world could be much higher in magnitude than what the heirs of the old powers (the families/dynasties that won WW2) are perceiving exists if the next sampling of the same random variable (i.e., people) is likely to be closer to its mean (i.e., let the mean be reactance to create a balance between good and evil). This is very serious and worrisome.

In other words, the victors of WW2 (the old powers) liberated the people they had defeated during the war and those they had previously dominated, based on the expectation that everyone would surrender their freedom in exchange for the work program outlined in the UN Charter or the UDHR in the post-war world. If we let the “mean” refer to the preparedness of people in 1945 to reduce shortcuts (i.e., reduce political corruption, betrayal, backstabbing, wars, crises, etc.), but as of 1945, divide and rule, confusion, disregard, and contempt have been on the rise instead, then we cannot say that the international rule-based postwar world order that the victors of WW2 proposed and invited the vanquished and freed to play a role in securing its outcome has improved connectedness or provided benefits to them or to the world in general so far. To the contrary, we can say that the longer the victors of WW2 permit their critical thinkers and servants (governments and international institutions) to regard themselves as exempt from observing the appeal suggested in the UN Charter or the UDHR, the more the number of people who would be losing their humanity will grow. When the number of people that stop to care for each other or to work together to create a better world shrinks, then there would be nothing human and nothing civilized that people would be doing together. Can the heirs of the old powers rejuvenate their power when the number of people that would want to stay with them and to let them have more power than others shrinks and their own self-help becomes the prevailing factor? In other words, can the heirs of the old powers make people want to stay with them and let them have more power than others when the number of people that would be telling

their children about the cruelty of their leaders and political class grows, or when the heirs of the old powers need people to be telling their children and those children to be telling their own children and so forth about how when they surrendered freedom to the heirs of the old powers, this action increased their happiness even more?

I do not know if the heirs of the old powers could easily make people want to stay with them and give them more power than others when more people start to know what they want and work to achieve it. What I do know is that when more people begin to understand that their actions affect their status and wealth more than the truth does, the overwhelming majority will realize that corruption, force, and chaos are a much faster path to increasing their own happiness than adhering to standards. Can the heirs of the old powers persuade people to choose truth over dishonesty when more individuals realize that using harmful methods to increase their own happiness is easier than relying on righteous deeds to achieve the same? In other words, can the heirs of the old powers rejuvenate their power around the world easily when the number of people who would be acting as the Lebanese have been doing since 1945, transferring their genes or laissez-faire attitude to the next generation, without any fear of the impact of their actions on the maintenance and stability of the international order or the heirs of the old powers?

I cannot understand how the heirs of the old powers believe that the laissez-faire attitude they allow their critical thinkers and servants (governments and international institutions) to adopt is actually reducing fear and want globally while simultaneously strengthening and stabilizing their own power. What I do know is that Spencer opposed any laws that helped workers, the poor, and those he deemed genetically weak, as I said before. Such laws, he argued, would go against the evolution of civilization by delaying the collapse or extinction of the “unfit.” Since 1945, the heirs of the old powers have been permitting the critical thinkers and servants (governments and international institutions) to legitimize laws without requiring that they observe the standards legitimized. Are the heirs of the old powers permitting their critical thinkers and servants (governments and international institutions) to drive them to death with their eyes wide

open pursuant to their decision to let them legitimize laws without practicing what they are demanding others to observe?

For example, are the heirs of old powers permitting the Lebanese to drive them to their death with their eyes wide open by letting their critical thinkers and servants (governments and international institutions) be devoted to legitimizing new laws to regulate their behavior when neither the Lebanese nor their critical thinkers and servants are observing the work program suggested in the UN Charter or the UDHR? Can the austerity measures that the heirs of old powers are constantly permitting their critical thinkers and servants (governments and international institutions) to place on the Lebanese change the political sphere in Lebanon when the political-economic policies or laws that their critical thinkers and servants are adding are going against the rejuvenation of their power?

It looks as if the longer the heirs of the old powers delay the uprooting (overthrowing) of the Lebanese families/dynasties that they are depending on, their wisdom to maintain their power in Lebanon and to have new families/dynasties start to play this role, as they did in Egypt in 2011 and Syria in 2024, the more the political-economic policies or laws that they would be adding will cause more turbulence and dynamism in the social order.

Self-organization, or self-righting, is a process where some form of overall order arises from local interactions between parts of an initially disordered system.²⁰ If the political-economic policies, laws, austerity measures, sanctions, etc. that the heirs of old powers are constantly permitting their critical thinkers and servants (governments and international institutions) to impose on the Lebanese are not self-repairing their in-country relations, then delaying employing force to persuade the Lebanese to begin to surrender freedom to the work program suggested in the UN Charter or the UDHR could be proving to be detrimental to their (the heirs of old powers') strength and stability.

In addition, if, as Spencer argued, added laws hinder civilization's evolution, then the more laws the heirs of old powers allow their

²⁰<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Self-organization>

critical thinkers and servants (governments and international institutions) to legitimize and demand the Lebanese obey—on top of the laws they are already disobeying—the more conspicuous the Lebanese commitment to observing the standards legitimized without ostentation will become. The more the ostentatiousness of the Lebanese about being determined to reduce fear and want, but without such a claim being substantiated with clear evidence, grows, the more the shortcuts (i.e., political corruption, betrayal, backstabbing, etc.) that the Lebanese would be perpetuating to determine who could make the weakest consider the opinion of the fittest before taking action on his own would be making their relationship become dynamic and volatile. The more disregard and contempt the Lebanese add in the country, the more the “mean” (i.e., the international order wave or curve) would be veering toward unstable zones. As the international order (i.e., the mean) loses balance and sways like a ship in a rough sea, the security and superiority of the heirs of the old powers will increasingly tilt to the right or left until they lose balance and sink, similar to how ships capsize.

I suggest continuing to examine if the decision of the heirs of the old powers to let their critical thinkers and servants (i.e., governments and international institutions) prioritize shortcuts (violence, wars, divide and rule, etc.) to resolve conflicts or competition and rejuvenate their power would serve them better than using routes that are in accordance with what the founding fathers of the UN (the old powers) counselled their heirs to observe to rejuvenate their power (i.e., tolerance and arbitration) in the next chapter.

3

Assassinating the Concept of Diplomacy

The victors of WW2 (the old powers) decided to let their critical thinkers and servants (i.e., governments and international institutions) operate with little respect for the work program suggested in the UN Charter or the UDHR. This strategy has led to approved policies that prioritize the self-interests of governments and international institutions over global cooperation and justice, which further perpetuates inequality and hinders the progress of global governance, ultimately betraying the promises of self-determination and independence made to the societies that supported them during the war. What the victors of WW2 are doing to rejuvenate their power is not beneficial to keeping their dominant role intact.

The heirs of the old powers do not want to admit that their fathers promised the societies that fought alongside them during WW2 on the side of their fathers (the Allies) to dismantle their empire and grant them independence in return. The heirs of the old powers are not factoring this truth in their planning. The heirs of the old powers are supposing that because the societies that their fathers (the Allies) defeated during WW2 and the societies that they freed agreed to carry out the obligations that were suggested in the UN Charter or the UDHR, this gives them complete freedom to act as they wish or think best.

Builders build upon existing structures. They do not tear down the structures erected over hundreds of years and start from scratch. If the old powers had to dismantle their empire to persuade societies to fight during WW2 on their side so they could keep their superiority, this means that their power or popularity was not significant during the

first half of the 20th century. If the heirs of the old powers continue to employ methods to rejuvenate their power since the date when WW2 was regarded as having ended that contradict the work program that their fathers suggested in the UN Charter or the UDHR, they could jeopardize their ability to keep the world population united with them. If they become incapable of building alliances or winning global support to weaken their enemies, the methods they employ to rejuvenate their power could exhaust them and cause them or their successors to transition from being "king of kings" back to a position of insignificance in a relatively short time.

I have no way of knowing how the heirs of the old powers (Western European monarchs and republics) are concluding that the plans that they are legitimizing are far better than the solutions their fathers suggested in the UN Charter or the UDHR to rejuvenate their powers. Historians suggest that the old powers (the Western European monarchs and republics) easily retained global support and increased their power during the first half of the 20th century, unlike their heirs who have struggled to attract people to coalesce around them since 1945. WWI and WWII were conflicts in which Western Europeans fought among themselves to determine who could compel the weakest to consider the opinions of the fittest before taking independent action, rather than being conflicts aimed at resolving ethnic bias, religious bias, or class struggle. Currently, individuals worldwide refuse to fulfill the obligations outlined in the UN Charter or the UDHR unless their kings, rulers, judges, chiefs, or law enforcement agents (i.e., governments and international institutions) set a positive example. Many questions beg for answers. How do the heirs of the old powers think they are different from the people they dominate, subjugate, and exploit worldwide? They think their superiority will keep most of humanity operating as individuals rather than collectively, as their forefathers did or suggested they would be doing to solidify their power and escape from the wrath of their enemies.

To put it differently, what differentiates humans from animals is that animals are incapable of cooperating as flexibly as humans are capable of doing. That is to say, animals do not organize demonstrations, marches, acts of disobedience, strikes, etc. when they become dissatisfied with the way the alpha in the pack is sharing food or mates

with them, in the hope of such non-violent measures prompting the alpha to reign and to hand his power to another trustworthy animal in the pack. Most importantly, animals seem less capable than humans of plotting and establishing sophisticated networks of cooperation. And so if humans are capable of cooperating on a large scale and plotting to do horrible things, how are the heirs of the old powers concluding that when they permit their critical thinkers and servants (i.e., governments and international institutions) to operate with little respect for the work program suggested in the UN Charter or the UDHR, they would be able to solidify their power and control all the flexible systems of cooperation that people create, thus staying prepared to stay with them and to let them have more power than others when anarchy does not make them prioritize law and order but personal power and conscience?

Once again, I cannot understand how the heirs of the old powers conclude that allowing their critical thinkers and servants (i.e., governments and international institutions) to adhere to different standards and norms enables them to control the flexible systems of cooperation that people create to increase happiness when people's imaginations are infinite. What I do know is that the manmade distinctions or fictional realities that we invented, such as God, money, and nations, appear to be sidetracking (veering) the world away from the commitments that our fathers took on our behalf during WW2 to spare us from experiencing the disregard they lived during WW2, which they said had outraged their conscience. The barbarous behavior that the Lebanese and the rest of the UN member states, including the United States (the global policemen of the world), are demonstrating in recent years depicts how most people are resorting to tyranny and oppression to increase their happiness instead of the rule of law. If more people use the current technological breakthrough to become desensitized and shift the global order to the right or left, how do the heirs of the old powers (Western European monarchs and republics) expect people to believe their stories and stay with them? The heirs of the old powers appoint untrustworthy men who hate dishonest gain to protect them or to secure the work suggested in the UN Charter or the UDHR, but men who behave and observe the opposite.

I do not know the answer to the aforementioned question. What I do know is that the technological breakthrough that we are experiencing right now is not only creating a new class struggle in the same way the Industrial Revolution did but is also demonstrating that humans are perhaps a redundancy. Can the heirs of the old powers keep all the people happy and prepared to stay with them and to let them have more power than others when the more technology distances individuals away from the role that the force that conceived us destined us to be devoted to doing to rejuvenate its own power, the more people would be devoted to ensuring that outcomes be shared on equal rights?

It seems the heirs of the old powers are preoccupied with using technology to turn a massive class of people into spectators who oversee how their critical thinkers and servants ensure fairness and order or interpret laws and make legal rulings, rather than letting nature wear them out, but this class is no longer willing to trust them or allow them more power than others.

In fact, the 2021 Capitol attack²¹ in the United States confirms that the laissez-faire attitude that the heirs of the old powers permitted their critical thinkers and servants (i.e., governments and international institutions) to enjoy since 1945 stopped making the ruling class and citizens in this country tremble at the laws enshrined in the US Constitution and are turning to their personal power and conscience to get their own way.

The Americans' lack of fear of moral laws during the 2021 Capitol attack shows deep-seated insecurity issues that go beyond the desire for governments to work for everyone, not just the wealthy and well-connected, but to something that is more complex than that. The 2021 Capitol attack indicates that citizens are beginning to view themselves not as a punchline in the halls of power but as active participants (players) in the politics of their country. Can the heirs of the old powers continue on transforming the conditions and outcomes that matter to them when citizens begin to want to change who governments usually serve? If more people worldwide become unhappy with how their governments are increasing their happiness

²¹ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/2021_United_States_Capitol_attack

and perceive that something is broken in the politics used, can the heirs of the old powers continue on transforming the conditions and outcomes that matter to them when citizens stop being prepared to be critical of their fairness or of the laissez-faire attitude that their critical thinkers and servants (i.e., governments and international institutions) are employing to protect them, rejuvenate their own power, and govern the poor?

I do not know if people will be willing to tolerate the contempt for standards shown by the critical thinkers and servants (i.e., governments and international institutions) of the heirs of the old powers or if they will take the easy way out and stand up to them as our predecessors always did when confusion, corruption, and crime increased in the land. What I do know is that if the heirs of the old powers continue to ignore the favoritism and complacency they are showing towards their critical thinkers and servants (i.e., governments and international institutions), and if they persist in allowing these critical thinkers and servants to blame internal or external political and economic rivalry, population increase, environmental degradation, or other circumstances for their failure to lift people out of poverty, they may not find many people willing to listen.

For example, some might argue the Lebanese government fails to meet the demands of crises, but most would agree the US government can deliver the future all Americans deserve. In Lebanon, we have 6.8 million individuals crammed into 10,452 km² as of 2021, and therefore, it is possible to blame the internal or external political and economic rivalry that the Lebanese are experiencing on the large population density²² of 656/km² that exists in Lebanon, including constant population increase and environmental degradation. Not to mention, when France (which colonized Syria from 1918 to 1945 and granted the people living in Mount Lebanon the rights to be sovereign and to form a nation, which they named Lebanon) left, the French government handed their power to local feudal families/dynasties that were cooperating with them before Mount Lebanon gained independence, instead of installing a government in Lebanon whose

²²

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_countries_and_dependencies_by_population_density

members would observe the work program suggested in the UN Charter or the UDHR. In addition, if we factor in how the feudal families/dynasties that the French appointed to govern Lebanon started passing their power to their children instead of carrying out the obligation contained in the UN Charter or the UDHR, and in doing so, they were passing along their learned qualities, as Spencer believed happens through gene transmission, then it should not befall anyone why the Lebanese failed to establish equilibrium or peace with one another so far. Since 1975, the Lebanese have consistently made mistakes in every aspect of their lives. The economic and political stress they are undergoing prevents them from having an agenda for the future, which further exacerbates the existing divisions and hinders any potential for collaborative solutions among the Lebanese population. In addition, when we factor in how rivalry is natural and everyone in Lebanon is prioritizing his self-interests and establishing relations with his neighbor based on "might makes right" and "not truth makes right," delaying using force against the Lebanese to get them to do the right thing could not be helping the heirs of the old powers to rejuvenate their power but to rob them of their ambitions.

We cannot say that the insurrection that occurred in 2021 against the US Capitol (i.e., the hallmark that drives the idea of democracy, freedom, and human rights forward) is rooted in internal or external political and economic rivalry, environmental degradation, and other issues stressing the Americans and making it very difficult for citizens to tolerate each other (keep equilibrium), specifically because law and political order are not natural but human creations. Additionally, Americans do not live in a confined social space like the Lebanese do, and their primary focus is on how to deceive one another, as the Lebanese do after they have collapsed every economic sector in the country. First, the density of the population in the United States is only 34/km² in 2021.²³ Second, the United States produces most of the inventions that power the world's factories, which reflects its significant role in global innovation and economic development.

23

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_countries_and_dependencies_by_population_density

In recent years, if Americans have become increasingly indifferent to the concept of absolute justice and its role in addressing distinctions such as race, gender, and color, as well as in promoting human rights, freedom, security, dignity, equality, and peace, then this shift can only be attributed to the deliberate neglect of these values by the wealthy, including merchants, financiers, and professionals in the country. If throughout history, the absence of such values deepened political and economic corruption, deceit, crime, disregard, confusion, chaos, poverty, unemployment, and so forth, then it should be very difficult for the Americans to avoid their social structure continuing to erode, and whatever social order they settle upon (democracy or autocracy) divides citizens into wealthy and poor, or privileged and unprivileged, until their relationships totally collapse. This is because all the societies whose citizens refused to observe the standards legitimized and later collapsed were tested to determine if being democratic or autocratic could prevent their fall.

Then again, I have no way of knowing if the Americans will manage to rebound as they did during the progressive era in the aftermath of the American Civil War and revitalize the public's confidence in their governability, thus clearing the political and economic crises that have been shadowing this country, especially since the fall of the Soviet Union in the 1990s.

Indeed, the technological dynamism that accompanied the fall of the Soviet Union transformed the situation for the Americans, enabling them to rebuild their trust in each other. Surely, people's relations follow the same cycle that the natural environment follows (i.e., degeneration acts as a prelude for a renewal and vice versa). Can the Americans make the merchants, financiers, and professionals in the country put the working people first, and can the poor agree to be patient so the rich (merchants, financiers, and professionals) make all the government agencies work better when the changes or the reforms that the Americans need to agree upon or introduce to improve kinship (fellowship) and reduce political partisanship, stress, tensions, and so forth conform to the norms suggested in the US Constitution, and everyone refuses to revive such a type of awareness and thinks that his plans can fix their malaise?

Then again, if the Americans are not able to stop clashing over how to improve political democratization as they did during the Progressive Era to make it possible for the government to revive trust in the US Constitution to better spread the American way (liberal democracy), this means that the Americans cannot be immune from future shock that would threaten their solidarity or threaten the concept of American exceptionalism, which is a prerequisite to spreading American imperialism.

I have no way of knowing what could be frustrating or fatiguing the Americans recently with the virtues that their fathers asked them to depend upon to keep the American way of life, typifying their distinctive paradoxical relationship, and through which they challenged traditional ideas about presence and identity around the world. What I do know is that if the Americans continue to be indifferent toward being politically correct and are willing to build a different country than they did before (i.e., a symbol for protecting freedom and peace around the world), it would be impossible for them to keep American exceptionalism a dominant political worldview. This is because all people around the world are committed to fundamentally increasing their happiness or reinforcing their defense capabilities. And so, as Americans prioritize pragmatism based on peace through strength or violence over the morality of justice and fairness suggested in the American Constitution, distancing themselves from preserving the American way of life, the American way of life will inevitably shrink, and citizens in the United States will begin to practice an adaptive system similar to the one thriving in Lebanon. Can American expansionism (liberal democracy) continue to serve as a symbol for protecting freedom and peace, and can the American way of life be integrated into weak social cultures that have lost their cultural identity, especially when the individuals meant to be its catalysts increasingly behave as if they cannot distinguish between good and evil?

It appears that contemporary Americans are facing political and economic challenges and tensions in their efforts to maintain American exceptionalism, leading to a situation reminiscent of the initial defeats encountered by early engineers who were trying to

prevent train wheels from derailing, which highlights the struggle to uphold foundational values amidst significant societal changes.

When engineers were working on designing the right shape of train wheels, all their attempts ended up with the cylindrical shapes they were using derailing from the track. Ultimately, engineers solved or corrected the problem of how to keep train wheels on track by making them not perfectly cylindrical but slightly conical. This conical shape is regarded as a marvel of engineering. The invention of the right train wheel shape in 1804 has enabled the world to be connected in unprecedented ways and made the modern train²⁴ a safe mode of travel. In other words, unless Americans introduce a new differential into their adapted social order, like 19th-century engineers preventing train derailments, they will be unable to prevent their civilizing mission, started in 1776, from derailing and from quarreling with truth. All the societies that quarreled with truth failed to plow straight, and the small tilt (or inclinations) that their actions were knowing led them to territories where they had to choose between continuing to march to secure senseless goals or dying while walking it.

For example, the American Revolutionary war (1775 -1783) depicts the story of colonists who introduced a differential that made it possible for them [the separatists] to separate from Great Britain to form the United States and for their successors to live a better life afterwards.

The American exceptionalism, or American expansionism, that the Americans achieved from 1776 to 1945 showed that the differential they introduced helped them spread American imperialism to many remote parts of the world, despite the internal problems they knew. This serves as evidence that the Americans—merchants, financiers, and professionals—who were responsible for improving the efficiency of all government agencies in the US utilized the appropriate strategies (used the right wheel shape).

²⁴<https://storymaps.arcgis.com/stories/efc66d32c40e4f7da89d2c9bd946d6a5#:~:text=The%20conception%20of%20the%20modern,by%20British%20engineer%20Richard%20Trevithick.>

Various analysts are suggesting that the ideas that the American patriots (or separatists) penned (i.e., freedom, liberty, equality, and democracy) in the US Constitution in 1776 to make people embrace the American way of life and to surrender freedom to its framework are not reaping in this present age the same rewards or cohesion that earlier Americans reaped from such coined principles anymore.²⁵ This is very serious and worrisome.

Put differently, if this differential (i.e., freedom, liberty, equality, and democracy) that the Americans started to depend on for their enfranchisement as of 1776 to shrink dissent, corruption, deceit, wars, disputes, etc., is no longer capable of helping citizens speak the same language, this then signifies that the frustration or fatigue that the Americans are increasingly showing in recent years with observing the political order suggested in the US Constitution is evidence of truth breathing its last breath in this country and around the world, and that the Americans are counting on economic and military transformational solutions to keep themselves current or superior. This also means that if the families/dynasties that control the United States do not come up with a new differential quickly, as the founding fathers of the United States did in 1776 to make citizens believe in the American way or in a newer philosophical way, it would not be possible for the families/dynasties involved to keep the American exceptionalism or American imperialism framework rejuvenated to power or to correct the constant tilts it endures due to how people use its standards to increase their happiness from it. As I said before, tilting the international order toward becoming autocratic would not help the heirs of the old powers to keep their dominant role, because this system is useless if it is not accompanied by a candid commitment by the individuals involved to observe the legitimized standards.

I have no way of knowing what type of differential that the families/dynasties that control the United States and the rest of the UN member states (i.e., the heirs of the old powers) are planning on using to make people around the world agree to stay with them and to let them have more power than others after they permitted the Americans to kill truth (i.e., freedom, liberty, equality, and democracy) and to begin to let chaos become the ruling force (i.e., emotions, opinions,

²⁵ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/American_decline

perceptions, and feelings). Perhaps the heirs of the old powers are counting on significant technological discoveries to replace the truths of freedom, liberty, equality, and democracy, which they previously relied on to keep people divided and unwilling to communicate effectively (speak the same language) until institutions become impersonal and rule-bound—a scenario that we know can never occur.

Once again, I have no way of knowing if the digital prison that the heirs of the old powers want all members of the human family to live in now would permit them to create the cohesion and trust that is necessary to enable them to continue to transform the conditions and outcomes that matter to them in the future. What I do know is that all the disputes, conflicts, protests, civil strife, and wars that people (societies) across the globe were entangled in their web until 1945 were motivated by convictions that their architects sketched a need for them to justify how resorting to such a recourse could increase the happiness of the individuals involved and bring everlasting balance, order, harmony, or peace specifically to their successors.

Pursuant to the decision of the old powers (the victors of WW2) to dismantle their empires and to invite the societies that they vanquished during WW2 and the societies that they freed in the aftermath of WW2 to carry out the obligations contained in the UN Charter or the UDHR, it is no longer possible to blame competing ideologies or dogmas for the peril that confronts the international order but to hold the regimes that are refusing to surrender freedom to them (the heirs of the old powers) personally responsible for leaving the national order in peril. In other words, the challenge is managerial or operational (i.e., selecting the right men).

International order control is not about convincing citizens that their leader is unfit, inactive, or incompetent but about making them indifferent to how the government maintains law and order, protects citizens from outside interference, or provides for their well-being and happiness. And so many questions beg answers. For one, can the heirs of the old powers and their critical thinkers and servants (i.e., governments and international institutions) make people live in the digital prison that they want everyone to live in and not worry about how the political order is changing or the social programs that are

providing employment, healthcare, freedom of religion, and personal freedom are performing when the technological advances used to control and distance people from such information are also stripping them of working in such fields or letting them trust their governments? For example, during World War II, the British government successfully unified public opinion against Adolf Hitler and the Nazis, who were seen as a grave threat to their security and to the values of human rights, freedom, dignity, equality, and peace that were important to them. The control exerted by the elites who governed Britain during WW2 allowed them to manage information warfare, disinformation, and media, including keeping citizens unaware of their lies, hypocrisy, and the true reasons for their involvement in the global conflict. This strict control of the verbal and written media, or propaganda (which is something that the government of Israel is trying its best to do during the ongoing Israeli-Gaza war and failing at), enabled the few individuals who were controlling the government to keep their dominant role (save their future, their business, and their hierarchical role) to this day. Great Britain did not become a republic after WW2 ended and remained a monarchy. In fact, the ability of the few elites that were controlling Great Britain during WW2 to make citizens believe one big lie throughout the course of WW2 about Adolf Hitler and the Nazis posing a grave threat to their security or the values of human rights, freedom, security, dignity, equality, peace, etc., and not having millions of citizens weighing in with them about the pros and cons of going to war and if this idea is worthwhile or not, as the Israeli government is facing in its war against the Palestinians presently, enabled the British government to present itself as being divinely guided to defeat the forces of evil around the world so citizens did not mind going to war and dying so the ruling class in Great Britain stays in power.

We cannot say that the same events occurred after the United States government convinced the world that Saddam Hussein and the Iraqi people are threatening their national security and working on producing weapons of mass destruction to corrupt the international order and blackmail humanity. That is to say, the United States government succeeded in persuading the world to support the destruction of Iraq, but later failed to inform citizens and people worldwide about the baselessness of their motivations for invading and

destroying Iraq. Additionally, their adherence to international conventions is questionable.

The United States and their allies' failure to control information warfare, disinformation, and media during and after the Iraqi War—unlike the British government's success during WW2 in transmitting a single, overarching lie about Adolf Hitler and the Nazis—prevented unifying public opinion behind the few individuals that control the US government. Since 2003, the US government has constantly defended its decision to attack and destroy Iraq, including trying to convince people around the world, one by one, that their decision to invade Iraq was not based on lies and false intelligence but on concrete ones.

Perhaps the challenges that the Americans are confronting with having citizens and people across the globe not doubt their commitment to improve peace and security around the world, following their decision to violate the framework suggested in the UN Charter or the UDHR and to destroy Iraq are similar to the challenges that the Israeli government is facing presently with trying to defend that the civilian Palestinians that they killed during the Israeli-Gaza war were collateral damage to improve accountability and foster democratic legitimacy in the country.

Can the heirs of the old powers and their critical thinkers and servants (i.e., governments and international institutions) make all the people who are already imprisoned in their digital prison not put into question how the money or taxes that governments are withdrawing from their paychecks to finance wars and produce weapons are increasing their security when the technology that the individuals involved are depending on for their power to create a differential makes citizens see the opposite, including distrusting them even more? Most importantly, can the heirs of the old powers, along with their critical thinkers and servants, overcome people's cynicism regarding the biased and peculiar methods they use to interpret and enforce laws, and create tailored communication strategies for each individual or society worldwide, so that their audiences stop questioning their intentions and begin to trust their plans?

I do not know the answer to the aforementioned questions. What I do know is that if the heirs of the old powers remain unable to leverage the digital age to shape public opinion in favor of their policies and earn respect, then politics and diplomacy will continue to revolve around influential followers achieving their goals despite opposition, rather than being guided by ideology and personal qualifications. And so, once again, many questions beg for answers. For one, can the heirs of the old powers use their wealth and influence to encourage people worldwide to view politics from a perspective that contrasts sharply with the current global anarchy, which is exacerbated by ongoing wars? So the differential that they would create would make people want to stay with them and to let them have more power than others when technology reduces people's fear of them or of losing their job or health coverage and prompts them to want to stand up to them so the idea of freedom, equality, and democracy prevails.

Again, I do not know how the heirs of the old powers and their critical thinkers and servants (i.e., governments and international institutions) expect to make politics and economic reform be about the perspective that they usually plan out and play their script to the point and not the one that improves transparency when people are not granted power to erase and distort the truth after knowledge and awareness have made it clear to them that the way their governments are securing on their behalf the values suggested in the UN Charter or the UDHR is contrary to the way they are supposed to be going about it. And so once again, the million-dollar question that begs an answer is how are the heirs of the old powers concluding that if they let truth die, technology and artificial intelligence can protect them better when there is no difference between the way real humans were doing it and when technology is not doing it? Humans were censoring and distorting the truth as they are presently doing it using digital media. And so, if when real humans were doing the distortion of the truth and the censoring, the fathers of the heirs of the old powers succeeded in keeping people obligated to obey them, how are their heirs presently considering that technology can cover, blur, or distort the truth so they would avoid the challenges that their fathers lived with when those two tools (real humans and technology) are redundant?

In fact, since it would be utterly illogical to suppose that the heirs of the old powers stopped wanting that people stay split (by design) between those who are working to let the truth (human rights, freedom, security, dignity, equality, peace, etc.) prevail and those who are working to let falsehood (deceit, dispute, corruption, disregard, wars, etc.) rejuvenate their power and grind at each other so the dynamic that is generated keeps them living in an eternal war and not interested in seeing any other truth, the decision of the heirs of the old powers having the Americans stop to have a positive influence on the world and become worthless and ineffective as the rest of the people around the world already are appears to be a grave mistake. In other words, if the signs of fatigue that the Americans are increasingly showing toward the standards suggested in the US Constitution are true, then mankind could be doomed. This is because if mankind loses the understanding that the Americans gained of themselves since 1776 and starts to behave in the same animalistic and immoral way that people across the world have been already behaving like since antiquity, then our successors could be entangled in a post-truth era that they would not be able to stabilize before engulfing the world first in a new global war so the victor can start to write history.

Indeed, the ongoing disputes and wars occurring around the globe, along with the constant spread of rumors about potential conflicts, support the notion that difficult days may be ahead and that the minds and hearts of the heirs of the old powers, as well as their critical thinkers and servants (i.e., governments and international institutions), have been blinded. Then again, the confusion and desolation that prevent the heirs of the old powers and their critical thinkers and servants from overcoming the challenges that make people withdraw their obligation to obey them or to stay with them must have a source. In my opinion, two scenarios could be motivating the confusion and transgression exhibited by all members of the human family in recent years. The first scenario is that modernity or progress (including science, awareness, and knowledge) confuses people, leading them to be unable to distinguish between what is right and what is wrong, as I suggested in my book *Social Improvement and Human Security: Collateral Damage*.²⁶ The second scenario may be related to the emergence of a rule whose drawbacks are causing public officials

²⁶ <https://centermpa.com/>

worldwide to become more focused on themselves and money, rather than being obedient, grateful, and virtuous.

I have no way of knowing which scenario between the two is making people in recent years become lovers of self, lovers of money, arrogant, abusive, and disobedient instead of grateful, patient, appeasable, etc. What I do know is that the overly cruel methods that the heirs of the old powers are permitting their critical thinkers and servants (i.e., governments and international institutions) to use to rejuvenate their power in recent years (wars, eavesdropping, imprisonment, assassination, etc.) appear to be bringing endless criticism. If the critical thinkers and servants (i.e., governments and international institutions) of the heirs of the old powers continue to rejuvenate their power in the same irresponsible and harsh way they are using in recent years, it would not be possible for later generations to trust them, as is already the case in Lebanon.

For example, the Ottomans (who ruled from the 1500s to 1914) and the French (who ruled from 1918 to 1945) believed they could maintain their dominance by keeping the Lebanese people exploited and unable to distinguish between right and wrong. This strategy did prevent the Lebanese from the 1500s until 1945 (the year when they were freed) from possessing any iota of education, culture, or manners. But the blindness that the Ottomans and the French imposed on the Lebanese produced new generations who do not know how to observe standards and are also untamable.. The prevailing state of chaos and despair that has existed in Lebanon since 1945 supports that the strategies that the Turks and the French initially employed to keep the Lebanese subjugated and keep themselves ahead, along with the plans that the heirs of the old powers started employing through the intermediary of the political class that are soldiering for them in the country to wreck and keep the country's political, economic, and social order subjugated, have now produced a culture that is without self-control, brutal, not loving good, treacherous, reckless, and most importantly, unprepared to surrender freedom unless outcomes are shared on equal rights.

The culture that thrived in the United States after the Americans freed themselves or gained political sovereignty from their European

masters in 1776 until 1945 showed that they were capable of debating among each other and agreeing on the type of policies to adopt to eliminate partisanship, something that the Lebanese have demonstrated that they are incapable of doing since 1945.

If, as of the start of the 21st century, the Americans began showing signs of unpreparedness to be truthful to the principles set forth in the US Constitution as they were doing before WW2 erupted (i.e., create new differential as they did during the Progressive Era), then their challenge cannot be tangled in modernity blinding them and making them unable to know how to distinguish between what is right and what is wrong, but perhaps a rule that they are not able to work around or to override and its effect is making them become unable to speak the same language. In other words, the Americans are unable to prevent the force of this rule from dragging them along, as happens during periods of flooding when the current is strong enough to move heavy rocks that would otherwise stay in a river.

I do not know what exactly this rule is. What I do know is that before World War II erupted, our predecessors believed that the unpreparedness of many people around the world to surrender freedom to the political order legitimized was due to the fact that most societies were dominated and not free. This conjecture became invalid after the victors of WW2 (the old powers) decided to free the vanquished societies and the societies they dominated until WW2 were regarded as having ended. As of 1945, no society was under domination by a foreign power. This means that the rule that could be tiring and annoying people worldwide and making them love themselves and money instead of being obedient, thankful, and holy must have come after they were freed.

“Post-truth” is a term that refers to the “widespread documentation of, and concern about, disputes over public truth claims in the 21st century.”²⁷ Oxford Dictionaries define it as “relating to and denoting circumstances in which objective facts are less influential in shaping public opinion than appeals to emotions and personal belief.”²⁸ Could

²⁷<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Post-truth>

²⁸<https://web.archive.org/web/20161116101017/https://>

en.oxforddictionaries.com/word-of-the-year/word-of-the-year-2016

the rule that is making one become unprepared to surrender freedom to the work program suggested in the UN Charter or the UDHR and that I said emerged post the victors of WW2 (the old powers) having freed the societies that they vanquished during WW2 and the societies that they were dominating until the date when WW2 was regarded having ended be tangled in a post-truth dilemma?

I cannot know if people around the world are fatigued and frustrated with their rulers and political class shaping public perceptions intended to advance covert political agendas rather than the work program suggested in the UN Charter or the UDHR. What I do know is that most people relate truth to the world, but not to the nonexistent (that which is not).

If truth relates not only to reality but also points to God, and if some people believe that humans were created in the image and likeness of God, then this indicates that either humans are relational beings who reflect God's nature through their relationships with one another, or that some people view humans as beasts, indistinguishable from other creatures.

Even if humans reflect God's nature or are considered beasts, this does not absolve people of the responsibility to deepen fellowship. When the inherent value and dignity of a person are violated, two methods remain to protect us from each other. The first is deceit, which can lead to manipulation and misunderstanding, and the second is force, which often results in conflict and oppression. And so, if without a teacher the path is long, with a teacher the path becomes clear, as Miyamoto Musashi, a Japanese swordsman, strategist, and writer, suggested in the 17th century. Can the heirs of the old powers expect people around the world to master the way to be obedient and patient when they are permitting their critical thinkers and servants to teach them to let their emotions and beliefs show them the techniques instead of the principles suggested in the UN Charter or UDHR?

For example, the Lebanese families and dynasties appointed by the victors of World War II (the old powers) to govern the sovereign nation they created, named Lebanon, have refused since 1945 to use their unique power in a way that benefits the rest of the world. As of

1945, the Lebanese government is not staffed by high commissioners or diplomatic residents to indirectly rule Lebanon but by native rulers. The claim made by the Lebanese that Americans, Indians, Chinese, Mexicans, Jews, and others are interfering in their political and economic systems, thereby hindering their ability to cooperate based on the principles outlined in the UDHR, serves merely as an excuse to rationalize their failure to improve transparency, accountability, and democratic legitimacy. When a society lets unsuitable rulers govern, citizens cannot increase their happiness or create conditions of stability and well-being with their neighbors. In addition, people strive to increase their happiness and not to diminish it. When the Lebanese keep their country dynamic, neighboring countries do not gain anything from establishing relations with them, and therefore, they become an obstacle to increasing their happiness rather than facilitators to speed up this positive emotion, as the lack of cooperation and support from neighboring countries can further exacerbate Lebanon's internal challenges and instability. In other words, the state of chaos in Lebanon can be attributed solely to the heirs of the old powers, their appointed native rulers, and the political class, with no one else to blame. This is very serious and worrisome.

Put differently, since the common people in Lebanon cannot overthrow their rulers and political class to gain independence or exile them—because these rulers, with their web of servants, are native people rather than foreign conquerors who could simply be expelled—there are only two choices to stabilize Lebanon. The first choice is if the rulers and political class that control Lebanon begin to cooperate based on the principles set forth in the UDHR. The second choice is if a great power acts on behalf of the common people of Lebanon and ousts the rulers and political class who control Lebanon from power and installs new leaders and rulers, as the international community did in 2024 when they ganged up on Bashar al-Assad, president of Syria, and ousted him and his critical thinkers and servants (government officials, judges, security officials, etc.) from power.

Then again, hence, the state of chaos in Lebanon exists because the rulers and political class that control Lebanon are being protected by the victors of WW2 (or the victors of WW2 are calibrating relations with them); this signifies that only two choices could stabilize

Lebanon. The first option is for the Lebanese to revolt against their rulers and political class, overthrowing them in a manner similar to how the three French estates (i.e., the clergy, nobles, and commoners) united during the French Revolution to challenge the king and the aristocrats, ultimately ousting them from power. The second is if the heirs of the old powers capture and assassinate the rulers and political class of Lebanon in the same way the Ottomans did to Fakhr al Din in antiquity or they did themselves to Saddam Hussein, Mu'ammār Al-Qadhafī, etc. in recent years when they accused them of being a threat to humanity and killed them. In this second option, figure out how the heirs of the old powers in Egypt and Sudan distanced themselves from Hosni Mubarak and Omar al-Bashir by withdrawing their protection, which made it significantly easier for the common people in those countries to overthrow these leaders.

If either one of the aforementioned two scenarios that I just said may be required to be implemented by the heirs of the old powers to stabilize Lebanon, it also becomes required to stabilize the international order if people's unpreparedness to surrender freedom to the idea of liberal interventionism or self-determination continues to deteriorate across the globe; the drawback to the wealth, power, and status of the heirs of the old powers (the families/dynasties that control the international order or the money supply of the world) could be catastrophic. This is because under either one of the two aforementioned scenarios that I said may be required to stabilize Lebanon or the international order, it was the heirs of the old powers who were being reverted to a simpler form to achieve this end.

For example, during the French Revolution,²⁹ the French monarchy fell when the three estates of the realm³⁰ (the clergy, the nobility, and the commoners) plotted against King Louis XVI³¹ (1754 – 1794), the last king of France. If the state of chaos that exists in Lebanon and in all the UN member states, but at varying degrees, continues to go on and to grow, then it would not be possible to discard the idea that the three estates of the world (the clergy, the nobility, and the commoners) plot against the heirs of the old powers (the families/dynasties that

²⁹ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/French_Revolution

³⁰ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Estates_of_the_realm

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

control the international order or the money supply of the world) in the same way those three estates plotted against King Louis XVI during the French Revolution, leading to his disgrace and execution in 1793, as such an antecedent already exists.

Likewise, if the heirs of the old powers capture and assassinate the rulers and political class of Lebanon in the same way the Ottomans did to Fakhr al Din to stop him from threatening their interests in Mount Lebanon, we now know that the rulers of the Ottoman Empire were reverted to a simpler form during WW1 when the Lebanese and other societies backstabbed them. In other words, the Lebanese refused to obey despite all the reforms that the Ottomans introduced in Lebanon after assassinating Fakhr al Din in 1635 to prepare them to surrender their freedom to the political order the Ottomans were establishing. During WW1, the Lebanese backstabbed or betrayed the Ottomans by refusing to fight the Western Europeans who had launched an offensive against them to seize their power.

If, as of 1948, the radius (circle) of the chaos that exists in the Holy Land has been expanding and, as of 1975, has reached into Lebanon; in the early 2000s, Iraq and Afghanistan; in the early 2010s, Syria, Egypt, and Libya; in 2016, Yemen; in 2019, Sudan, etc., then it is highly possible that if this circle of chaos continues to grow, its impact will reflect negatively on the wealth, power, and status of the heirs of the old powers in the same way the insurrection that spread in Lebanon after the assassination of Fakhr al Din in 1635 has had on the Ottomans. As I said before, the Ottomans were unable to control the Lebanese (or gain their trust) despite all the methods they tried before their collapse during WW1. This means that Great Britain and France did not defeat the Ottomans during WW1 solely because the British and the French were militarily stronger; rather, it was due to the betrayal of the Turks by the Lebanese and other societies that were under Ottoman administration.

Furthermore, if the heirs of the old powers continue to be unable to make the Israelis, Lebanese, Jordanians, Syrians, Egyptians, Iraqis, Libyans, Turks, Sudanese, Afghani, Yemenis, Saudis, etc., surrender freedom to the international rule-based postwar world order that was legitimized in the aftermath of WW2, which those societies pledged to

obey and on its basis were granted independence in the aftermath of WW2; and every time, the heirs of the old powers and their allies, such as Americans, NATO member states, etc., remove a leader from power as they did to Saddam Hussein in Iraq, the Taliban regime in Afghanistan, Mu'ammr Al-Qadhafi in Libya, Hosni Mubarak in Egypt in 2011, or Omar al Bashir in 2019, etc., this outcome does not reduce fear and want but widens the area that its members would be unprepared to obey, then all the heirs of the old powers could be doing since 1945 is reenacting how the collapse of the Ottoman Empire can be played out in modern history on a global scale. That is to say, when the Ottomans assassinated Fakhr al Din in 1635, the rulers of the Ottoman Empire were expecting the Lebanese to surrender freedom to them, but this expectation did not occur.

If as of 1948 (the year when the Israeli and Palestinian conflict started), the radius (circle) of societies that are struggling for political control seems to be growing away from the epicenter that exists in the Holy Land and touching neighboring societies instead of shrinking, then the longer the societies that are tackling widespread social distress stay unprepared to surrender freedom to the work program suggested in the UN Charter or the UDHR, the bigger the entropy that those societies would be knowing would be growing and spilling into new societies. Accordingly, as the world's entropy rises, the heirs of the old powers will find their capacity to control the international order shrinking, just as happened to the families/dynasties that controlled the Ottoman Empire. The heirs of the Ottoman rulers finally paid, in 1914, or three hundred years after their forefathers assassinated Fakhr al Din in Lebanon, for all the mischief and disregard that their predecessors were piling up in the empire. This is very serious and worrisome.

When the old powers, specifically the western European monarchs and republics, defeated the rulers of the Ottoman Empire in 1945, the world did not descend into a catastrophic political and economic disorder like it did after the French Revolution in France. For example, after the three French estates (the clergy, the nobility, and the commoners) assassinated King Louis XVI during the French Revolution, the members of those three estates (i.e., those three social hierarchical orders in France) became entangled in a period of

elimination of power known in French history as the “Reign of Terror”³² period. During this period there were many disagreements between the members of the three French estates, which resulted in the death, public execution, and massacres of many people in response to the revolutionary fervor that was ongoing.

If the ongoing campaign to narrow the gap between the rich and the poor across the globe continues to escalate and more people become overwhelmed by the emotional stress that such a situation creates, then it would not be possible to prevent social unrest from spreading and growing. In addition, if the earth belonged to the fittest, and he gave it as an inheritance to heirs or whomever he willed, then if people continued to freeze social space and struggle for political control to improve their wealth and status instead of to secure the UN Charter or the UDHR, the economic slowdown (stagnation) that they would be exacerbating, unemployment, distrust, disillusionment, and political division that they would be causing across the globe would be confusing people, and all the standards that the rich need the poor to observe to keep their dominant role would break down. Hence, if national institutions collapse, people will debate how to reaffirm faith in liberal democracy, rather than agree on structures to stabilize the international order. As the struggle for political control increases, conflicts will rise. When conflicts and social unrest increase, this situation could trigger a series of events similar to those that occurred during the "Reign of Terror" in the French Revolution.

For example, during the French Revolution, the struggle for political control not only sparked a reign of terror to determine the fittest among the individuals involved but also initiated a movement that executed anyone who attempted to overturn or reverse the course of the revolution. This is very serious and worrisome.

Simply put, historians suggest that “one of the central events of the French Revolution was to abolish feudalism and the old rules, taxes, and privileges left over from the age of feudalism.”³³ Therefore, if the hardships that are compelling people around the world to be intolerant in 1945 include similar variables, then there is a good chance that the

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

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

same poor human conditions that existed during the French Revolution will repeat themselves on a global scale. In addition, since most human choice seems to be motivated by the desire for happiness, this means that the reason for the unhappiness of most people with the existing international order can be tangled in a combination of social, political, and economic factors. All the social, political, and economic parameters that people come up with are to improve practical results for the greater well-being of society, ultimately aiming to create a more equitable and just environment that fosters happiness and addresses the root causes of discontent. Liberal democracy is one of the fundamental principles that people consider in their ongoing search to improve happiness.

Liberal democracy is characterized “by elections between multiple distinct political parties, a separation of powers into different branches of government, the rule of law in everyday life as part of an open society, a market economy with private property, and the equal protection of human rights, civil rights, civil liberties, and political freedoms for all people.”³⁴

The values that are defined in the liberal political ideology are all ideas that the founding fathers of the UN integrated into the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR). Since 1945, all rulers and the political class in UN member states have refused to observe these principles, except for those in the United States.

It is important to note that the exclusion of the United States from the above categorization shall not mean that the United States is cooperating based on the principles set forth in the UDHR. However, because the United States has acted as the custodian of the liberal democracy idea since 1945 and, at the same time, as the global policeman who is enforcing this central philosophy, it is not possible to expect the US government to lead by example for two reasons. First, it is not possible to order a shuffled deck of cards without first increasing its disorder. Second, we cannot expect the US government to lead by example or cooperate according to the principles in the UDHR while human rights violations continue and respect for human rights declines.

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

For example, it is not possible to task a policeman with establishing law and order and then hold the policeman accountable for killing a person who was committing unlawful acts or committing a crime when the policeman was mandated to preserve the law. In addition, we cannot say that the United States is instigating insecurity around the world in the same way organized crime cells do, because policemen do not run around terrorizing people, committing crimes, or asking people to pay them protection money.

If the ongoing campaign to improve liberal democracy continues to grow, while rulers and political classes around the world remain exempt from adhering to the principles suggested by the founding fathers of the UN in the UDHR, then the resulting gridlock could trigger a series of events similar to those during the French Revolution, but on a global scale, as I mentioned earlier.

If the order of terror that occurred during the French Revolution to determine the fittest transpires on a global scale in the future, mankind could be putting at risk the entire human progress that was acquired in the course of generations through individual and group striving. This is very serious and worrisome.

Said differently, because the poor have no other choice to increase their happiness than to thrust newborns into believing that recourse to protests, civil strife, revolutions, or wars could increase happiness and bring an everlasting balance, order, harmony, or peace to the individuals involved; and the rich have no other choice to increase their happiness than to thrust newborns into believing that the legal and natural rights they legitimize are programmed to achieve the same (i.e., increase happiness and bring an everlasting balance, order, harmony, or peace to the individuals involved), this means that it would not be possible to prevent the international order from remaining dynamic if both (the poor and the rich) are disobeying the appeal suggested in the UDHR. If people are conditioned to repeat the same history by refusing to obey the rules that protect the natural world and human progress, then the heirs of the old powers—namely, the families and dynasties that control the international order and the global money supply—will inevitably face the same challenges that

the families and dynasties of the Ottoman Empire and the French monarchy encountered when the awareness of the people they dominated increased while they relied on modernization to maintain control over the poor.

In the book, *Social Improvement and Human Security: Collateral Damage*, I try to support how human reason may be an aptitude that does not know how to distinguish between what is right and what is wrong and suggest that this aptitude be stripped from the rights that mankind has granted it to preserve humanity. Accordingly, I suggest that this responsibility be placed in the hands of Global Human Security. In other words, I split human security into two facets: survival needs and earthly desires. I propose that the families/dynasties that control the international order and the money supply of the world regulate earthly desires (i.e., place all scientific progress that is not programmed to improve survival needs on hold temporarily) to improve survival needs first (i.e., access to water, food, and air). When people's survival needs are improved or met, then divert resources (material and intellectual) to discover other planets, have robots and artificial intelligence idle newborns, etc., and not as the case is done right now.

Then again, irrespective of whether or not the heirs of the old powers accept to admit that their own quest for happiness (wealth, power, and status) while relying on their personal power and conscience instead of on the work program suggested in the UDHR and people's ongoing quest to improve their own standards while they are doing the same will eventually overlap, and topple their aspirations to transfer to their successors their superiority will crumble, as happened to their predecessors, it would be interesting to give a scenario of how such a fall could happen. This way, the heirs of the old powers can reflect and draw lessons. Most importantly, the heirs of the old powers can choose to be the measure of all things where others failed or to follow the advice of their fathers (the founding fathers of the UN) on how to keep their wealth, status, and power, as suggested in the UDHR, and avoid their successors confronting the same fate that awaited the heirs of their predecessors.

Therefore, for as long as the heirs of the old powers allow their imagination to sketch how calibrating relations with rulers and political classes in UN member states who are violating the work program suggested in the UDHR is helping them to succeed where others failed (i.e., their predecessors), the more the transformations that would be happening would be thrusting them to interpret the changes as garnering their power, when in reality, this status quo would be careering affairs off course irreparably. Perhaps this means the longer the heirs of the old powers take to correct their erroneous convictions, the deeper people's distrust with the rules they would be legitimizing and enforcing would be getting. In addition, the understanding that people are continuously gaining for themselves should be driving them to withdraw their obligation to obey, leaving mankind with no option but to accept that the world will go back to being ruled as per pre-1945 political ideals to stabilize peace and security.

I have no way of knowing how the heirs of the old powers plan to avoid their fallout after they decided to deviate away from the work program the founding fathers of the UN (their own fathers) counselled them to stay faithful to its principles to continue to solidify their power, preferring instead to achieve the same end through tasking the intergovernmental organization named the United Nations and human development organizations (NGOs, charities, etc.) with teaching the poor to stop coping as they were doing to be devoted to achieving the same kind of standard of living the rich enjoy. Jesus chose to disobey the laws legitimized by the Romans, Jews, Greeks, and others, and he urged the poor to stop coping until they could achieve a standard of living comparable to that of the rich, for which he paid a significant price. If everything is relative, then the heirs of the old powers could be destined to face the same end.

Furthermore, even if the heirs of the old powers manage to ignore the need to improve the standard of living for the poor, this does not prevent them from facing the same fate that awaited Jesus when he chose to disobey the existing political order and paid a significant price for his rebellion. Historians tell us that in 476 AD, the heirs of the families and dynasties that condemned Jesus to death were themselves reduced to a simpler form by the people who used Jesus'

teachings to get their ways despite the resistance of others This is very serious and worrisome.

If the families and dynasties ruling the Roman Empire had obeyed the political order they legitimized, Jesus would not have defied them. In other words, the fall of the Roman Empire was a self-inflicted injury. Likewise, after the fall of the Roman Empire, the post-Roman kingdoms that emerged were more complex than the Roman Empire kingdom, which was dissolved.

Hence, the politicization of the ideas of Jesus has kept the world insecure for two thousand years already, and the dismantling of the political order that was prevailing during the Roman Empire has achieved nothing since 476 AD except accelerate political and economic turmoil. This means that if the heirs of the old powers continue to draw legitimacy through connecting themselves to rulers and political classes who disobey the work program suggested in the UDHR to strengthen their self-interests (power, wealth, and status), there is a big chance that the Anglosphere will collapse.

That is to say, the longer the heirs of the old powers allow their convictions to thrust them into believing that their power, wealth, and status are not weakening as a result of rulers and political classes around the world disobeying the work program suggested in the UDHR, the more likely the international order is to evolve in the same way that happened after the fall of the Western Roman Empire. This means that the longer the heirs of the old powers take to reset the United Nations, the surer the Anglosphere is bound to veer off track and collapse.

For example, after the fall of the Western Roman Empire in 476 AD, many Germanic kingdoms (barbarian governments) emerged. The new Germanic kingdoms were less complex because they controlled significantly less territory. However, the consistent breakdown in living standards as well as social and economic complexity made them (the post-Roman kingdoms) highly fragile and ephemeral. Historians state that only the Frankish kingdom remained out of the once vast and diverse network of kingdoms in 800 AD, when Charlemagne (747–814), king of the Franks, was ordained emperor of the Romans.

In the aftermath of WW2, the heirs of the old powers partitioned the world (the international order) into 193 nations. The social and economic order that arose after WWII seems as complex as the one that arose after the Roman Empire fell in 476 AD.

If the political and economic turmoil that emerged in the world since 1945 continues to gradually dissolve the international rule-based postwar political order that the victors of WW2 (the old powers) legitimized at the end of this global war, then there is a good chance that all the new nations that emerged so far would disappear in the same way all the Frankish kingdoms that emerged after the collapse of the Roman Empire in 476 AD did in the course of time and things.

The major difference among all the political and social orders that have emerged since the crucifixion of Christ in 33 AD is their scale. Virtually all of the political and social orders that emerged since the crucifixion of Christ have been administered by rulers and political classes who considered themselves exempt from the laws they legitimized, with the exception of the Rashidun Caliphate rulers of Islam from 632 until 661 AD and the rulers and political class of the United States from 1776 until 1945. The civilizing mission that the Rashidun Caliphate rulers of Islam and the rulers and political class of the United States from 1776 until 1945 managed to instill was characterized by relational aspects that drew legitimacy through the individuals involved connecting themselves to strengthen values, and not as the case became in the aftermath of WW2, whereby most people (and particularly rulers and political class) connect themselves to the idea of freedom, democracy, and human rights to get their way despite the resistance of others.

Therefore, since all the contributions that people are making to improve the idea of good (freedom, democracy, and human rights) as of 1945 are not fully intended to improve public service under a dynastic order (or monarchial or house order) as was the case pre-1945, but rather the personal service under the same dynastic order (or legal entity, or monarchial, or house order), then we cannot say that the patronage of support that individuals, organizations, or governments bestow on one another is improving values but rather

improving self-interests (favoritism, corruption, betrayal, backstabbing, etc.). This is very serious and worrisome.

Said differently, personal bravery, achievement, or service is rewarded with honors. Until the date when WW2 erupted, the orders, decorations, and medals of the United Kingdom used to be regarded as the highest and most prestigious awards of valor among all the existing societies that were rewarding their loyal subjects with symbols of favor. For example, the Order of Garter³⁵ is an order of chivalry founded by Edward III (1312 -1377), king of England, in England in 1348.³⁶ The Order of the Garter is one of the most senior orders of knighthood in the British honor system. The order is limited to the sovereign, the Prince of Wales, and 24 living members. The order also includes supernumerary knights and ladies (e.g., members of the British royal family and foreign monarchs).”

As of 1945, all the new societies (nations) that were established began to reward their loyal subjects (their own citizens) with their own honor system or symbol of favor and stopped aspiring to be rewarded with British honors, as was the case before World War II. If, as of 1945, people are no longer pursuing chivalry ideals aimed at sustaining dynastic orders founded to sustain monarchial (dynastic) or cultural patrimony, but are instead bestowing or conferring reward service to sustain a national honor system, then the acts of bravery or valor that people compel stopped being about illustrating such qualities for the benefit of a limited number of rulers, monarchs, ideals, or ideas and became about benefiting many.

For example, from 1882 till 1953, all the acts of bravery or valor that the Egyptian soldiers were performing around the world were provoked to protect and defend the British Empire or Anglo ideals.³⁷ After Egypt gained independence from Great Britain in 1953, all the acts of bravery or valor that the Egyptian soldiers are performing are to protect and defend the state of Egypt. In other words, since 1953, the

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

³⁶ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Edward_III_of_England

³⁷ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/History_of_Egypt_under_the_British#:~:text=The%20history%20of%20Egypt%20under,Anglo%2DEgyptian%20agreement%20of%201954.

families/dynasties that control the British monarchy can only rely on the connection among the people living on the island of Great Britain to uphold chivalric ideals, which aim to protect and defend the British monarchy against both external and internal threats.

I just said that all the bravery or valor that people compel are usually programmed to serve an ideal, a national idea (public service), or a personal service to a sovereign or ruler. If the heirs of the old powers do not want the Egyptian soldiers and others to continue to demonstrate chivalry to protect and defend the British monarchy in the aftermath of WW2 and want the Egyptian soldiers to be devoted to defending and protecting national Egyptian ideals and ideas (Pharaohnic culture, Islam, Egyptian identity, Egyptian territory, etc.) instead, then one of two scenarios could have prompted this change in chivalry target. The first is if the British monarch still administer Egypt to this day, and what the Egyptians were granted in 1953 was not independence but the delegation of the governance of Egypt to the military complex instead of this task being done by British governors. The second is if the families/dynasties that control the British monarch think they are invincible.

I have no way of knowing how the families/dynasties that control the British monarch reached the conclusion that if the Egyptians and others are granted independence and allowed to recruit and train newborns in the art of killing or fighting (i.e., soldiering), including allowing the people who live in those freed societies the right to grant one another honors for chivalry or valor that protect and defend ideals that are not Anglo-Saxon-based, such strategies would allow them to continue to control those people. What I do know is that the path toward the glory that the families/dynasties that control Great Britain has enjoyed since 1945 (i.e., after winning World War Two) was not free from blood and brutality. If the families/dynasties that control Great Britain believes that they can continue to let rulers and political classes in UN member states consider themselves exempt from obeying the work program set forth in the UDHR and avoid the arrogance of those leaders being matched by the convictions of their soldiers, then either the families/dynasties who control Great Britain are letting their emotions prevent them from recognizing that men's struggle for happiness seems to come only from the tingling of blood,

or they believe that because no society has managed to challenge them for control of the production of goods or services since the last thousand years and won, they are unbreakable and therefore invincible, as I just said.

Then again, I do not know if all the societies that the old powers (Great Britain, France, Germany, Belgium, the Netherlands, etc.) conquered before WW2 erupted but chose to spare all its members caused the survivors to pass on to their newborns the importance of revenge for the injustice they lived, thus preventing the heirs of the old powers from going through the same exploitation or humiliation their fathers lived, starting with the insecurity that has ingrained much of the world as of 1945. However, if defeat does not make people happy and all that misery, poverty, or subjugation entices is the vim to compete and to have no ennui, then there is a good chance that all the societies that Great Britain decolonized and permitted to have their own gun laws, racial mix, religiosity, income, favored sport, etc., but without obeying the work program fixed in the UDHR, are all working to ensure there is no repeat of living under the same predation experience of their fathers or predecessors at the hands of this country or another old or new power. This is very serious and worrisome.

Put differently, if sniping is like hunting, and since 1945, people have been flexing muscles to see who can make the weakest consider the strongest's opinion before acting, then humanity is doomed. This is because fear and desperation can erode will. In other words, if fear and desperation can make people lose patience and can persuade them to make or take the wrong decision, then a person must acknowledge their fallibility. This is again very serious and worrisome.

In addition, if, as of 1945, the idea of freedom, democracy, and human rights has become a go-to concept to improve national self-interests or profits instead of international ethos, this means that capital will continue to play people, communities, and nations off against one another, thus continuing to deepen inequality among people. When ethical standards erode, it becomes very difficult to systemize, defend, or recommend concepts of right and wrong behavior. Likewise, when people stop to become capable of resolving questions required to systemize the difference between what is right and wrong, good and

evil, virtue and vice, and justice and crime, it becomes very difficult to determine which way is best to live. When people cannot determine the best way to live, they become bound by their personal power and conscience. When people stop thinking about how one ought to act, it becomes very difficult to come up with parameters for everyday behavior, leading to confusion and inconsistency in moral judgments and actions. Hence, all the value systems (law and political order) that people come up with are not natural but rather are prospective and prescriptive beliefs (i.e., human creations). Therefore, the fittest cannot legitimize natural and legal rights when everyone considers themselves exempt from the UDHR's work program, believing themselves God's deputy on earth, tasked with maintaining law and order or defending freedom, democracy, and human rights.

I cannot know how the heirs of the old powers plan to allow their love for liberty to help, rather than hinder, their goal of making the weak consider their opinion before taking action on their own. However, since the mindfulness of the heirs of the old powers for freedom, democracy, and human rights has been full of contradictions since 1945, one could say that the widespread dynamism that has emerged around the world in recent years will continue for the foreseeable future. To the contrary, the more the heirs of the old powers allow rulers and political classes in UN member states "to think what they wish and say what they think," the more people's distrust with governments would grow. Therefore, since more people's distrust with rulers and the political class grows, the more the insurrection that people would be compelling in the name of improving freedom, democracy, and human rights would be getting in the way of maintaining law and order (which needs to stay uncompromised because it is the source from which rulers and the political class get their way despite the resistance of others), this means that, in the near future, the biggest priority of the heirs of the old powers would be how to avoid the attitudes of the societies that are static (under control) growing impatient and beginning to soldier to strengthen freedom, democracy, or human rights. In other words, how to make the poor in the static nations abandon relying on the idea of good to get their way despite the resistance of others as the rich do, and to make them go back to becoming ready to postpone happiness as religion teaches for the afterlife.

Then again, hence, the heirs of the old powers do not know what it would take to stabilize the international political and economic order so people (rich and poor) go back to trusting rulers and the political class and to surrender voluntarily freedom to them (i.e., stop people from remaining desensitized to crises and suffering) after they chose to deviate away from the work program that the founding fathers counselled them to obey to continue to solidify their power; this means that it is not possible to know for how long this dynamism that emerged in the world would last. Most importantly, what would be the effect of this detour back to having people observe the work program suggested in the UN Charter or the UDHR on the wealth, power, and status of the heirs of the old powers?

To put it differently, when a sailor (without a console) decides to sail from Calais in France to Dover in Great Britain, this mariner needs to make sure that the sailboat stays in the perimeter of the English Channel. If the sailor takes his sailboat to any spot that is located on the outside of the English Channel perimeter, all that he [she] would be doing is circumnavigating the sea. This is because, on the outside of this boundary, a sailor stops to have landmarks.

Hence, the challenges that the heirs of the old powers are encountering around the world to make people be ready to surrender freedom to the political order they laid out in the UDHR could be the result of the challenges they are encountering while circumnavigating the earth and not because they are addressing the challenges that they should be encountering had they stayed on the path that the founding fathers of the UN laid out for them in 1945; this means that they could be chasing after wind. The wind, not the sailor, decides the boat's drift direction.

Furthermore, since there is a good chance that all the heirs of the old powers would be doing is continue to go in circles if they do not pull the console (i.e., the work program) that the founding fathers of the UN charted for them and counselled them to obey to achieve their goals and keep the world order under control, this means that there is a good chance that the international order will sink in the same way sailboats sink when confronted with high waves.

This book will examine whether the UN's policies, training, capacity building, and crisis response planning for the heirs of the old powers will help them fulfill the founding fathers' purposes for both the UN and the world, or if these efforts will continue to produce the same disappointments they have experienced so far, echoing Albert Einstein's observation that one should not "do the same thing over and over and expect different results."

4

The Price of Greatness is Responsibility

Euclid (also known as Euclid of Alexandria) was a Greek mathematician who lived in the 4th century BC. He is often referred to as the "founder (or father) of geometry."³⁸ In his book, *The Elements*,³⁹ which is a collection of mathematical proofs, theorems, and constructions, Euclid defines the word "curve" to mean "trace left by a moving point."⁴⁰

Since antiquity, newborns encounter and work with an unlimited number of traces or patterns, but the majority form a derivative of a line, circle, or parabola (or U-shape). In addition, since the time humans disobeyed God's instructions, as mentioned in the Bible, and began using their ingenuity to distinguish between right and wrong, people have been exploring ways to evolve their physical bodies and ideas so that they take the form of a line or an S-shape instead of a parabola or a circle.

Since the time humans disobeyed God's instructions, as mentioned in the Bible, and began using their ingenuity to distinguish between right and wrong, people have been exploring ways to evolve their physical bodies and ideas so that they take the form of a line or an S-shape instead of a parabola or a circle.

At the same time, if the afore-mentioned suggestion about ideas respecting a parabola shape, just as physical objects appear to follow, is true, this claim would be very serious and critical. This is because

³⁸ <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Euclid>

³⁹ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Euclid%27s_Elements

⁴⁰ <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Curve>

the aforesaid would mean that the ideas that the patriots (or separatists) of the American Revolution penned and fought the British Crown to be granted the right to observe and embrace how to strengthen truth, balance, order, harmony, law, morality, justice, etc., are prone to decline. Indeed, the United States sought to address issues associated with political corruption, as well as the loss of competition in the market due to trusts and monopolies, to strengthen truth and order since this country gained independence from Great Britain in 1776. In fact, it was to strengthen truth and law and order, including avoiding wealth and power concentrating in the hands of very few individuals, that compelled the United States to enter to fight on the side of the Allies during WW2.

Despite the United States enjoying unprecedented stability and prosperity by the end of World War II, the country has faced widespread political upheaval since the start of the 21st century, which has significantly destabilized concepts such as truth, balance, harmony, order, law, morality, and justice. If the stress or fatigue that the American started showing with the ideas that are penned in the US Constitution, such as truth, balance, order, harmony, law, morality, justice, etc., and which are not any different than the ideas that are penned in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights is due to such principles that people believe strengthen morality following a parabola like anything that is physical in nature, this means that everything is meaningless.

Mankind was reminded in the Bible in the book of Ecclesiastes⁴¹ that everything is meaningless. However, even if this claim that is suggested in the Bible about everything (i.e., wisdom, folly, pleasure, toil, etc.) being meaningless (i.e., a chasing after the wind) is true, it looks as if promoting “good” can generate bonding that lasts much longer than when the bonding is left to depend on the personal power and conscience of people. In other words, people cannot observe the long-term effects of their work; history has demonstrated that efforts to enhance wisdom or righteousness benefit new generations more than those aimed at promoting evil.

⁴¹ <https://www.biblegateway.com/passage/?search=Ecclesiastes%201&version=NIV>

Additionally, the fact that human entry into life occurs through a plug flow process divides people into two groups: shepherds (existing humans) and herds (newborns). The shepherd dominates and controls the herd by legitimizing what type of natural and legal right or action the flock can prompt by justifying that human relations should be destined to serve specific principles. All the newborns who refuse to accept to cooperate based on this work program that the existing people (the shepherd) decree and enforce are either disciplined or categorized as dissidents and pursued.

No one knows if the insubordination that newborns manifest toward the natural and legal right that existing people legitimize is because newborns are a force of evil or because children (the flock) do not perceive that the individuals who are playing the shepherd role (rulers and political class) are doing this job the right way (leading by example). So far, one thing is undeniably true: all ideas foster bonds. In other words, humans are not like chemical elements whereby only specific substances can create weak or strong bonds. All the ideas that humans come up with are capable of creating a strong bond, a weak bond, or a change from a weak bond to a strong one and vice versa at any time. For example, the idea of good, such as religion, is an idea that many people are ready to establish a bond around. The idea of evil, such as injustice or corruption, is another one that many people establish bonds around as well. The reason corruption or injustice is less attractive than religion is not whether corruption is good or bad, but rather that people who promote good (or religion) outnumber those who depend on corruption to get their way, despite others' resistance. If religiosity diminishes around the world, corruption would rise, and so forth. For example, if the superpowers permit the people of Afghanistan to legalize the production of illicit substances such as opium in the same way they permit Saudi Arabia to extract and recover oil or South Africa to mine for diamonds, the people of Afghanistan could be today perhaps as wealthy as the people of Great Britain, France, or Luxembourg. Evidently, the superpowers prevent the weak societies from violating the laws not because they are worried that such conduct could ruin them, but because their prohibition springs from envy.

It appears that it matters little whether the idea of good follows a bell-shaped curve or an S-shape. The heirs of the old powers (the families/dynasties that control the international order and the money supply of the world) must be vigilant about how to establish balance, as all the people are inclined to support the new but then later would become unhappy with it and wish for something else. If people's intolerance seems to be on the rise post-1945, this means that a rule must have upset (or shaken) the ideas that the heirs of the old powers are depending on to keep newborns prepared to observe the balance or the rules that those powerful families/dynasties that won WW2 legitimized and enforced to keep their dominant role. Alternatively, the unbalance that emerged in the world post-1945 could be due to the failure of the families/dynasties that control the international order and the money supply of the world (i.e., the heirs of the old powers) to properly equip the critical thinkers and servants (rulers, political class, judges, priests, bankers, teachers, law enforcement agents, public officials, etc.) who are enforcing social parameters on their behalf with the right knowledge about what it is exactly that people came together in the aftermath of WW2 to work together to build. Thus, enabling them (the powerful families/dynasties) to continue to create the necessary balance they need to maintain their wealth, power, and status, as well as keep the civilizing mission (natural and legal rights) they are legitimizing on course.

Hosea was an 8th-century BC prophet in Israel who authored the book of prophecies (in the Bible) bearing his name.⁴² Hosea tries to expose in this book the hypocrisy of Israel's worship. He repeatedly accuses the Israelites of putting their trust in the political alliances they were making with other nations, including military power, instead of remaining faithful to their covenant with God. He tries to show how the Israelites were allowing grave injustice in their communities, including offering sacrifices to God like everything was just fine.⁴³ Most importantly, in Hosea 4:6, he says that his "people are destroyed from lack of knowledge."⁴⁴

⁴² <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Hosea>

⁴³ <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=kE6SZ1ogOVU>

⁴⁴ <https://www.biblegateway.com/passage/?search=Hosea+4%3A6&version=NIV>

Is the failure of the heirs of the old powers to stop the grave injustices exhibited by their critical thinkers and servants across the globe since 1945, due to their refusal to adhere to the principles outlined in the UN Charter or the UDHR, preventing mankind from making progress on the aspirations set forth in this covenant? Could the heirs of the old powers' failure to pass on the right knowledge—what are people supposed to be dedicated to observing post-1945?—be the cause of this abnormal selfishness or deep social brokenness that emerged across the globe when the opposite should have been the case?

In general, the emotions of humans vary in response to experiences in the world. Most people believe that optimal mental health involves maximizing positive affects (used interchangeably with emotions) and minimizing negative affects.⁴⁵

Hence, all people are motivated by the pursuit of happiness (or added pleasure); this allows us to prescriptively say that actions, policies, and rules influence how people's emotions (or affects) get categorized. Likewise, since emotions, feelings, or moods influence thoughts and behavioral responses, we could say that strengthening relationships that seek to maximize positive affect (or pleasure) and minimize negative affect (or displeasure) greatly influences the impulse to act.

If ideas can create both strong and weak bonds, then common sense suggests that all ideas aimed at improving a person's well-being (happiness) influence strong bonds and provide a valid reason for people to exhibit the motivational intensity and conduct necessary to achieve any goal or stimulus.

Then again, even if all the ideas that people come up with are meaningless and people's interest in "ideas" follows a bell-shaped pattern (or a sine wave⁴⁶), the mere fact that all "ideas" invite intuitive attention signifies that the curiosity that people exhibit can be quantified in terms of an amplitude and a frequency. Furthermore, people's interest or curiosity can be quantified. To maximize positive emotions and minimize negative emotions, it is necessary to control

⁴⁵ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Silvan_Tomkins

⁴⁶ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sine_wave

and regulate the actions, policies, or rules that people are exposed to, as these factors influence the duration of their interest in an idea.

For example, right after the patriots (or separatists) in the United States obtained their independence and began to determine and enforce their own political and social status, we found that those people [the separatists] remained unified and determined to promote social progress and better standards. Their successors manifested the same will despite all the internal conflicts they were facing, which included disagreements over governance and differing visions for the future of the nation. The United States managed to advance militarily, technologically, and economically until transforming into a superpower in the middle of the 20th century.

Some commentators claim that nearly every country and territory in the world participated in World War II.⁴⁷ Interestingly, the vast majority of the great powers who were defeated during WW2, such as Germany or Japan, acted with the same degree of astuteness or maturity as the patriots did following their split from the British Crown in the aftermath of the American Revolutionary War. The great powers who were defeated during WW2, and whose infrastructure was basically in total ruin in the aftermath of this global war, surrendered freedom and worked with the nations who won WW2 until their economy got stronger to regain their economic power.⁴⁸

We cannot say that all WWII participants were as wise or mature as the Germans or Japanese were after their defeat. For example, Lebanon is the smallest recognized sovereign state on the mainland Asian continent.⁴⁹ This country is as big as the State of Connecticut in the US.⁵⁰ In 1941, the Allied forces invaded and occupied Lebanon during the Syria-Lebanon Campaign (or Operation Exporter).⁵¹ The allied forces granted Lebanon independence in 1945. From 1945 to 1975 (the year when the Lebanese civil war broke out), the Lebanese people did not want to exhibit the same maturity and courage that the

⁴⁷ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/World_War_II_by_country

⁴⁸ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Marshall_Plan#Development_and_deployment

⁴⁹ <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Lebanon>

⁵⁰ <http://www.decisionsciencenews.com/2015/02/20/put-size-countries-perspective-comparing-us-states/>

⁵¹ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Syria%E2%80%93Lebanon_campaign

Germans or the Japanese displayed following their defeat during WW2. The Lebanese remained faithful to the religious “apartheid” culture that the French adapted as a repertoire to gain and maintain social and political control. The French made the Lebanese's culture of religious segregation a legitimate form of coercion to run the country. In a way, this religious culture that the French grafted the Lebanese with is similar to the racial culture that the South Africans seem to be grafted with and are unable to stop from influencing them since apartheid ended in the early 1990s. In fact, by 1975, the Lebanese had become entrenched in the same cultural relativism that defines those who subscribe to the Jewish faith. Jews uphold and operate the oldest religious and racial segregation and coercion methods of all existing cultures.

Additionally, in the years leading up to 1975 (the year when the Lebanese civil war broke out), large disparities in birthrates among the competing religious groups, along with a lack of political maturity, hindered the efforts of the “feudal” Lebanese families and dynasties that the French appointed to exercise power in Lebanon, as they sought to maintain a population divided along the religious lines that the French legitimized to ensure balance among all involved. In simpler terms, the “feudal” Lebanese families/dynasties that the French put in charge of Lebanon, along with the religious groups working with them, were unable to maintain balance or align their own political and economic goals with the basic actions needed by the state to keep peace and social order, including improving public morality. In 1975, Lebanon became engulfed in a civil war to determine who between the rivaling “feudal” families/dynasties (including religious bodies) could have unlimited freedom or “the right to all things.” From 1975 to the present, Lebanon's political, social, economic, and cultural life has steadily declined, culminating in its current state of isolation, poverty, cruelty, and brutality in 2020. Most importantly, the heirs of the old powers are counterbalancing the rise of the Muslim Shia branch of Islam in Lebanon by allowing more than two million Syrian refugees, who subscribe to the Muslim Sunni branch of Islam, to stay in the country.

No one knows why the Lebanese refused to exhibit the same degree of astuteness or level of maturity that the Germans, the Japanese, and

others displayed following their defeat during WW2. In theory, it should be the Germans or the Japanese who are inclined to emphasize the importance of religion in their relationship more than the Lebanese in the aftermath of WW2. The Germans and Japanese saw their countries ruined in WWII, not the Lebanese.

If, in the aftermath of WW2, the Germans or the Japanese managed to demonstrate astuteness or sufficient maturity to regain their economic power, and the Lebanese converted this country from being a stable society up to 1945 to a stateless nation post this date, this contradiction could only be due to one reason. The Germans or the Japanese were cooperating based on the ideas that were stipulated in the UN charter, but the Lebanese were not, which suggests a failure to engage in international diplomacy and governance that could have supported their societal stability.

Winston Churchill (1874 – 1965) once said, “The price of greatness is responsibility.”⁵²

During the Lebanese civil war and in the years that followed, Fairuz (a Lebanese singer who is regarded as one of the most admired and influential singers in the Arab world) produced many musicals, which were political in nature. The lyrics of one of Fairuz’s songs describe the conditions that result when kings or rulers undermine responsibility or what Winston Churchill referred to as the price of greatness. Fairuz, in one of her songs, tells the Lebanese about the story of a muezzin (the person appointed in the Islamic religion to lead and recite the call to prayers), who called the believers to prayers, and then he realized that his calls were in vain because “the shepherds were in a valley and the flocks in another.”⁵³

If human nature pre- and post-1945 did not change (i.e., rivalry, corruption, etc. remained endemic), we can say that the Germans’ or the Japanese political leaders managed to be responsible to the point of being able to bring their flock (i.e., dependent people) to be with them in one valley from 1945 onward. Regarding the Lebanese leaders and

⁵² <https://www.goodreads.com/quotes/558343-the-price-of-greatness-is-responsibility-over-each-of-your>

⁵³ <https://www.facebook.com/127101570698715/posts/1007276056014591/>

political class, the gap between the shepherds and the flock remained unchanged since 1945 and continued to widen after that date. Despite all the attempts made by the "shepherds" (i.e., the Lebanese political leaders) in Lebanon to unite the flocks (i.e., dependent people) in one valley, the political situation in the country continues to deteriorate.

It is possible to say that the Lebanese feudal families/dynasties that the victors of WW2 (the old powers) carved out for them from Syria, a slice of land named Lebanon, and tasked them with governing its political structure were highly intelligent or clever. If a great fighter is someone who has time on his side, and if the political leaders in Lebanon (i.e., the "feudal" families/dynasties whom the French appointed to rule over Lebanon when WWII was regarded as having ended in 1945 and the warlords who emerged during the Lebanese civil war in 1975) managed to stay in power until today (2020) and to keep the population in the country prepared to elect them despite the mismanagement, division, or chaos that the political immaturity of those political leaders has piloted the country towards (which includes tolerating that banks impose capital restrictions on depositors in 2019), this means one of two scenarios is true. The first is if the Lebanese people (sheep) and their political leaders (shepherds) are each in a separate valley, as Fairuz stated in the lyrics of one of her songs in 1975, but the heirs of the old powers and the Lebanese "feudal" families/dynasties or Lebanese warlords whom they depend on to rejuvenate their powers are also confronting the same challenge. All those aforementioned individuals are not speaking the same language and are not able to distinguish between right and wrong on top of that, unlike sheep. The second is if the Lebanese political leaders whom the heirs of the old powers permitted to keep Lebanon dynamic and bankrupt are acting by design, and are responsible individuals who know exactly what it is that they want.

Either scenario between the aforesaid two is very serious and worrisome because they both can persuade the heirs of the old powers to pay a dire price if they contain any elements of truth. If sectarian dependency makes people become blind, then the security institutions that the heirs of the old powers are depending on to make citizens in UN member states regularly revolt against their political leaders and the faction that protects them will control their ambitions.

Alternatively, count on citizens in UN member states not betraying their adversaries or the political leaders that are already protecting them by selling them during serious crises for the right price.

For example. If political leaders in a small country like Lebanon can destabilize the international rule-based postwar political order without facing consequences, then the damage caused by larger countries that refuse to adhere to the UN Charter or the UDHR, in favor of the heirs of old powers, could be catastrophic. This also means that either the heirs of the old powers (the powerful families/dynasties that control the international order and the money supply of the world) are naïve, or they are underestimating the inclination of the human heart, which the Bible says is evil from childhood. [Genesis 8:21]

I have no way of knowing what specific criteria are motivating the apathetic attitude that the heirs of the old powers are exhibiting toward the unpreparedness of the political leaders in Lebanon (and in different UN member states, including the United States) to obey the work program suggested in the UDHR, knowing that it is not possible to assess its impact (toll) on the maintenance of their strength and stability. The key issue here is that the UDHR is the work program that the heirs of the old powers depend on to transform the conditions and outcomes that matter to them. If this work program weakens and the world abandons its usage as a tool to advance the liberal interventionism or self-determination philosophy, then mankind will need to go back and start to adopt pre-1945 political rules. If totalitarianism rose around the world, the heirs of the old powers might revert to a simpler form or be absorbed by another growing authority. This is because when authoritarianism rises, wars and betrayal reciprocally rise, leading to increased conflict and instability in international relations.

Stubbornness is a behavior in which a person refuses to change his attitude or position on something.⁵⁴ For instance, the Lebanese political leaders' refusal to cooperate with the work program they must follow as UN members, and the protection they gain from the heirs of the old powers by regarding themselves exempt from this appeal, have prevented them from using their power wisely. The stubbornness of

⁵⁴ <http://english.oxforddictionaries.com/stubbornness>

Lebanon's political leaders, their unwillingness to change their attitudes, and the incapacity of the Lebanese people to remove them from power have allowed turbulence and chaos to affect the country (i.e., the wind to swing them, take them, and twist them) since 1975.

No one knows if the international order, controlled by the heirs of the old powers, has been influenced and manipulated by changing winds since 1945, in the same way the winds have been affecting the Lebanese people (swinging them, taking them, and twisting them), shaping their circumstances since 1975. In other words, the more science and technology accelerate an individual's awareness or knowledge, the less likely that individual is to be patient (take up low-paying and precarious informal jobs) and the more likely they are to use their improved awareness or knowledge to deny other rights. Then, the more the heirs of the old powers adopt policies that prioritize the integration of technology over focusing on labor-intensive industries, the more they risk harming their own interests. The more science and technology advance the poor's knowledge, the more their improved awareness will make them ill-prepared to tolerate the rich's corruption and non-transparency.

Additionally, hence, all people forgo each other's security by relying on corruption and non-transparency or subjective ideas such as religion or the idea of good (because if the other way were the case, peace and security would have been established on earth a long time ago), then it would not be possible for the heirs of the old powers to control the frustration of the poor and prevent it from escalating into violence if the rich are relying on technology to increase their profit (making the poor jobless or unoccupied), and the only employer in poor countries becomes the state. In addition, when the military complex in the state becomes the only employer, as the case is like now in Egypt for several years now, then mankind would know that the world has etched toward authoritarianism.

I have no way of knowing how the heirs of the old powers (i.e., the families/dynasties that control the international order and the money supply of the world) plan to stop the financialization of the world from diminishing the value of human worth, especially since awareness is not reversible, and people depend on technology to make the weakest

consider the opinion of the strongest before taking action of their own and not to reduce the gap between the rich and the poor or to shrink fear and want. In other words, when awareness rises, it is not possible to make a person inspire confidence in another human being unless either one is leading by example or the country relies on social security mechanisms that can offset the need for citizens to question inclusive growth.

For example, the social security mechanisms that exist in Western European countries permit the families or dynasties that control those nations to establish balance with their citizens, including making them ready to voluntarily surrender their freedom to the complex monarchical or political systems, which in theory are democratic in form but not in practice. In countries that do not have strong social security mechanisms and claim they are republics but operate totalitarian regimes, the only pathway for an individual to have access to a dignified life in such countries is through joining the military complex. This is very serious and worrisome. This is because the families/dynasties that control the western European countries rely on technological superiority to make the poor countries consider their opinion and on keeping the tax systems in poor countries inefficient to prevent those governments from making the necessary investments in public goods such as education, housing, health, and transport, thus preventing them from developing awareness or stability.

In other words, if the western European countries want to prevent the nations that they decolonized in the aftermath of WW2 from rivaling them, they would need to keep the people in the decolonized nations from experiencing an income growth as happened in China starting from the mid-1970s or after the western European countries moved their production into this country to take advantage of its low labor cost to prevent the country from experiencing a rise in inequality.

When a poor country experiences a rise in inequality (i.e., the awareness of its people rises), it cannot avoid that its economy shifts from being farm-based to being service-based, especially since its manufacturing or factory jobs would be changing from being manned by skilled and unskilled workers (i.e., humans) to over-exceedingly skilled workers (i.e., machinery). Until the start of the 21st century, a

politics of polarization and hate worked to keep the people in poor nations leading a precarious existence. However, this strategy is ineffective because awareness depends on knowledge, and Western European countries—the wealthiest both economically and militarily—are using the concepts of democracy and human rights as tools to keep poor nations suppressed and unable to cultivate the necessary culture to alleviate fear and want. This culture of fear that the western European countries are adopting in poor countries, either directly or through the intermediary of their spokespersons, the United Nations system, and human development organizations, is not producing the level of chaos that it is supposed to be generating to be fully effective, but rather is strengthening authoritarianism in poor countries. For example, Egypt, which in the middle of the 20th century was regarded as a center for art or culture, has now transformed completely into a full-fledged authoritarian regime that is more apt than the regimes that exist in Turkey, Russia, India, China, North Korea, Cuba, etc. combined. In other words, the military complex in Egypt is exploiting people's distrust of democracy and human rights to eliminate this political framework from the social order and replace it with an authoritarian regime. Additionally, if the military complex in Egypt continues to act as a mirror and to bounce back whatever concepts are thrown at it or have the potential to destabilize it, then they become capable of making citizens distrust the truthfulness of the western European nations (including the United States in particular) to strengthen human rights and democracy, just as the western European nations and their allies manipulate their citizens into believing that the regime in Egypt is an authority that violates human rights to stay in power. When the military complex in Egypt becomes shielded by citizens, it becomes capable of reversing or deflecting the distrust that the idea of human rights and democracy should be creating among citizens to reflect it away from them and in the opposite direction, or toward the source where it came from.

Many questions beg answers. For one, can the heirs of the old powers prevent the distrust that people in poor nations are developing with the truthfulness of the rich nations (the western European nations, including their global policemen, the United States) to strengthen democracy and human rights when the leaders and the political class of the societies that are poor are preventing such aforesaid ideas from

damaging their cohesion (case of Lebanon or Egypt) with their citizens and are succeeding at convincing their citizens that the mindfulness of the rich nations about democracy and human rights is false? It is important that readers keep in mind that only when the political situation in poor societies stays unstable do the rich nations (the western European nations, including their global policeman, the United States) succeed at keeping their dominant role.

For example, in the case of Lebanon, the western European nations, including the global policeman, the United States, have been allowing the Lebanese to stay divided and distrust each other since 1975. In the case of Egypt, the Western European nations, including the global policeman, the United States, ignored in 2013 the suspension and dissolution of the constitution that the military complex waged in Egypt to remove an elected president from power to let Egypt go back to being ruled militarily after the Egyptians ended in 2011 the control of the military imposed and transitioned into democracy. Most importantly, can the heirs of the old powers control inequality in poor nations without the unequal social and economic landscape pushing individuals to rival them, especially if they rely on a liberal economy while maintaining an authoritative political system?

In other words, China is a country that liberalized its economy in the 1970s while maintaining an authoritarian political system. This strategy increased inequality rather than reducing it. In addition, the growth enjoyed by the families and dynasties that control China has entangled them in a trade war with the United States, as both sides seek to determine who can make the weakest consider the opinion of the strongest. Similarly, the families/dynasties that control Egypt refused to liberate the economy of this country, which has led to increased centralization of power and resources, limiting economic opportunities for the general population. Since Egypt gained independence, the families and dynasties that control the country have increasingly stripped away freedoms and centralized power in the hands of the military complex. Can Western European nations or the United States, for example, prevent the military complex in Egypt from competing against their wealth, power, and status over time (as the Chinese, Russians, Turks, etc., are doing) if they continue to allow Egypt's economy to become inwardly oriented rather than outwardly

focused, similar to the situations in China and Russia? Alternatively, they could make political, economic, or military compromises aimed at tightening their grip on power, similar to the strategies employed in Egypt, which would disrupt the balance of the international order.

When the rich nations (the United States and Western European nations) relied on the communist/socialist regime that exists in China to benefit from its cheap labor, the families/dynasties that control the United States and Western European nations were not expecting that the families/dynasties that control China would later demand respect. If the rich nations (the United States and western European nations) continue to protect the military complex in Egypt as they have been doing since 1953 instead of being in favor of letting everything in this country become liberal (the economy) so everyone would be worried and scratching his head to figure out how to earn his end-of-day meal (as the case is like now in Lebanon), can the United States and the western European nations prevent the Egyptians from demanding they treat them with respect as the Chinese are now doing if the only leeway that a person has to have access to security of income and benefits passes through the intermediary of learning about discipline first (the military complex)?

Countless people are ready to betray their leaders in any country. Finding the right individuals who could successfully execute a mutiny in a nation with a robust security and surveillance program presents a unique challenge.

Can the United States, for example, prevent the military complex in Egypt from starting to compete, in the course of time and things, against its wealth, power, and status when many Americans start to lack discipline (faith or patience) and become unwilling to accept sustaining their livelihood from ill or low-paying jobs (such as military, farming, construction, and informal jobs) while people in Egypt are doing just that, letting the military complex be a good instrument to learn to escape from having to live without discipline?

It seems that the heirs of the old powers are trying to find glory through a different work program than the one their fathers suggested, which is creating a challenge for their successors and for the nations

that they depend on to continue to get their way despite the resistance of others that is more complex than the one that existed before WW2 erupted and is the reason why their fathers engulfed the world in a global war and then decided to unite all members of the human family to try to solve it. This challenge involved finding ways for people to control their actions with calmness.

The world has served as an experimental theater for the elites throughout history. It is not difficult for the families/dynasties that won WW2 (the families/dynasties that control the international order and control the money supply of the world) to engulf the world in a new global war to create a new political and economic reset. The question that begs answers is not about figuring out how to prevent such a destructive event, but rather its utility if such a reset does not strengthen the power of the families/dynasties that won WW2. This is because the last experiment that the families/dynasties that won WW2 tested with to reduce fear and want through tasking the international organization named United Nations with teaching people to be unprepared to surrender freedom to their leaders and political class unless this relationship is intended to increase their happiness offered a rare opportunity to validate that people do not stay faithful to the pledges they make after a hardship touches them so they do not fall back into the same challenges or their children.

For example, the victors of WW2 (the old powers) specified in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR) that every individual has the right to protect the material interests resulting from any scientific, literary, or artistic production of which he (she) is the author. This provision contradicts the political and economic solutions approved by the heirs of the old powers, which stipulated that the international organization known as the United Nations would secure and ensure that outcomes are shared based on equal rights. This discrepancy, along with the reality that all material interests produced by individuals aim to distance humanity from fulfilling the natural roles intended for them, poses a significant challenge to achieving peace and security worldwide. Since 1945, the Lebanese have not been preoccupied with how to secure the standards suggested in the UDHR or the UN Charter, but rather with how to build rockets to defeat and perhaps obliterate the United States and the state of Israel. The United

States and the state of Israel have been acting similarly since 1945. Their primary concern is how to deny the Lebanese rights to develop material interests that could threaten their security. As the previous points indicate, neither country is focused on securing the standards outlined in the UN Charter or the UDHR; instead, they are concerned with maintaining insecurity for themselves and the entire world. The absentmindedness of public officials makes them stay devoted to increasing military and defense spending and to weakening social security mechanisms, which ultimately detracts from addressing the pressing social issues that affect the population's well-being. In the meantime, each country hopes to be blessed with a futurist like Nikola Tesla or Albert Einstein, so that the scientific contributions made can be transformed into practical ideas that would compel others to surrender their freedom.

In fact, satellite imagery of light luminosity at night (as seen from space) is a simple method to quantify the state of affairs in the world or to measure the economic and social imbalance that has existed between societies (nations) since 1945. The societies (nations) whose light luminosity is the brightest are the ones who are denying the societies whose light luminosity is the dimmest rights to relate in accordance with the work program suggested in the UDHR, just as they are doing among themselves. Similarly, the societies whose light luminosity is the dimmest are the ones who are either engulfed in conflicts that the societies whose light luminosity is the brightest instigated or the international organization named the United Nations is teaching its members to be devoted to strengthening democracy and human rights instead of strengthening patience, which is what the founding fathers of the UN suggested that people be devoted to teaching each other in the aftermath of WW2.

Furthermore, hence, people cannot fill the same void space, and no one is prepared to "meet change with changelessness," but everyone wants to use change to his advantage. We can say that this widespread corruption, crime, betrayal, authoritarianism, etc. that has exploded in poor and conservative societies in the aftermath of WW2 is due mainly to rich societies having brought their harmful, unjust, or restrictive traditional practices or social behaviors into such societies that were still resisting societal transformations and preserving values and

customs. Additionally, hence, the rich societies (nations) could not continue to have access to better living standards if the poor and conservative societies become unprepared to resist rapid societal transformations and start to prioritize corruption, crime, betrayal, and authoritarianism, as well; then the bleak peace and security conditions that poor and rich countries alike are knowing recently could be due to many people around the world rejecting continuing to cling to disregard for increasing their strength and stability and wanting that stability and established customs—such as religion, family, and national identity—guide their evolution. This is very serious and worrisome. This is because people who depend on corruption, crime, betrayal, or authoritarianism to increase their happiness, or people who depend on religion, family, or traditional customs to increase their happiness, prioritize such instruments not to secure the goals suggested in the UDHR but to make the weak stay with them and to let them have more power than others. Throughout history, whenever our predecessors in both rich and poor societies were unable to allow the political or religious order they supported to establish hierarchy or organized relations, they became trapped in a zero-sum game where neither the rich nor the poor made any relative gains. Only when our predecessors turned and started to support new types of regimes that are, to some extent, totalitarian or fascist were they able to resolve the political or social stalemate they were in.

If the political or social stalemate that people in rich and poor nations appear to be stuck in is producing a zero-sum game power distribution, then only two scenarios or actionable steps could help the heirs of the old powers to clear the political or social gridlock that they are in so they could continue to get their way despite the resistance of others. The first is if they reduce desires by turning to a new global war or retesting with totalitarianism or fascism in the hope of obtaining different results than our predecessors obtained. The second scenario involves getting people to accept that their relationship with the world should function similarly to how airline (or ship) companies regulate the way crews organize their relationships with the aircraft (or vessel) they are typically assigned to transport from one geographical point to another.

In the airline industry, a pilot can be on duty up to 14 hours only (with only up to 8 hours of flight time), and the minimum rest immediately before duty is 10 hours.⁵⁵ When an airplane reaches its destination, the crew on board is relieved from its duty, and a new crew is assigned control of the aircraft. The pilot is not necessarily assigned to the same aircraft the next day, but rather to an aircraft of the same class. On a ship, the sailors are not assigned a new vessel after each shift and live on board for a limited time before becoming eligible to go on dry land. However, each ship recruits two or three people for every function so each worker can occupy an 8 or 12 hour shift.

A pilot (aviator) is a person who operates the flying controls of an aircraft. An aircraft is a machine that moves through the air. Humans use such flying machines to transport humans or goods from one destination to another. The captain of a ship does the same. The captain moves the ship through the water from one destination to another. On dry land, the infrastructure and technology that people build move humans from one development standard to the next, such as through advancements in transportation, communication, and urban planning. Politicians typically guide human progress from one development standard to a higher one.

If we compare the way humans let aviators (or captains of ships) transport them from one point to another in an aircraft (or a ship) and the way humans let politicians shuttle (progress) them from one development level to another on dry land, we find that the two methods are totally different from one another.

Politicians do not hand over to a new person after an 8-hour shift (or 4-year term) their responsibilities to shuttle (progress) constituents or citizens who appointed (voted) them in their position from one development level to another but stay in this same position for life if they are wealthy or can find wealthy people to back them up.

Could the reason why mankind managed in the airline or shipping industry to have aviators (or captains of ships) successfully transport people from one point to another be because pilots stop to exercise control over the aircraft (ship) that gets handed to them or the lives of

⁵⁵ <https://www.law.cornell.edu/cfr/text/14/91.1059>

the people who are onboard after an 8-hr shift, and the reason why politicians (and judges and law enforcement officers) are unable to shuttle (progress) the people who live on dry land from one developmental level to another peacefully is because the power that gets handed to them is not stripped from them throughout their careers?

Should the public life of any politicians (and judges and law enforcement officers) be limited to a two years' terms to preserve unity, keep the loyalty of politicians to nation over their self-interest (party, sponsors, region, etc.), or as George Washington did put it in his 1796 farewell address to the Americans to prevent that politicians "regard neither truth nor decency; attacking every character, without respect to persons – Public or Private, – who happen to differ from themselves in Politics"⁵⁶

When the terms of politicians (and judges and law enforcement officers) are limited to two years, this strategy would prevent unprincipled men from subverting "the power of the people and to usurp for themselves the reins of government,"⁵⁷ as Washington mentioned in his 1796 farewell address to the Americans, which can happen when people let their loyalty toward their ego, political party, or region dominate loyalty to the nation or values, and which is what has been happening around the world since 1945.

In theory, there is no difference between the duty that a president of a country carries and a person who is appointed to be a politician, a judge, a law enforcement officer, etc. offers. They are all required to prevent infighting and protect citizens. If most constitutions limit a president's term to demonstrate that individuals are committed to democracy rather than to power, how can humanity improve democracy when the positions of kings, politicians, judges, and law enforcement officers are lifetime appointments?

⁵⁶ <https://constitutioncenter.org/interactive-constitution/blog/how-we-wound-up-with-the-constitutions-only-term-limits-amendment>

⁵⁷ <https://www.gilderlehrman.org/history-resources/spotlight-primary-source/washington-proposed-third-term-and-political-parties>

To put it differently, humans are incapable of dispelling complacency. For example, the United States practiced a non-interventionism policy between the late 18th and the first half of the 20th century to prevent being drawn into wars not related to direct territorial self-defense, but then complacency made it ignore risks and impact on growth. No one knows if the United States would have been better off today had it not entangled itself in the power struggle that older societies are embroiled in to determine who could get to tell the weakest to consider the opinion of the strongest before taking action of his own.

However, throughout history, humanity has consistently failed to demonstrate the necessary will to shun or dispel complacency. This means that we should not expect our successors to develop the understanding necessary to prevent change from affecting their behavior or interests, no matter how much they try. This also means that even if the United States had accepted to maintain a non-interventionist policy as George Washington suggested that his successors adopt, others might still intervene in its affairs. Therefore, hence, there is no guarantee that the United States' adversaries would not ally and gang up on its citizens to weaken them if this country maintained an isolationist posture. This means that the United States is better off becoming actively involved in the affairs of other nations to prevent others from influencing global events, upholding international norms, or projecting power that can weaken its superiority. If, in theory, any society is better off pursuing a foreign policy approach that involves actively interfering in the internal affairs of other nations, typically through military action, economic coercion, or political maneuvering, why did George Washington suggest that the United States was better off maintaining a non-interventionist posture?

I have no way of knowing why George Washington suggested that the United States was better off maintaining a non-interventionist posture to ward off any type of threat. What I do know is that George Washington suggested that the United States was better off maintaining a non-interventionist posture after the American separatists gained independence from Great Britain during the American Revolutionary War and not before. George Washington and the rest of the American separatists that were fighting with him to gain independence from Great Britain were not adopting this posture before

independence. The French helped the American separatists to defeat the British during the American Revolutionary War.

In my opinion, George Washington suggested that the United States would be better off maintaining a non-interventionist foreign policy after independence because he believed the American Constitution would serve as a protective barrier for citizens, similar to how the state of Israel relies on the “Iron Dome,” an air defense system designed to intercept rockets and protect its citizens. In fact, the golden dome that the Americans were relying on from 1776 to 1939, when WW2 was regarded to have started, was so effective in making citizens in the United States surrender voluntarily freedom to each other that the founding fathers of the UN (the old powers) proposed that a similar dome be used to protect them against any threat globally. Moreover, the Americans fought with the arsenal of this global dome when they entered and fought on the side of the Allies (Great Britain, France, and others) to help the Allies defeat their adversaries, rather than the military weaponry they were using. This global dome was the work program suggested in the UN Charter and the UDHR. Sadly, the heirs of the old powers chose not to rely on the global dome proposed by their fathers in the UN Charter and the UDHR to address future threats to their dominance, instead opting to depend on their personal power and conscience. So far, the work program that the heirs of the old powers have been relying on to intercept future threats to their superiority has been ineffective. This work program, which consists of letting the "arsenal of democracy" be used by rulers, politicians, judges, and law enforcement officers in UN member states to protect national and market interests instead of dogmatic principles, did not prevent or intercept new conflicts or wars but increased their numbers. Can the heirs of the old powers come up with a versatile work program that would be capable of intercepting threats from different directions simultaneously before the fragmentation that their critical thinkers and servants (governments and international institutions) are effecting among people scatters them in all directions and converts them into shrapnel that hits them?

I find it baffling how the heirs of the old powers conclude that allowing the unchecked power of their critical thinkers and servants (governments and international institutions) since 1945 prevents

societies from becoming chaotic, like Lebanon, or totalitarian, like Egypt, thus ensuring the erosion of their power. What I do know is that if the heirs of the old powers continue to let the power limitation of their critical thinkers and servants (governments and international institutions) stay unbounded as has been the case since 1945, it would not be possible for the patronage system that would rise from deepening retaliation and fascism.

The heirs of the old powers can throw their weight around on the global stage when they stop the idea of democracy from being a collective effort to supply weapons to the individuals who are rivaling to determine who could get to make the weakest consider his opinion and shuttle people from one developmental level to another into an effort where people believe that laws are binding on all, the strong and the weak. Can the heirs of the old powers avoid their power decaying when their critical thinkers and servants (governments and international institutions) are converting the institutions they need that people see as permanent rule setters into transient platforms that different people use to buy and sell perspectives?

Once again, I have no way of knowing how the heirs of the old powers are concluding that they would be safe with their critical thinkers and servants increasing fear and want around the world when people lack the power to know which deed strengthens a person's power and which deed undermines his status. What I do know is that on 29 December 1940—nearly a year before the United States entered the Second World War—U.S. President Franklin D. Roosevelt delivered a radio broadcast to the American people in which he expressed the intent of the United States to help Great Britain during WW2. In his speech, Roosevelt mentioned that "Some of us like to believe that even if Britain falls, we are still safe, because of the broad expanse of the Atlantic and of the Pacific."⁵⁸

Since 1945, the Americans have been undermining the instructions that George Washington suggested in his 1796 farewell address to them to stay strong, including disobeying the standards included in the UN Charter and UDHR, prompting many people around the world to paint the United States as an obstacle to improving the ideas of

⁵⁸ <https://www.mtholyoke.edu/acad/intrel/WorldWar2/arsenal.htm>

freedom, democracy, and human rights instead of a facilitator. In fact, the large number of acts of disregard that the Americans are increasingly committing contrary to the standards suggested in the UN Charter and UDHR is prompting people around the world to believe that if the United States were disintegrated, the ends set forth in the preamble of the UN Charter would be quick in getting attained.

This supine and short-sighted approach that the Americans have been exhibiting since 1945 cannot be due to the Americans becoming unpredictable and incapable of engaging in global affairs, but rather because humans are constantly erasing history to not let its events tell facts that would make people be unprepared to surrender freedom to the strongest. From 1776 until 1945, it was the United States that was “the spearhead of resistance to world conquest,” as Roosevelt mentioned in his radio broadcast, which he delivered on 29 December 1940, and not Great Britain, France, and the rest of the western European monarchs and republics. Great Britain, France, and the rest of the western European monarchs and republics were adopting an outward posture in global affairs and exploiting and subjugating societies around the world.

The dereliction of the United States of its duty of ensuring that people around the world continue to regard the American way of life as a global ethos since 1945 cannot be because the Americans decided to disengage from letting the idea of freedom redeem the world but because the heirs of the old powers (the western European monarchs and republics) believe that they can let their eyes look beyond history and safeguard their interests without drawing lessons from its events.

Indeed, the evolution of technological warfare, such as long-range missiles, cyberattacks, aircraft that can be refueled in midair, submarines that can stay submerged for an extended period of time, etc., makes it unnecessary to rely on laws and standards to make the weakest surrender freedom to the fittest. However, can technology or artificial intelligence be the savior that the heirs of the old powers hope for to maintain their strength and stability when the lifetime of any technology is short and all a person needs to threaten the wealth and military superiority of the heirs of the old powers is access to a computer and an internet connection? Today, it is not necessary for a

society to build weapons of mass destruction to threaten adversaries but to have a person develop algorithms that can penetrate into the systems that control the functionality of such weapons or instruments.

Therefore, since it is not possible to know any longer who is the true “spearhead of resistance to world conquest” and who is the false spearhead after the heirs of the old powers decided to let technology or artificial intelligence form a protective dome over their wealth, power, and security, as compared to letting the work program suggested in the UN Charter and UDHR provide this shield, we can say that the world has entered a new *Great Game*.⁵⁹ that occurred between western European colonial forces during the 19th century. This new Great Game is no longer a chessboard, as per the way Zbigniew Brzezinski (1928–2017), a Polish American diplomat, unfolded it in his book, *The Grand Chessboard*,⁶⁰ because, in theory, any teenager today can be a challenge to the US, British, French, Russian, Chinese, etc. global preeminence or dominance.

Furthermore, hence, the new Great Game that has swept the world today is one that would be crowned by a deep atmosphere of distrust, talk of wars, and most importantly, through the reliance on preemptive and preventive strategies, the fittest is going to be the one who could emphatically arrive at converting propaganda into becoming a dangerous and deadly weapon, knowing it is a weapon with a double cutting edge. Propaganda is a powerful tool to control the narrative to persuade audiences to support a particular agenda, but false information can also be a very dangerous tool when the individuals who use such warfare to disregard or distort the truth instead of to improve accountability or social justice. Can the heirs of the old powers persuade people around the world to make the WWII war aims dominate their attention when the rulers, politicians, judges, and law enforcement officers who are supposed to be leading domestic politics and relations by example on their behalf so people would want to stay with them are busy prioritizing the benefits of democracy, economic opportunity, employment, health care, social security, etc. to serve their self-interest and the best interests of the donors and political

⁵⁹https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Great_Game#:~:text=The%20Great%20Game%20was%20a,in%20Persia%20and%20British%20India.

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

action committees that help them to get elected or appointed in their roles, as compared to reducing fear and want, which is a precursor to all acts of physical aggression anywhere in the world?

I have no way of knowing how the heirs of the old powers are concluding that the whole world believes that their empires were dismantled in the aftermath of WW2 and that people are going to tolerate indefinitely the unfair way they are leveraging power with their global policemen, the United States, and the international institutions that they dominate, including meddling in every political action and everywhere (and in every world island) across the world. For example, when most people think of France, they think of France, the country that only exists in Europe and which some sources rank as the 42nd country by total area.⁶¹ This France accounts for only a share of all France's land. If we integrate the overseas land areas that are scattered across all the corners of the earth and that France still controls to this day, we find that France's ranking jumps to being classified as the 5th biggest country.⁶² In fact, considering that the number of nuclear weapons that France possesses is greater than the number Great Britain possesses, France is capable of countering any threat anywhere on the planet, perhaps better than the United States or Great Britain due to large territories that it still controls to this day. This reasoning also explains why France projects power to this day and its seat among the great powers is always reserved.

Great Britain, France, and other European countries European countries (the old powers) ruled the world until 1945, but after this date, this landscape started changing. The pace of global change altered the assumptions and strategies made by the victors of World War II, and they were counting on their enforcement to maintain power and transfer it over to their heirs. So far, the changes that ensued ruptured the outlooks that the victors of WW2 were counting on their mechanisms keeping the societies they vanquished during WW2 and the societies that they freed when WW2 was regarded to have ended staying with them and letting them have more power than others. As of 1945, most people around the world do not want to consider the opinions of Western European countries, the United

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

⁶² <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=kXP8F4TIZ0U>

States as their global policeman, or the international institutions they dominate before taking action on their own. The people who live in the world islands that are still controlled by the old powers (i.e., western European nations) consider it beneficial to them to be attached to the people who treated their fathers brutally, as they believe that such connections provide economic stability and security in a rapidly changing global landscape. This is their prerogative.

In this work, I want to explore whether the political strategy that the heirs of the old powers chose to follow—allowing the societies they defeated in World War II and those they liberated at the end of the war to manage their own politics and relationships without following the UN Charter of the UDHR—can enable them to control all major diplomatic and military decisions without seriously harming their own power and stability. For instance, can the scattered islands around the world, which the heirs of the old powers use as bases, along with the large embassies built by the United States and the international organizations they dominate, function as fortresses that alter the deep-rooted traits of local populations over generations to maintain their status as second-class citizens, or would those populations repel these influences as they have done with others in the past to secure their own autonomy?

The insecurity that swept the world as of 1945 seems to stem from two sources. The first is that the heirs of the old powers (the families/dynasties that control the western European monarchs and republics) are not spending their days reading about world history to draw lessons, including getting involved in domestic and foreign politics and relations or maintaining close personal control of all major diplomatic and military decisions, but letting their critical thinkers and servants (chiefs, politicians, judges, military officials, etc.) carry out this obligation from approving bills before they become law to overseeing overseas possessions, including military outposts. The second is if the critical thinkers and servants (chiefs, politicians, judges, military officials, etc.) that the heirs of the old powers (the families/dynasties that control the western European monarchs and republics) are depending on their wisdom to maintain their strength and stability are doing no reading about world history to draw lessons

and are thinking that they are mightier and cleverer than their predecessors.

Not all people gamble with their power, wealth, and status. It is hard to believe that the heirs of the old powers (the families/dynasties that control the western European monarchs and republics) would take risks with their wealth, power, and status and avoid getting involved in domestic politics and international politics, especially since they are the ones who approve laws and manage their overseas territories and military bases.

Hence it is inconceivable to suppose that the heirs of the old powers (the families/dynasties that control the western European monarchs and republics) take chances or risks related to any domestic and international politics and relations that can threaten their wealth, power and status for fear of deception, the unpredictability that their critical thinkers and servants (governments and international institutions) are demonstrating could be due to the international order that their fathers (the old powers) laid out following winning WW2 being ripped apart and into pieces. This could carry terrible consequences for the heirs of the old powers (the families/dynasties that control the western European monarchs and republics).

In other words, the heirs of the old powers (the families/dynasties that control the western European monarchs and republics) can no longer import values into any country, as the people of the world have gained freedom, new maps have been created, and technology has diminished the influence of religiosity. The only plan that the heirs of the old powers (the western European monarchs and republics) can rely on to maintain their strength and stability is to either wage war on the stability of other societies, making them dependent on a change in values for protection, or to deepen alliances by increasing the happiness of the societies they partner with to avoid being absorbed by another growing power. If the heirs of the old powers (the families/dynasties that control the western European monarchs and republics) accepted to adopt a value-based pragmatism that improves democracy, freedom, human rights, and rules, the insecurity that swept the world would not have occurred. Hence, we cannot expect the heirs of the old powers (the families/dynasties that control the western

European monarchs and republics) to be prepared to prioritize democracy, freedom, human rights, and rules in their value-based pragmatism that they would be offering the societies that they want to be allied with because this action would mean forgoing part of their security or happiness in the process. This means that the ongoing breakdown of the international would continue to go on until either the power, status, and wealth of the heirs of the old powers disappear or their plans and luck aid them and they emerge victorious so they continue to control the new world order that would emerge. Many questions beg answers. Can the heirs of the old powers (the Western European monarchs and republics) keep the people they conquered and freed, rich or poor, with them and give them more power than others when the new world order appears to be based on "the right of might" and not "the might of right" in determining who would be first and who would be second? That is to say, can the heirs of the old powers (the families/dynasties that control the western European monarchs and republics) make the people whom they vanquished during WW2 and the ones they freed not harbor for them in their hearts anything other than hate when the rulers and political leaders (and judges and law enforcement officers) who are supposed to be securing in every nation a healthy peacetime life for inhabitants on their behalf are appointing themselves deputies of God on earth and considering themselves exempt from the appeal of the founding fathers of the UN to them to lead by example?

It looks as if the tension, chaos, lawlessness, poverty, and dramatic weakening of central government authority in most nations, including the weakening of the international rule-based postwar world order that Great Britain, France, and the rest of the old powers (the victors of WW2) invented to maintain their strength and security in the aftermath of WW2, are crumbling before their eyes. In other words, the tension that exists around the world would not calm down, nor would the plans that the heirs of the old powers and their critical thinkers and servants (governments and international institutions) would make people change and be ready to accept to surrender freedom to the world governmental order and system that the old powers suggested invented without new mechanisms to enforce rules, accountability, and democratic control being integrated. Be that as it may, the deplorable state of peace and security that the world is knowing could mark the

collapse of the Anglosphere and the Western European nations' role in setting trends or as a great power, giving rise to a new authority in which the Western European nations would have a lesser role or possibly no role.

To prevent the Anglosphere from disappearing or being absorbed by a competing ideology, the heirs of the old powers must organize people's relationships with the world in a manner similar to how airline or shipping companies regulate their crews' interactions with the aircraft or vessels they are assigned to transport between geographical locations, as I mentioned earlier, before it is too late.

Actually, the heirs of the old powers (the western European monarchs and republics) confront a difficult problem: avoiding the disappearance of the Anglosphere or its absorption by another growing ideology. This is because the political situation facing the heirs of the old powers is similar to that of an aviator who, after taking off to fly an aircraft to a specific destination, changes course midflight and either takes the passengers on a joyride or lands in a different city. Additionally, when an aviator flies an aircraft between two airports, his shift lasts for eight hours, and he disembarks from the aircraft upon arrival at the destination. A new pilot or aviator flies the aircraft to a new destination. The heirs of the old powers (the western European monarchs and republics) want the individuals who administer the new exclusive territories they partitioned the world into and called states to stay permanently in charge of the political structures they depend on to enforce the standards they legitimize.

If the heirs of the old powers continue to see themselves as the only individuals tasked by God to end lawlessness, poverty, and injustice and improve democracy, human rights, freedom, etc. on earth and to exclude the rulers, political class, judges, law enforcement officers, etc. that they depend on for wisdom in UN member states to maintain their dominant role and such similar privilege, then the world is likely to progress in a backward and uncivilized manner. This reality could take away from them the luxury of approving each bill that becomes law or holding on to a large share of the world's islands so they can be within a stone's throw of the nations that they still control.

In my opinion, the challenge facing the world today does not stem from the heirs of the old powers abandoning their determination to reduce fear and want worldwide, but rather from the existence of an infinite number of individuals who believe they have been anointed as God's representatives on earth. Put differently, instead of all the societies that the late Queen of England granted independence to staying faithful to her and working with her to secure the work program suggested in the UN Charter or the UDHR in the same way she stayed faithful to her father's wish (King George VI) to end domination and to accept that people around the world be free and be capable of exercising self-determination, all the societies that with her father they freed refuse to obey the political order that was legitimized in those two documents and are all acting like her son is doing after he inherited the throne as the deputy of God on earth. Can the heirs of the old powers count on the individuals who are enforcing the laws they legitimized in the different exclusive territories that they created in the aftermath of WW2 and called states to rejuvenate their power when the problem in the world today is about having 192 world governments that the old powers created, whose members refuse to carry out the obligations that their fathers pledged they would be devoted to securing, and are all considering that God anointed them as his representatives on earth?

Once again, I have no way of knowing how the heirs of the old powers count on making all the critical thinkers and servants (governments and international institutions) that are helping them rejuvenate their power ready to carry out the obligations that the fathers of those helpers pledged that their children would be devoted to securing if the victors of WW2 let them be born free. What I do know is that if the heirs of the old powers continue to let their critical thinkers and servants (governments and international institutions) live in denial about the importance of using their role to be a force for positive change, it would not be possible to avoid the Anglosphere collapse. Organizing free and fair elections is also crucial to prevent the collapse of the Anglosphere. This is because this group-decision-making process that people use to choose an individual to hold public office or a position of responsibility is not an objective mechanism but a subjective process. Positions of responsibility are not filled by philosopher kings or individuals who inherently dislike dishonest gain;

rather, just as football players, singers, scientists, masons, carpenters, and dough makers each demonstrate unique skills, any person with wealth can become a president, politician, chief, or leader. When the wrong person is appointed to a position of responsibility, the individual involved cannot improve the fairness or effectiveness of existing systems, which can lead to poor decision-making and a lack of accountability in governance. To the contrary, when the wrong candidates are elected to fill a position of responsibility, a shift in the balance of power is inevitable.

For example. If the victors of WW2 (the old powers) or later their heirs had backed the appointment of the right political leaders in Lebanon instead of supporting the wrong leaders as they have done since 1945, this country would not have known the insecurity that its people have lived with since then. Similarly, if the victors of WW2 (the old powers) or their later heirs had allowed the United States, which they assigned to act as a global policeman, to ensure that UN member states implement the work program suggested in the UN Charter or the UDHR, mankind might have avoided the chaos and lawlessness that currently exist in the world, where 193 nation-states compete to determine how the weakest can consider the opinions of the fittest before taking action on their own. It is not possible to secure the aspirations suggested in the UN Charter or the UDHR when we have 193 nations that are not united to secure the standards suggested in such documents but are united to determine who could reenact the same history that the British Empire achieved of becoming an empire on which the sun never sets. Can the heirs of the old powers make the critical thinkers and servants (governments and international institutions) whom they are depending on their wisdom to control the political and economic order in UN member states behave in the same way aviators relinquish control of the aircraft that they were piloting once they reach their destination after they permitted those helpers to regard themselves as deputies of God on earth, just as they regard themselves?

The heirs of the old powers' decision to limit the US's freedom after WWII has left them and the Anglosphere in a deep quagmire. As I said before, if the victors of WW2 (the old powers) had granted the United States in 1958 rights pursuant to its interference in the Lebanese Civil

War of 1958 ⁶³ to flush out the feudal families/dynasties and warlords who were denying the Lebanese right to cooperate based on the work program suggested in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights instead of tasking the United States with calibrating relations with them (the Lebanese political class), Lebanon would have not known the total political and economic breakdown or disorder that has been waging in this country since 1958, perhaps. The same story repeats in almost each new country that was created in the aftermath of WW2 or has known a civil war since. In fact, if the heirs of the old powers had observed the work program that was suggested in the UN Charter or the UDHR, they would not have agreed that an outlaw with a 10 million US dollar bounty on his head be president of Syria in 2024, proving through this strange political move that they are not working to deliver the results suggested in the UN Charter but to keep the world depraved and without any accountability or oversight.

Indeed, the decision made by the heirs of the old powers and their global policeman, the United States, to place a 10 million US dollar bounty on the head of an outlaw and elevate him to the presidency of Syria in 2024, following the removal of his predecessor from power, underscores their lack of desire to uphold the principles outlined in the preamble of the United Nations Charter and their belief that they own the world.

Many people believed that they could conquer anything, and therefore, the irrational actions that contradict unwritten social rules that the heirs of the old powers are taking could be because they perceive that their unlimited power gives them the right to humble whomever they want or to promote whomever they want, but without the abuse of power that they are exercising hardening people's hearts to the point of ganging on them and stripping them of their glory in the same way all the kings who became arrogant faced.

Evidently, this disinterest that the heirs of the old powers are expressing toward having their critical thinkers and servants (governments and international institutions) observe the standards suggested in the UN Charter or the UDHR, including carrying out their responsibilities in the same effective way aviators transport people

⁶³ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/1958_Lebanon_crisis

from one location to another, is only possible because the heirs of the old powers are convinced that wagering on technology and on the muscles of political leaders and the political class, who are good at nothing except making false promises and appearing friendly when they are actually malicious, is enough to prevent their wealth, status, power, and the Anglosphere from collapsing. In other words, the heirs of the old powers do not believe that if they strengthen state institutions, advance economic reform, and ensure a common disarmament of UN member states, such plans are necessary to rejuvenate their power.

Throughout history, individuals and societies that relied on wealth, military superiority, racism, exclusion, oppression, and colonialism—including attempts to erase other cultures despite resistance—discovered that the power to control the lives of others belonged not to them, but to the people they were oppressing. In this context, as long as the heirs of the old powers continue to suppress human ingenuity and prevent it from reaching the level of artificial intelligence, the historical dynamic that has shaped humanity will persist until a specific race, religion, or political doctrine achieves supremacy over all others; only then will the most capable society have a good chance of exercising such ultimate supremacy in the future.

The Bible says Jesus told his disciple, "The student is not above the teacher, but everyone who is fully trained will be like their teacher." (Luke 6:40) If the student is not above the teacher nor a servant above his master, then there is a good chance that the supremacy that the heirs of the old powers have enjoyed since 1945 will be stripped from them and handed to one of the feudal families/dynasties or warlords, whose wisdom they have been counting on since 1945 to rejuvenate their power.

For example, the Israelis have been keeping the Palestinians fragmented and living under oppression since 1948 in the same way societies that lived under apartheid or in the days of Pharaoh endured. Furthermore, the Israelis have been continuously shrinking the social space available to Palestinians and preventing displaced individuals from returning to their homes, arguing that such a return would demographically overwhelm their national security and threaten its

existence. Since 1950, when the US entered the Korean War, it has bullied societies that don't heed its advice before acting, like Israel does to Palestine, and maybe worse. But since 1950, the US has not been as successful as Israel, which seems to jump from one quagmire to another after each war, often resulting in prolonged conflicts and instability in the regions they intervene in.

What is strange and challenging to comprehend is that while all the abuse that the Israelis are subjecting the Palestinians to since 1948 is intended to deny them rights to self-determination, and all the wars that the United States fought since 1950 are supposedly to permit the countries that its rulers were denying citizens rights to self-determination to exercise such privileges, we find that most people around the world are fine with the Israelis' staying denied rights to self-determination but not okay with the United States using force to push the countries that its rulers deny citizens rights to self-determination to exercise such standards.

Indeed, the withdrawal of the United States from rebuilding the societies that it meddled with and wrecked their political status and social fabric without rebuilding them back into the way they promised since 1945, and the incapacity of the societies that the United States interfered in their political status supposedly to help them to be free to unite and to carry out the obligations contained in the UDHR in their relations with one another, support that there is a systematic and highly institutionalized order (doctrine) that is okay with the societies whose human progress was destroyed staying disintegrated. This systematic and highly institutionalized order (doctrine) wants people around the world to keep resenting their governments and governments abusing citizens, just as the Palestinians and the Israelis are involved in a perpetual conflict if one group does not defeat the other or agree to settle their disputes through negotiation and arbitration.

Many people have suggested that secret societies control the world and that such societies foment world wars to strengthen the argument for the creation of a worldwide government or for the prevention of mankind from making any progress on its aspirations to secure the ends suggested in the preamble of the United Nations Charter.

Then again, if powerful secret societies rule the world and their members feel secure in the United States' biased support of Israel—usually shown by the United States allowing Israel to take any action to stay strong, unlike its interference with other countries—it signals that his attitude could be motivated by two rationales. The first is if the members of this systematic and highly institutionalized order (doctrine) believe that by undoing what people build, nothing can threaten their superiority. The second is if the members of such a secretive society believe they are invincible.

I have no way of knowing which scenario between the aforementioned ones could be prompting the heirs of the old powers into relying on divide and conquer to maintain their strength and stability. I know that people can't tell right from wrong. If not, all the fallen nations, kingdoms, and empires could have avoided collapse. And so, since no nation, kingdom, or empire managed to prevent its collapse, when citizens realized that their leaders and political class (judges and law enforcement officers) were cheating them, can the heirs of the old powers prevent the feudal families/dynasties or warlords, whom they have been counting on their wisdom since 1945 to rejuvenate their power in UN member states, from outsmarting them and stripping them of their power in the same way the leaders of the Israeli government are doing if the servant is not above the master and with the right training he will be like his master?

It looks as if the large number of ideological and geopolitical crises that are swaging across the world in recent years are due to heirs of the old powers being against taking into account in their plans the suggestion Abraham Lincoln made to the Americans in his Gettysburg address in 1863 about ensuring that the US government be ruled and operated “by the people, for the people” to arrive at having such a legal entity serve the collective interests and welfare of citizens and not the specific interests of specific individuals, races, religions, etc., as the case is between the Israelis and the Palestinians or their Muslim neighbors. Similarly, the heirs of the old powers and their critical thinkers and servants (governments and international institutions) do not seem to be interested in promoting the Four Freedoms—freedom of speech, freedom of worship, freedom from want, and freedom from fear—that President Franklin D. Roosevelt outlined in his January 6,

1941, State of the Union address, which are also enshrined in the UN Charter to build a full and complete structure of a world order under law, but want their critical thinkers and servants to use their authority to serve their best interests instead of the best interests of citizens.

Animals do not betray or backstab each other, but humans do. Likewise, animals do not build permanent settlements or deny weaker species access to their natural wealth and resources; humans do. And so, since humans cannot distinguish between right and wrong, unlike animals, we can say that as long as people regard themselves above the rest of the existing species and choose to put obstacles in each other's way—by choice, not by nature—our history will continue to repeat the past.

In addition, we can say that for as long as the heirs of the old powers fail to recognize that people outgrow their convictions when their rules do not humble themselves and serve the needs of citizens in the same way they outgrow their clothes, they would be just institutionalizing freedom in constitutions, but without any society or nation making any salient effort to function in accordance with the work program laid out in the UN Charter or the UDHR. For example, the families and dynasties that control Great Britain want both the British people and individuals around the world to prioritize democracy, human rights, and freedom, all while continuing to uphold the monarchy, which they claim reflects the wishes of the British people. The families/dynasties that control France, on the other hand, want citizens in France and people around the world to prioritize democracy, human rights, or freedom, while civil liberties in France rank either at par with the ones that exist in China, Russia, India, Saudi Arabia, North Korea, or Cuba, or just below.

Today, people around the world refuse to accept rhetoric that encourages them to put their lives on hold, as their fathers did until they moved to the afterlife. All people want that their rulers and political class administer legal institutions in the same way airline companies successfully transport passengers between two airports, including administering pilots and crew. Aviators do not monopolize the aircraft assigned to them for more than 8–16 hours. The heirs of the old powers want the public officials they appoint in UN member

states to establish guidelines for everyday behavior throughout their lives, and when these officials retire or transfer, they intend for this responsibility to be passed on to their children or designated individuals.

Once again, I have no way of knowing how the heirs of the old powers plan to create economic opportunity, employment, social security, and "adequate health care" for all the people of age after they tasked the international organization named the United Nations in the last 70 years with teaching people around the world about how they are entitled to such rights legally, including pushing them into refusing to obey their rulers unless they improve their access to such benefits, thus making it impossible to prevent lawlessness, chaos, and aggression from rising around the world.

Furthermore, hence the unprecedented worldwide chaos, lawlessness, and aggression that has struck (swept) the world pursuant to the decision of the heirs of the old powers to deviate away from the work program that the founding fathers of the UN (their fathers) counselled them to remain faithful to its principles in favor of tasking the international organization named the United Nations and other non-state actors with teaching people to stop being tolerant as they were doing has damaged the compass of national and international unity between people. This signifies that only two scenarios could prevent the ongoing downfall of the democratic institutions from eventually engulfing the world in a social revolution, which could also have severe ramifications on the sustainability of the Anglosphere. The first is whether the heirs of the old powers create a new reset through a new global war. The second is if the heirs of the old powers begin to make their critical thinkers and servants (governments and international institutions) lead by example.

I have no way of knowing which of the two scenarios the heirs of the old powers plan to rely on to prevent the new order of chaos, lawlessness, aggression, and tyranny—already spreading across every continent—from disintegrating their wealth, status, and power. As I said earlier, hence, it is unrealistic to expect that the critical thinkers and servants (governments and international institutions) that the heirs of the old powers are relying on their wisdom to maintain their

strength and stability will lead by example (even though digital currencies would improve the currency management system). The only way to stop the chaos, lawlessness, aggression, and tyranny that has swept the world and is destroying unity and promoting discord worldwide at an unprecedented rate is to make all the positions that deal with formulating the rules and regulations regarding matters of governance revolve in the same way aircraft pilots work today. In other words, structure all the jobs that deal with formulating the rules and regulations regarding matters of governance to function in the same way a vehicle leasing contract works. At the end of the lease, the lessor returns the car to the manufacturer instead of keeping it for life and passing it to heirs. In my opinion, the canton political system in Switzerland could serve as a foundational model, but it should incorporate stricter rules regarding term limits and selection processes. In particular, ensure that no individual serves as a politician (senator, congressman, governor, or mayor), a judge, or a law enforcement officer for more than a 2-4 year term during their lifetime. In addition, the positions of senator, congressman, governor, mayor, and judge should be filled through a lottery system, similar to practices in antiquity, or by a show of hands (not electronic voting) so that everyone can see who is voting for whom and to prevent any fraudulent activities. No educational background is necessary to be a senator, congressman, governor, mayor, etc., but to be a judge, an incumbent must be a lawyer or a wise person who hates dishonest gain. Positions in law enforcement would be filled by conscriptions for a term of 1–2 years and handled locally at the societal, city, or village level. The level of education will determine the rank that a person can achieve in law enforcement positions.

When functions that deal with formulating the rules and regulations regarding matters of governance revolve and cover appointments of short durations, such arrangements will reduce corruption and improve democracy; hence, it makes it very difficult for the rich, in particular, to pass and enforce the laws that suit them. In addition, technology is more and more eliminating the need to have real humans administer governments, keeping positions that deal with determining and enforcing laws revolving. This makes it very hard for any person to abuse his authority for more than 2–3 years instead of doing it throughout his career, which is the case right now.

Indeed, the appalling number of people, rich and poor, whom the intergovernmental organization named the United Nations and other non-state actors have enlisted on behalf of the heirs of the old powers to soldier to improve democracy or justice, while all those involved in this fight refuse to accept any of the principles suggested in the UN Charter or the UDHR, has blotted out the democratic life that people were supposed to be cooperating collectively to strengthen.

If this unhealthy attitude that has blotted people's relations blots people's sight in the same way dark clouds blot out the sun, then there is a good chance that as it gets in motion or marches in the same way water constantly moves if not contained, then there is a good chance that the negative energy or emotions that it would be uplifting or draining supercharge and threaten the balance of any person who comes in contact with it.

In the human body, when an intruder (a virus) attacks, hundreds of thousands of cells start to organize complex defenses until dishing out a swift death to the invading assailant. This battle occurs within the human body, unseen by the person who is feeling ill. In addition, the flesh and water that exist in the human body do not appear to be just inanimate and useless tissues or substances, but science has shown that such forms of matter change shape and store information and frequencies that occur around them, including rearranging themselves as needs be, which suggests a dynamic interaction with the environment that contributes to the body's overall function and health. They, along with the bones and spirit, form the physical body that some of us rely on to get others to consider our opinion before acting.

Since antiquity, the only idea that humanity still agrees upon despite all their differences has been that they are different from the creatures with whom they cohabit on earth, even though there has not been any evidence proving the validation of this distinction. Yet despite the efforts of many who had lived to prove otherwise, an equal number toiled to show that humans are beasts and live like animals. However, history has demonstrated that only those who were well-prepared were able to persuade the weakest to consider the viewpoint of the strongest within these recurring patterns.

For example, before WW2 erupted, Great Britain, France, and the rest of the old powers (the western European monarchs and republics) succeeded in conscripting all the societies that they were dominating to defend democracy and freedom, so our relations do not continue to exist in the same way beasts do. The ideas proposed in the UN Charter and the UDHR inspired people around the world to be willing to lay down their lives in order to be declared victors. The decision of the heirs of the old powers to spend the last 70 years financing the intergovernmental organization named the United Nations and other non-state actors in training and preparing the people around the world in the art of how to put pressure on the rich (i.e., rulers and political class) to share outcomes with them on equal rights could necessitate that the heirs of the old powers conscript a new round of people to defend them as their fathers did when the same situation existed in the world before WW2 erupted. This also means that two scenarios could unfold in the world in the near future if people continue to be divided into a rational, softhearted, and soft-headed group who want to reduce fear and want another group who are selfish and who want others to consider their opinion before taking action on their own, pursuant to people having been already freed, and we know that there is no other method that individuals could cooperate under except based on respect for the principles of equal rights, and they are doing it as of 1945.

The first scenario is that if the insecurity sweeping the world continues to grow, a social revolution aimed at granting people true independence, peace, and freedom of expression may occur. The second is that the heirs of the old powers continue to buy time through returning the world to function as per pre-1945 political systems (i.e., isolationism, dictatorship, socialism, etc.) in the hope that all the crackdowns that security forces would be carrying out against civilians (i.e., demonstrators who would be in favor of improving democracy) would die out and spare the world from becoming engulfed in a global war in the course of time and things.

Obviously, no nation can claim that it is immune from discord that starts off as grassroots resistance, which in the course of time and things becomes organized, daring, and battle-hardened. In fact, this is how the old powers—Great Britain, France, the United States, China,

Japan, and others—transformed into great powers. Can the heirs of the old powers (the families/dynasties who depend on the Anglosphere to transform the conditions and outcomes that matter to them) stop their critical thinkers and servants (governments and international institutions) from political infighting that places their personal interests over the best interest of the common good so those helpers can protect them and spare them from confronting the same fate that awaited the aristocrats during the French Revolution when they allowed treachery, lawlessness, poverty, etc. to be the norm to inject power into the rejuvenation of their power rather than commitment to democracy?

Luckily, only the heirs of the old powers (the families/dynasties who depend on the Anglosphere to transform the conditions and outcomes that matter to them) need to answer this aforementioned question; hence, it is their power, wealth, and status that would be at stake if the world peace and security continue to diminish and people consider that only a new global war (i.e., increasing death rates by large masses) could bring back order.

What I can share, however, is that in 2018, Abdel Fattah al-Sisi, President of Egypt, made a speech in which he announced that the civil resistance and disobedience that spread throughout Egypt in 2011⁶⁴ will never reoccur again.⁶⁵ I have no way of knowing if this pledge means that Egyptians will return to living under domination, as they did before World War II erupted. What I do know is that the police brutality, state of emergency laws, lack of political freedom, political censorship, lack of civil liberty, and lack of freedom of speech that have existed in Egypt since the year Abdel Fatah al-Sisi became president of Egypt in 2014 have transformed (with the military complex) the modernization of this country drastically. This strategy has reduced corruption, unemployment, food-price inflation, and disobedience, among other issues.

In addition, if we accept Jesus's suggestion that “the student is not above the teacher, but everyone who is fully trained will be like their teacher,” then it is likely that the power being gained by the military

⁶⁴ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/2011_Egyptian_revolution

⁶⁵ https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=WBzQQ_xMtUc&ab_channel=AlHayahTVNetwork

complex in Egypt will have serious repercussions for the heirs of the old powers, especially if the concepts of good and evil are interconnected. When the Egyptians practice tolerance but without practicing democracy, this strategy weakens the Anglosphere. This is because political freedom, freedom of speech, civil liberty, assembly, and association are cornerstones of the Anglosphere. When societies preach democracy, liberal interventionism, and self-determination without practicing such principles, the individuals involved would be weakening the Anglosphere rather than increasing or broadening its footprints in the international order.

Accordingly, if Abdel Fattah al-Sisi, president of Egypt, and his critical thinkers and servants (military complex, security complex, judicial complex, etc.) succeed in preventing the Egyptians from protesting, demonstrating, rioting, resisting, or marching against the socio-economic strategies that he (and the military complex) are legitimizing, as he pledged in 2018, this then signifies one of two things. The first is if the heirs of the old powers (the families/dynasties who control the Anglosphere) decided to hand to the Egyptians (or the Chinese, Russians, Cubans, Jordanians, Saudis, Indians, Mexicans, etc.) the Anglosphere on a plate in the same way Herodias, the wife of Herod Antipas, asked that John the Baptist be beheaded and his head handed to her on a plate.⁶⁶ The second is if the heirs of the old powers (the families/dynasties who control the Anglosphere) believe they are invincible.

Throughout history, those who achieved freedom have consistently refused to return to a life of dominance. Only the United States has genuinely defended freedom since 1776. All the other societies used democracy and freedom to enhance their dominance and wealth, often prioritizing the interests of a select few over the well-being of the majority. In other words, this situation serves as a source of harm and damage to those societies. Furthermore, for as long as governments create jobs for citizens, reduce taxes, and improve social security services, citizens accept tolerating the legitimized standards, but when citizens do not benefit from such governmental services, then it is only a matter of time before people withdraw their obligation to obey. We can say that all the insecurity that the world is knowing is because the

⁶⁶ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Beheading_of_John_the_Baptist

world is in the process of being reversed into becoming ruled dictatorially to save the Anglosphere and prevent its collapse. Only if the heirs of the old powers, along with their critical thinkers and servants (including governments and international institutions), stop considering themselves exempt from the principles outlined in the UN Charter or the UDHR and lead by example, could the world once again achieve peace.

Then again, throughout history, no society has managed to increase its happiness except at the expense of other people living in misery. The victors of WW2 dismantled their empires and invited the societies they had vanquished, as well as those they had freed, to uphold the standards outlined in the UN Charter and the UDHR in order to end the historical dynamic that has accompanied mankind. Since the heirs of the old powers decided to deviate away from the work program that the founding fathers of the UN proposed to them in 1945 to secure the ends suggested in the preamble of the United Nations (i.e., to let governments provide political and economic solutions, including developing parameters for everyday behavior) and preferred to have the intergovernmental organization named the United Nations and human development organizations prepare people in the political, economic, social, educational, and cultural fields, this signifies that the families/dynasties who won WW2 decided to let the destiny of the Anglosphere in the hands of the people instead of keeping it in their own hands.

In the next chapter, I plan to continue to investigate to understand if this choice that the heirs of the old powers made to have governments and non-state actors such as the intergovernmental organization named the United Nations and human development organizations prepare people in the political, economic, social, educational, and cultural fields but without observing the standards suggested in the UN Charter or the UDHR is helping people to be tolerant and ready to stay with them and letting them have more power than others, or is it increasing dynamisms and driving mankind toward a social revolution that the Anglosphere and the families/dynasties that rejuvenate their power from its principal dogma would be its principal victims?

5

Even the Sun Must Leave the Sky

The victors of WW2 (the old powers) did not consider it to be important to ensure that the critical thinkers and servants (rulers, politicians, judges, and security officials) that would be helping them to secure the standards suggested in the UN Charter or the UDHR in UN member states lead by example since 1945. Nor did they consider it to be important to make the political order in UN member states function in the same way the airline industry employs aviators. In the airline industry, when a pilot reaches his destination, he is relieved from continuing to exercise control over the aircraft that he was flying, and a new pilot takes charge of the aircraft. In other words, the aircraft is not parked and kept awaiting the same pilot to fly it back to a new destination. In politics, a ruler, a politician, a chief, a judge, a public official, etc., can spend his entire life being reelected to the same position if he is wealthy and powerful. If the politician is running on the ticket of a political party and the number of times an elected official can serve is limited, the political party backs a replacement to the politician who is stepping down, thus extending its control or power indeterminately.

Indeed, the decision of the victors of WW2 (the old powers) and later their heirs to calibrate relations with their critical thinkers and servants (governments and international institutions) based on the premise of having them enjoy the same privilege they profit from instead of using their wealth, power, and status to ensure that no ruler (politicians, judges, or security officials) who does not lead by example or abuse his authority is held accountable is strange. Mencius (371-289 BC), a Chinese Confucian philosopher, suggested that stability is in unity. It

is not possible to build a just society bound by moral virtue and principles of good governance when the heirs of the old powers aim to enforce standards on citizens and not mind that their critical thinkers and servants regard themselves exempt from obeying the laws. If the heirs of the old powers accept that rulers, politicians, judges, security officers, law enforcement officers, etc., lead by example to prevent citizens from having a pretext to disobey, then they could be sowing the wrong seeds for their heirs.

For example, the Israeli–Palestinian conflict is one of the world's most enduring conflicts since 1945 (i.e., since the date when the world knew its latest political and economic reset). The Israeli-Palestinian conflict was in a state of gestation before 1945, but in 1947/48 the conflict exploded and became a global crisis. The decision of the victors of WW2 or their heirs to not let the Israelis take into their own hands repressing the Palestinians since 1948 to finish off the Palestinians and end this conflict (or let the Palestinians take into their hands repressing the Israelis and ending this conflict) has kept the Holy Land, which many people believe is a mortmain (held in perpetuity) for God on earth, a theater of wars and hostilities.

Given the sacred importance of the Holy Land in many religions and its status as a spiritual focal point for prayer, one might expect that the heirs of the old powers would support ending the Israeli-Palestinian conflict to avoid scrutiny over their inability to resolve such a crisis. In addition, since all authority or power rests in their hands, they could diminish or erase the historical significance of the Holy Land, thereby reducing its religious symbolism and meaning for people worldwide, and letting the Israeli-Palestinian conflict go on without having all people feel any form of attachment.

Strangely, the heirs of the old powers decided to transform the holy land from a central site that promotes faith, tolerance, and unity into a place that fosters disunity and disobedience.

A radio antenna is a device that acts as an interface between electrical circuits and electromagnetic waves. The antenna converts electricity into radio waves that get transmitted or sent through space, and then when televisions, radios, or cellular signals catch the radio waves, they

turn them back into electrical signals. Radio antennas are designed to transmit short-distance and long-distance frequencies.

Indeed, the decision of the heirs of the old powers to convert the holy land into an interface that emits hate, intolerance, disunity, and disobedience since 1945 has made many people around the world intercept the waves (disregard) that are being transmitted daily. The circle of intolerance and hate that began in 1947/48 in the Holy Land has now, 70 years later, reached the furthest points on earth, and its effects are being manifested in various degrees of disregard and contempt.

For instance, the people who live on the land located north of the Holy Land, whom the French were colonizing and granted independence in 1946 to create a new country named Lebanon, have consistently failed to observe the work program suggested in the UN Charter or the UDHR since their inception in 1945 and 1948, respectively, and have made no efforts whatsoever to carry out the obligations suggested in those two international treaties. All that the Lebanese have offered mankind since the French granted them independence in 1946 so far is convert the wave of hate, intolerance, disunity, and disobedience that was being transmitted to them from the Holy Land into actionable data, thus extending the surface area or the expanse of hate and intolerance that began in 1947/48 in the land that, throughout history, people and biblical scriptures referred to as a Mortmain of God on earth. The domestic division and the near paralysis that the United States government, which is over 9,000 km away from Jerusalem (i.e., the Holy Land), started knowing in recent years is evidence to support that the surface area or the expanse of hate and intolerance, which started out in the Holy Land in 1947/48, has now covered the entire world.

I have no way of knowing why the heirs of the old powers decided to allow the disunity, disobedience, and hatred that originated in the Holy Land to spread globally after the political and economic reset that followed World War II. One could easily perceive that the intention of the victors of WW2 (the old powers) was to have people around the world cooperate in the political and economic fields in order to create a one-world government, religion, and currency in the aftermath of the

war. Why did the heirs of the old powers allow the Israeli-Palestinian conflict to continue and permit its disunity, disobedience, hatred, etc. to be transmitted around the world so people perceive that they are incapable of everything or that all authority does not rest in their hands?

The victors of WW2 (the old powers) did not invite the countries they defeated or liberated to work together with them equally in politics and economics but instead made those countries follow rules that support the UN Charter or the UDHR without risking their own control. Two motives could explain why they struggled to achieve global peace and security.

The first is if the heirs of the old powers lack sufficient power over their critical thinkers and servants (governments and international institutions) in UN member states to prompt them to lead by example or to observe the obligations suggested in the UN Charter or the UDHR. The second is that the heirs of the old powers do not know exactly what they want.

The ideas suggested in the UN charter or the UDHR are not complicated to follow and can contribute to people enjoying a healthy peacetime life when secured. People refused to surrender freedom to rules and regulations regarding matters of governance whenever the political order legitimized instability or disunity and the individuals who were presiding were unbound by moral virtues and principles of good governance.

Therefore, as long as the heirs of the old powers continue to be unprepared to make their critical thinkers and servants (governments and international institutions) cooperate in accordance with the work program suggested in the UN charter or the UDHR in UN member states, or to step down from this presiding power or role they want to play over the international rule-based postwar world order so another authority could start to hold their critical thinkers and servants (presidents, kings, chiefs, judges, etc.) in UN member states accountable if they do not lead by example, mankind could be going in circles and rewriting the same history; this means that the power, wealth, and status of the heirs of the old powers could be shrinking

instead of expanding. In other words, the insecurity that swept the world since 1945 will continue to weaken the power, wealth, and status of the heirs of the old powers until their superiority disappears completely or they are absorbed by another growing power.

Additionally, since people do not generally surrender freedom to rulers (public officials) who consider themselves exempt from observing the natural and legal rights legitimized (or rules and regulations formulated) unless forced into it or the individuals who are exercising the subjugation are showering citizens with benefits, thus accepting staying quiet or silent on the way their rulers are abusing their power, we can say that for as long as the heirs of the old powers follow such plans to keep their dominant role, the standards suggested in the preamble of the UN Charter would never materialize and would be far-fetched. This is because force repels people away and does not attract them to each other. Similarly, rulers need to provide benefits to citizens to encourage them to remain silent about the abuse of power or how they are forgoing the security of others; this implies that governments can maintain their authority only if they convince their citizens that other governments or states pose a threat.

World War II erupted because the old powers failed to control how they were letting governments make citizens view other governments or societies as a source of harm to stay in power. If the heirs of the old powers continue to let their critical thinkers and servants (governments and international institutions) regard themselves as exempt from observing the appeal suggested in the UN Charter or the UDHR, as was the case before WW2, then all the disregard and contempt that would be brewing in the world could be setting up the international order to confront the same disunity that occurred before WW2 erupted. This also means that if the critical thinkers and servants of the heirs of the old powers continue to refuse to lead by example and just want citizens to obey the political order that is constantly updated, including citizens manifesting the same tenacity, i.e., refusing to obey the political order legitimized for as long as their kings, presidents, chiefs, judges, public officials, etc., surrender freedom to it first, then the heirs of the old powers may not be able to prevent the world from becoming embroiled in a new global war, with, of course, unknown consequences on their strength and stability.

The heirs of the old powers seem to believe they can develop a doctrine to prevent the challenges their fathers faced before WW2 by having their critical thinkers and servants disobey the UN Charter and the UDHR.

The international order cannot be commanded in the same way a Parcheesi or Monopoly game is played. Converting the international order into a game or an idea whose objective is to force the other players into bankruptcy, leaving the winner with all the assets and no customers, makes people become cynical toward the way the fittest are conducting business and politics. This means that if the heirs of the old powers continue to extend this game of politics that they have converted the international order into since 1945, and in which they expect that their critical thinkers and servants (governments and international institutions) spend most of their time forming beneficial strategies while disregarding the work suggested in the UN Charter or the UDHR, they would produce even more random effects, as the insecurity that swept the world supports. If the political strategy that the heirs of the old powers rely on to maintain their dominance leads to critical thinkers and servants (governments and international institutions) making agreements only to betray each other or take military actions against one another, it will create a deep sense of distrust between governments and citizens. The longer the distrust between governments (leaders and the political class) and citizens lasts, the harder it will be to prevent things from getting completely out of control between them or to repair the damages that divisions would be creating in their hearts and minds.

The more governments (leaders and the political class) and citizens behave insensitively toward one another, the wider the schism will get. As the schism between governments (leaders and the political class) and citizens widens, it becomes increasingly difficult for those who earn a living by formulating rules and regulations regarding governance (i.e., rulers, politicians, judges, and law enforcement agents) to be heard, and the more these actors will intensify enforcement to avoid losing their power or authority.

When the rules that are determined and enforced are intended to serve the interests of the fittest rather than the common good, it becomes very difficult to achieve an understanding that ensures every member of the human family can enjoy a healthy peacetime life. When fear and want rise, people stop working together to make the world become a safer place for our successors, which is what every member of the human race claims to be toiling to secure (give his own children a healthy life), but they build for disaster. Can the heirs of the old powers keep transforming the conditions and outcomes that matter to them and their successors when their critical thinkers and servants (governments and international institutions) are spending time forming and executing political and economic solutions intended to weaken and destroy them, rather than creating domestic or foreign political policies to make people love them?

Indeed, the indifference that the heirs of the old powers are exhibiting toward the way their critical thinkers and servants (governments and international institutions) around the world are violating the work program suggested in the UN Charter of the UDHR and the lack of interest in following through to ensure that those servants change their behavior is strange, to say the least.

The political turmoil in UN member states highlights the serious dangers and threats posed by the apathy or detachment of the heirs of the old powers from addressing the underlying causes, which can have a serious impact on their wealth, power, and status. Most importantly, the heirs of the old powers are poorly engaged emotionally and behaviorally because they think it will be easy to keep their strength and stability after their fathers dismantled their empires and advised them to follow the UN Charter of the UDHR's work program to restore their power. But for arrogant reasons, they chose to deviate and implement political and economic solutions that led to the collapse of all the kings and rulers that tested them.

The heirs of the old powers could continue to let their critical thinkers and servants (governments and international institutions) rely on guile, force, and diplomacy to create new countries or dismantle existing countries, but none of the new power bases that they would create or power they would dismantle could make the weakest consider the

opinion of the fittest before taking action of his own, or vice versa, because humans are not variables that can be styled (multiplied, added, divided, or subtracted) in the same way numbers are manipulated. Can the heirs of the old powers continue to style or legitimize new natural and legal rights while their critical thinkers and servants disregard the existing ordinances, avoiding the confusion that such disregard leads people to, trampling on them under their feet and turning and tearing them or their critical thinkers and servants to pieces?

In the New Testament, in the Gospel of Matthew, Jesus instructs people to use discernment whenever establishing relations with people who consistently mock truths or refuse to surrender freedom to them. Jesus said, “Do not give dogs what is sacred; do not throw your pearls to pigs. If you do, they may trample them under their feet and turn and tear you to pieces.” [Matthew 7:6] I have no way of knowing what Jesus was trying to say or warn believers and people against. However, if we interpret the word “dogs” or “pigs” as referring to people, and the words “sacred” or “pearls” as representing truth or rules, then perhaps Jesus was warning kings and emperors against neglecting to lead by example, which could result in their critical thinkers and servants (including leaders, chiefs, the political class, judges, and law enforcement agents) trampling on them and their rules. This is very serious and worrisome.

Most people, when they see a rotten apple in their fruit basket, immediately get rid of it to save the other apples from a much-too-early end. The reaction people have to save the good apples is a judgment made to protect their interests. The proverb “one bad apple spoils the bunch” is a popular metaphor that people use to support how one person’s negative attitude can affect everyone in the group.”⁶⁷

If the heirs of the old powers do not want their critical thinkers and servants (leaders, chiefs, political class, judges, law enforcement agents, etc.) to lead by example in UN member states and want to let societies build their own synergies despite having pledged to carry out the obligations contained in the UN Charter, which was a precondition to be admitted into the international organization named the United Nations, then there is a good chance that the political chaos that

⁶⁷ <https://www.wonderopolis.org/wonder/can-one-bad-apple-spoil-the-bunch>

emerged in the world is due to the ongoing conflict that has existed in the Holy Land since 1948 between the Israelis and the Palestinians spoiling the bunch in the same way a bad apple spoils a good bunch at the individual level.

For example, the political peril or decay that began with the Israelis and Palestinians in 1948 has negatively affected the societies and countries surrounding the Holy Land. People living in countries orbiting the Holy Land, such as Lebanon (chaos), Syria (civil war), Jordan, and Egypt (authoritarian regime), have been undermining the international rule-based postwar world order, whose principles were outlined in the UN Charter or the UDHR by the World War II victors. Those societies that orbit the Holy Land are dismantling the standards and rules of the international order in the same way the Jewish and Palestinian leaders and political class, including judges and law enforcement agents, have been doing since 1945. In fact, countries that share borders with those orbiting the Holy Land are experiencing similar political decay and human rights violations. This recurring phenomenon exhibits political decay, human rights violations, and energy levels that resemble the planetary-style rings or shells surrounding atomic nuclei. Could the domestic divisions and near political paralysis that exist in many countries around the world in recent years be due to the heirs of the old powers not being willing to accept that confusion and corruption spread between individuals in the same way that a bad apple (through the ethylene gas that it emits) could spoil the bunch?

If the heirs of the old powers continue to refuse to admit that negativity (misconduct) is not an isolated incident and that each time a member in a group acts poorly, such poor behavior will reflect negatively on the remainder in the group, including pushing everyone else to behave in the same way, then this political peril that is sweeping societies in planetary-style rings or shells could spoil all the people of the world in an unsalvageable way, just as happens when a box of apples goes bad and rots. Can the heirs of the old powers arrive at transforming the conditions and outcomes that matter to them if their critical thinkers and servants (leaders, chiefs, political class, judges, law enforcement agents, etc.) continue to regard themselves exempt from observing the appeal suggested in the UN Charter or the

UDHR and concurrently become worthless to them, fit only to be thrown out and trampled?

I do not know the answer to the aforementioned question. What I do know is that ethylene is a “hormone produced and released into the air by most plants, including from the fruit of certain plants, such as apples, bananas, pears, etc.”⁶⁸ The ethylene gas that apples release causes fruit to ripen. Riper pieces of fruit “emit more ethylene than unripe fruits, leading to an overconcentration of the gas and signaling all the fruit around it to overripen as well.”⁶⁹ If a person decides to keep a ripened apple in the bunch, this could be either because the person in question overlooked eating the ripe apple before it caused the other fruits to ripen faster or because the person likes his apple ripened.

If the evil and hatred that people release function in the same way most plants release ethylene into the air, then we cannot say that negativity (misconduct) is an isolated incident, as officials often downplay misconduct by blaming only the individuals involved. In other words, we cannot assume that every government is filled with corrupt politicians, judges, or law enforcement officers and that eliminating them will restore normalcy, as they are merely a few bad individuals tarnishing the political order. If the evil and hatred that people release function in the same way most plants release ethylene into the air, and the heirs of the old powers are allowing their critical thinkers and servants (leaders, rulers, political class, chiefs, judges, law enforcement agents, etc.) in UN member states to disregard their obligations to lead by example, then the abnormal rise in corruption, intolerance, hate, immorality, or irreligion that has engulfed the world since 1945 could be a natural phenomenon that behaves in the same way the ethylene that fruits release or emit causes fruit to ripen. If the evil and hatred that people release function in the same way most plants release ethylene into the air, then the heirs of the old powers, in particular, and mankind could be doomed. In other words, if the heirs of the old powers do not contain or minimize the evil and hatred that

⁶⁸ <http://www.todayifoundout.com/index.php/2014/03/one-bad-apple-spoils-bunch/>

⁶⁹ https://www.huffpost.com/entry/bad-apples-rotten-good-ones_n_5784f23ee4b0ed2111d783ff

their critical thinkers and servants (leaders, rulers, political class, chiefs, judges, law enforcement agents, etc.) are releasing to stop it from causing other people to be hostile, contemptuous, or disrespectful, then the more their critical thinkers and servants disregard their obligations to lead by example, the more their disregard should be accelerating corruption, intolerance, hatred, immorality, or irreligion around the world. This is very serious and worrisome.

For example, if the heirs of the old powers continue to be against letting the Israelis take into their own hands the repression of the Palestinians since 1948, instead of granting rights to the Israelis to kill all the Palestinians, because they (the heirs of the old powers) do not want them (the Palestinians) to have any access to human rights in accordance with the UN Charter or the UDHR, then the lengthening of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict could not be helping the heirs of the old powers to rejuvenate their power but hurting them. Similarly, if the heirs of the old powers continue to oppose allowing the Palestinians to reclaim their land and homes from which they were displaced, or to cut down more trees and sell the wood to pay for the land that the Israelis are confiscating, then the ongoing Israeli-Palestinian conflict may be detrimental to the heirs of the old powers rather than aiding in the rejuvenation of their power.

The same circumstances apply to the Lebanese who share a border with the Holy Land. If the heirs of the old powers prevent a great power from re-administering Lebanon or arranging for the Lebanese to create balance, like the people in Switzerland or Malaysia, to reduce corruption or waste, the sectarian conflict that has been waging in this country since 1975 could significantly weaken their power, status, and wealth. Similarly, if the heirs of the old powers do not end the Syrian civil war and stabilize this country or make the Jordanians and the Egyptians cooperate with one another in accordance with the work program set forth in the UN Charter or the UDHR instead of letting them navigate their way through guile, then their successors' hypocrisy could weaken and revert them to a simpler form, perhaps, as happened to many kings in the same situation before.

Indeed, if the evil and hatred that people release function in the same way most plants emit or release ethylene into the air, and the disunity,

partisanship, and confusion that already exist in the United States, which is a country that is generally not known to have been in crisis since the American Civil War, are due to the ring or circle of hate and distrust that exists in the Holy Land, Lebanon, etc., having travelled and reached that far, then there is a good chance that the heirs of the old powers could be building for the destruction of their successors and the destruction of the Anglosphere.

In addition, if we are to consider how it is not possible to stop an apple or a banana from being ripe and how this process is irreversible, then if the negative demeanor or bad behavior that a person develops is also irreversible and only when a person voluntarily or involuntarily is persuaded into changing his character is it possible to make him forgo his conviction, then if the domestic divisions that exist in all UN member states, or regional divisions that exist between states, or global divisions that exist between great powers are not reversed or resolved, it would be only a matter of time before the world would become engulfed in a new global war to create a new balance. The drawback of plunging the world into a global war to create a new balance is that there is no guarantee that the victors will be the heirs of the old power (the same families or dynasties that have controlled the international order and the money supply of the world since 1945). If newer families/dynasties rise to power, then there is no guarantee that they would be in favor of relying on the idea of liberal interventionism and self-determination to solidify their power. In this case, mankind would be throwing away all the human progress that was invested in the last few centuries to reach the milestones of understanding that exist between people.

Furthermore, since humans do not know how to prevent an apple from spoiling but only know how to slow down the spoiling of an apple, if the heirs of the old powers do not stop the lawlessness that exists in the Holy Land between the Jews/Palestinians (1948), the Lebanese (1975), and the Syrians (2011) with each other, or the authoritarianism that exists in Jordan or Egypt since 1945, etc., from spreading hate and mistrust into the societies that share borders with them, then there is a good chance that the political order and domestic division that already exist in Great Britain (4,800 km away) or the United States (9,000 km away) will deepen until becoming chaotic as exists in Lebanon, Syria,

etc., or Egypt, Jordan, etc., if the evil and hatred that people release (emit) function in the same way plants do through releasing ethylene into the air. Jesus once said, "If salt loses its saltiness, it loses its worth." If the United States were weakened, could the heirs of the old powers prevent their successors and the Anglosphere from stumbling in the same way many of their predecessors or their successors were stumbled upon by their critical thinkers and servants (rulers, political class, judges, and law enforcement officers) when they let corruption and lawlessness spoil the doctrine they were depending on to stay in power?

The word "discretion" is defined as the ability to act on one's own authority and judgement.⁷⁰ I have no way of knowing if the decision of the heirs of the old powers to turn away from the work program that their fathers legitimized in the UN Charter or the UDHR and counselled them to ensure that their critical thinkers and servants (rulers, political class, judges, and law enforcement officers) obey to continue to solidify their powers and to let those critical thinkers and servants regard themselves exempt from this appeal, including delegating to the United Nations and human development organizations rights to interfere in the political and economic preparation of people in UN member states is weakening the power, wealth, or status of the heirs of the old powers or not.

Then again, the word "discernment" is defined as the ability to distinguish between things.⁷¹ I have no way of knowing how the heirs of the old powers merge knowledge, experience, and intuitive understanding to prevent that the horrible fate that awaited their predecessors does not occur to them. Generally speaking, "the ability to apply relevant knowledge in an insightful way, especially to different situations from that in which the knowledge was gained"⁷² is called wisdom. If the heirs of the old powers haven't been able to create peace and security since 1945, it could mean that either they are making poor choices that don't benefit everyone, or their decision to divide the world into many nations after World War II and allocate power to governments and international institutions is forcing them to

⁷⁰ <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Discretion>

⁷¹ <https://wikidiff.com/discretion/discernment>

⁷² <https://wikidiff.com/wisdom/discretion>

support political systems that go against the advice of the UN's founders on how to organize society.

It's unclear which of the two scenarios is preventing the heirs of the old powers from making wise choices or decisions that could reduce fear and want worldwide. In general, people do not hide the truth or speak falsely about matters that could diminish their own wealth, status, or power; rather, they do so to prevent others from improving their wealth, status, or power. If the heirs of the old powers have been making unwise choices or decisions since 1945, the record indicates that the involved families or dynasties must be applying knowledge gained from different situations to new situations, in contrast to how farmers apply relevant knowledge to different contexts from which it was originally acquired.

For instance, food experts claim that “there is a right and a wrong way to store fruit and produce, and that if one learns to do it right, a person can avoid premature spoilage, prevent food waste, and save lots of money.”⁷³ In this respect, food experts caution against storing fruits and vegetables too closely together; hence, this is apparently a common mistake that can lead to food going bad faster.⁷⁴ Could the heirs of the old powers have been making unwise choices since 1945 because they continue to apply knowledge from different situations to new ones, despite the founding fathers of the UN advising against this? In other words, the founding fathers of the UN (the old powers) advised their heirs to ensure that their critical thinkers and servants (governments and international institutions) adhere to the principles outlined in the UN Charter and the UDHR, leading by example rather than considering themselves exempt from cooperating with such a work program.

In the book, *The Prison*, I discuss how the founding fathers of the UN (the old powers) wanted governments to be responsible for preparing people in the political, economic, and social fields rather than following the approach their heirs adopted in the aftermath of WW2.

⁷³ https://www.huffpost.com/entry/how-to-store-fruits-and-vegetables_n_577fdb6fe4b0c590f7e92c1f?section=

⁷⁴ <https://www.realsimple.com/food-recipes/shopping-storing/food/how-to-store-produce>

Their heirs turned around and tasked the international organization named the United Nations and other human development organizations with interfering in the political and economic status of nations, including teaching people why they should not tolerate the political order governments establish unless they share material things with them on equal rights. In the same book, I discuss how the founding fathers of the UN may have suggested that the international order should function like a penitentiary center, with each country regarded as a cell responsible for determining its own developmental pace, rather than adhering to the pace set by the United Nations or the rapid changes in science and technology. I also elaborated about how the old powers (the victors of WW2) and later their heirs failed to prevent wars consequent to their decision to have the intergovernmental organization named the United Nations become an economic operator and be busy buying and selling in the same way people do on the outside of the UN fence or as per the way Jesus found people doing when he visited a synagogue, as compared to being devoted to teaching people to be tolerant as the founding fathers of the UN suggested. Could the heirs of the old powers transform the conditions and outcomes that matter to them if their critical thinkers and servants (rulers, political class, judges, and law enforcement officers) continue to step up enforcement (isolationism and authoritarianism) in UN member states to control violence to their own benefit while citizens refuse to surrender freedom to civil authorities who use law and order to benefit the individuals involved and want those public officials to deliver on the promises they make, improve their living standards, or share (split) outcomes with them on equal rights?

For instance, Egypt has undergone a significant transformation in the past 70 years. Egypt switched from being one of the freest nations in 1945 to being one of the worst human rights violators in 2021.⁷⁵ In fact, the strategy the regime is adopting to build a just society in Egypt seems to center on controlling harm, rage, and pain by following the

⁷⁵ <https://www.nytimes.com/2021/09/16/world/middleeast/egypt-human-rights.html#:~:text=An%20annual%20State%20Department%20report,detentions%20and%20inhumane%20prison%20conditions.>

American and European punitive model^{76,77} instead of on adopting policies that center on restorative and transformative practices that strengthen healing and creative energy, such as the ones that are included in the UN Charter or the UDHR.

I have no way of knowing if all the new prisons that the regime in Egypt has been building since it came to power in 2014 will eventually end harmful systems and create the right terrain (environment) for people to thrive in the country. In the United States and Europe, the mass incarceration model adopted has converted the prison industry into a very profitable business but has not reduced corruption, intolerance, hate, immorality, or irreligion inside prisons or on the outside.

In fact, the decision of the United States to build a just society by adopting a mass incarceration model has created a paradox. The continuous failure of the US government to reduce corruption, intolerance, hate, immorality, or irreligion made the cost of incarcerating a condemned person (time and resources) much cheaper than the cost that is required to ensure the quality and accuracy of each conviction. The conflict between the faction that profits from the prison-industrial complex (including prisons, hospitals, and cheap labor) and the political pressure to prevent the United States from being labeled as an authoritarian regime has been driving the government to decriminalize offenses that negatively impact the creation of an environment where acceptance, dignity, and justice are upheld. For example, the United States started to legalize recreational marijuana in recent years. Marijuana can cause individuals to think they embody qualities or have the wealth, power, or status to achieve things. Humans can't lessen fear and want on Earth because they think it's important to do things like putting others' well-being before their own or validating certain civilization missions. If governments want people to increase their access to substances that have the potential to make them think "things" other than themselves, rather than reduce

⁷⁶ <https://insidearabia.com/isis-solution-to-human-rights-abuses-build-the-largest-prison-in-egypt/>

⁷⁷ <https://www.middleeastmonitor.com/20211011-egypt-prepares-for-tumultuous-years-ahead-by-building-the-largest-prison-in-its-modern-history/>

such sensations, then the more people who think “things” no one has assigned to them, the harder it would be to reduce fear and want.

I do not know if the current reliance of some nations on isolationism and authoritarianism through an assembly-line type criminal justice system, or on the decriminalization of offenses that has the potential to make people become dynamic, is the right way to narrow the gap between the rich and the poor or make the poor become acclimatized and ready to surrender freedom to the political order, knowing it is grossly dysfunctional and not natural and people use it to deny each other rights.

Indeed, people’s ongoing practice of dividing themselves into nations first and then agglomerating or segregating based on race, colour, language, religion, political belief, etc. is a good way to exclude each other from sharing in the rewards and benefits that people’s inherent interests to explore produce or to shape how our societies work. Then again, this practice has failed to help any group to build exclusive power, because humans are not fruits; thus, when assigned a tag (i.e., race, religion, political belief, etc.), they are then dealt with in the same way fruits are controlled or preserved (i.e., treated, stored), each according to its kind. People's adoption of segregation has hindered those who seek to legitimize natural and legal rights, making it difficult to distinguish between behaviors that comply with the law and those that defy it, just as humans struggle to identify a bad individual within a group. This is because people are able to mask their true nature or evil character, making it difficult to discern their intentions and actions in social interactions. In other words, humans employ both the concepts of good and evil to achieve their goals, even in the face of opposition from others.

Furthermore, hence, the resources that people are always depending on to provide benefits for our society and to deny them from each other are not concentrated in a given geographical place but are scattered, and at the same time, their use is always varying in function of science; the partitioning of the world into nations or the segregation of people according to race, colour, language, religion, political belief, etc. makes it harder for those who devote their lives to making others consider their opinion before taking action of their own to get their

way despite the resistance of others, because people are rivaling to obtain the resources they need and are always splitting them.

Even if people can react differently to events and believe God tasked them with resources to explore for society's well-being, those wanting to influence others' actions cannot shift the balance of power to themselves if people can mask their true intentions. Most importantly, it is crucial to distinguish between those who are genuinely working for the common good and those who are pursuing their own interests or agendas. In other words, controlling people's behavior is more difficult than it appears (i.e., distinguishing the “false teacher” from the “genuine teacher” is challenging); consequently, the heirs of the old powers cannot easily identify who is surrendering freedom to the international rule-based postwar world order their fathers established after World War Two to support their vision and leadership, rather than those striving to become increasingly powerful and dangerous.

It is not possible to know who is working against social and economic justice, to know the “good” person from the “evil” one, or to separate them in the same way people separate fruits and produce to ensure that they do not encourage each other to ripen too quickly or to be spoiled. This means that the families/dynasties that won WW2 (or the nations that are protecting them) have no way of knowing if the patience they are exhibiting toward the regimes that are not cooperating in accordance with their citizens and in accordance with the work program stipulated in the UN Charter or the UDHR is sabotaging everything they are aspiring to secure.

In Surah Luqman of the Quran, it is reported that those who use theatrics to mislead others from Allah’s path—without any knowledge—and to mock it will face a humiliating punishment." [Luqman 31:18]. No one knows whether the Holy Land is holy or not. Israelis and Palestinians inhabited the Holy Land as of 1945. Neither the Israelis nor the Palestinians are cooperating in accordance with the work program that the founding fathers of the UN specified in the UN Charter or the UDHR. Likewise, societies (nations) that orbit the Holy Land, such as Lebanon, Syria, Jordan, and Egypt, are not cooperating with the work program specified by the UN's founding fathers in the UN Charter or the UDHR. Similarly, the nations that orbit the Holy

Land are failing to cooperate with the work program specified by the UN's founding fathers in the UN Charter, the UDHR, and so forth. If the heirs of the old powers have allowed the rulers and political class exercising power in the Holy Land and its surrounding nations to use theatrics that distract their citizens from cooperating with the work program specified by the UN's founding fathers in the UN Charter and the UDHR, how can we be sure that these families or their successors will not face humiliating punishment?

Simply put, the relative economic and military power of the people living in the Holy Land (both Israelis and Palestinians) and the surrounding societies, such as Lebanon, Syria, Jordan, and Egypt, is significantly less than that of France, Great Britain, or the United States, which possess the world's largest nuclear arsenals. This implies that if the societies residing in the Holy Land or those orbiting it decide to attack or wage war against France, Great Britain, or the United States, they would be taking a significant risk. However, because the families/dynasties who control France, Great Britain, or the United States have no way of knowing if the hate and intolerance that the societies who live in the Holy Land or the ones who orbit the Holy Land emit is influencing their citizens to be intolerant in the same way fruits do it to each other (i.e., when a bad apple spoils a good apple, the bad apple does not encourage the spoiling process by touching or rubbing on the good apple but by doing it while each apple is static in its place), this means that if the heirs of the old powers continue to let the political and economic situation in UN member states stay dynamic, there is a good chance that the unrated behavior that the people who live in the Holy Land or the ones who orbit the Holy Land manifest will emerge in the rich nations as well. When the negative attitude or bad behavior that is raging in the Holy Land and in the societies that orbit the Holy Land engulfs the whole world, then the heirs of the old powers may inevitably revert to a simpler form if the rulers and political class that would be protecting them are the principal cause of the disregard or contempt they would be knowing.

If a bad apple can spoil a good apple without touching or rubbing onto the good apple, and the societies that live in the Holy Land (the Israelis and the Palestinians) or orbit the Holy Land, such as Lebanon, Syria,

Jordan, and Egypt, and whom the nations with great power granted independence in 1945 but to date have not offered the world anything that could be regarded as useful to accelerate mankind's aspirations to secure the goals suggested in the UN Charter except retard them, could the apathy that the heirs of the old powers are manifesting toward those societies that are not cooperating in accordance with the work program suggested in the UDHR be subjecting their power, status, and wealth and that of the nations that protect them, such as Great Britain, France, Russia, the United States, or China, to disintegration?

The question that needs to be answered is, "How?" In other words, how can the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, along with the political and economic chaos in Lebanon, the civil war in Syria, and the authoritarian regimes in Jordan and Egypt, individually or collectively threaten the strength and stability of France, Great Britain, the United States, Russia, China, and others, given that the societies living in or surrounding the Holy Land are all facing different internal crises to determine who is the fittest? Most importantly, none of those societies living in or orbiting the Holy Land have access to superior military might, as they disobey the work program suggested in the UDHR, which emphasizes the importance of human rights and governance for stability. Therefore, comparing their relative economic and military preparedness or superiority to the power of France, Great Britain, the United States, Russia, or China would be like comparing the physical difference or power that exists between a lion and a mouse.

Lions and mice are two living creatures that are incomparable in terms of power, physical shape, weight, etc., but they seem to have both been programmed with ingenuity. If "ingenuity" is a common feature among all living creatures, and if all natural beings can instinctively distinguish between "danger" and "safety," then humans uniquely exploit this capability to serve their own interests rather than solely for survival, as other living creatures do. This suggests that those who use their relative economic and military superiority to influence others' decisions must believe that, in the absence of a supreme authority enforcing biblical laws like the Ten Commandments, the world operates under anarchy.

World history does not indicate that a force or entity has programmed humans with the same level of ingenuity. The absence of a supreme authority that compels newborns to obey biblical laws, along with the varying degrees of ingenuity exhibited by individuals, may lead those who believe the world is governed by anarchy to think they can rely on their ingenuity to influence others' decisions or to position themselves as regulators of human interaction without adhering to the legal and natural rights they reference in biblical scriptures.

However, it appears that the force that masterminded the world made change a permanent aspect of society primarily to hinder those who use their awareness and knowledge for self-interest rather than for the common good. This force allowed those who cannot defend themselves to do the right things, but it also created mechanisms to ensure that all who claim to prioritize the well-being of others ultimately fail, either through self-inflicted setbacks or at the hands of the people whose interactions they were supposed to regulate, thereby highlighting the inherent challenges in altruism within a self-serving world.

Furthermore, the constant rise and fall of companies, nations, kingdoms, empires, and so on appear to revolve around a concept known as "time," with the concepts of "good" and "evil" acting as its controllers. In other words, "good" seems to act as the driver while "evil" serves as the vehicle, or the roles may be reversed. Human ingenuity controls the speed at which this axle travels to complete a half-turn or a full-turn.

If the heirs of the old powers are increasingly indifferent to the UN's goals or how the nations that act on their behalf should achieve them, this disinterest may stem from two beliefs. The first could be due to the heirs of the old powers (the powerful families/dynasties involved) believing that when the world becomes totalitarian, people would be surrendering freedom to them in the same way prisoners do during a lockdown. Second, this apathy could be due to the powerful families/dynasties involved (the heirs of the old powers) believing that the unpreparedness of people to obey the international postwar world order would not have any bearing on their strength and stability. In other words, the corruption, intolerance, hate, immorality, or irreligion

that people are manifesting in recent years would not have any drawback on their wealth, status, or power.

If the heirs of the old powers perceive that they can continue to transform the conditions and outcomes that matter to them when people's unpreparedness to obey rises, this means one of two things: The first scenario occurs when the heirs of the old powers have a naive belief that the various law enforcement forces, responsible for maintaining the social order during a social breakdown, would always prevail, thereby preventing them from living in a completely uncontrollable social order. Second, it is if the heirs of the old powers believe that hate or distrust thins' in the hearts of people in the same way pollutants do when they are diluted in water. In other words, hate or distrust are two phenomena that die out or thin in the same way the wind dies out or the rain stops.

Verse 3 in Surat Al-Duha in the Quran says, "Your Lord did not abandon you, nor is He displeased."⁷⁸ If God does not abandon people or get displeased with how people behave, then the heirs of the old powers (the families/dynasties who control the international order or the money supply of the world) could be supposing that because the earth is big and everything appears to have a start and an end, the evil that people compel on their watch dies out or thins out in the course of time and things and does not imbue any threats that can affect their strength and stability. Unfortunately, no authority who used the idea of "evil," "good," or God as a ladder to gain its way despite the resistance of others managed to prevent its resizing throughout history.

If throughout history no business, nation, kingdom, or empire, including religion, managed to prevent its own collapse or resizing except to extend it, and its duration was a function of the "good" or "evil" that its members were conveying and of the readiness of its members to allow that one (or some) in the group should have more power than others, then we can say that the businesses, nations, kingdoms, and empires that managed to last the longest were the ones whose leaders succeeded at using their human ingenuity to make the people whom they wanted to control or to make subscribe to their ideas (i.e., consider their opinion before taking actions of their own)

⁷⁸ <https://www.corequran.com/93/#3>

believe they are working to secure the benefits or the good that everyone else was surrendering some of his freedom to eventually achieve.

It is important that readers keep in mind here that all the ideas that people come up with and pursue are composed of the idea itself and the efforts that individuals later exhaust to make the idea in question succeed. People cannot prevent wars on earth because they are unprepared to obey the actions they devise to secure this goal. In other words, everyone understands that the commandment "do not steal" has the potential to prevent conflicts. The problem that exists in the world is that neither the people who the masses surrender freedom to them to uphold such principles abstain from stealing, nor the people who discovered that reducing theft is better to improve peace among themselves and agreed to delegate to some individuals among them power to uphold such principles are also willing to do it.

Governments can only solve crime because they recruit criminals to help them identify other criminals, or because the criminals have fought over who should have more power, and a whistleblower revealed their secrets.

If so, we could say that the businesses, nations, kingdoms, empires, or religions whose members managed to keep secrets and whoever committed a crime in the group was not shamed or punished have to be the legal entities that managed to preserve their power, wealth, and status the longest. For example, when a lion kills prey and brings it to his pride, the rest of the lions do not shame him or punish him. In addition, the secret between animals does not get shared.

Hence, animals appear to be cleverer than humans; we could say that what prompts certain businesses, nations, kingdoms, empires, or religions to eventually collapse and be resized faster than others must be tangled in the failure of the leaders of the entities who failed to become aware on time of what was troubling or disenchanting their dependents.

This also means that when businesses, nations, kingdoms, empires, or religions fail to timely uncover what could be troubling or

disenchanted their dependents, it negatively affects the abilities of those individuals who benefit the most from the collective surrender of freedom aimed at achieving success and transforming the conditions and outcomes that matter to them.

This also signifies that the businesses, nations, kingdoms, empires, or religions that collapsed the fastest must be the ones whose leaders either allowed their dependents to begin to obtain their way despite the resistance of others faster or acted spontaneously without properly analyzing facts to form judgments. In other words, the leaders who drove businesses, nations, kingdoms, empires, or religions to complete failure or collapse took from their dependents more than what they gave them and had their dependents deputize for them instead of serving their own interests themselves or with their own hands.

Could the reason for all the abnormal insecurity that engulfed the world in recent years be due to the heirs of the old powers allowing that their critical thinkers and servants (rulers, political class, judges, and law enforcement officers), including human development organizations such as the United Nations, NGOs, charities, foundations, etc., take from citizens more than what they are giving them, or allowing that such aforementioned actors deputize for them instead of being vigilant themselves to secure that the UN goals are being achieved? In other words, the insecurity that engulfed the world since 1945 is due to people being without a human master.

Likewise, could the decision of the heirs of the old powers to deviate away from the work program that the founding fathers of the UN counselled them to make sure UN member states stay faithful to its principles and to allow that the nations who deputize on their behalf or protect them, such as the United States, Great Britain, France, China, and Russia, be in favor of letting the poor have access to the material interests from the scientific progress that the rich are producing so it does not go to waste (including enlisting human development organizations such as the United Nations, NGOs, charities, foundations, etc., to promote it) but without weighing its impact on idling the human body on the maintenance of their strength and stability, be another reason for this abnormal rise in insecurity that has engulfed the world since 1945?

To put it differently, because the heirs of the old powers could transform the conditions and outcomes that matter to them only through giving more than taking (i.e., granting rulers and political classes in UN member states the right to legitimize the natural and legal rights that they see fit to maintain their strength and stability as long as they do not rival them for control of the international order of the money supply of the world), they (the powerful families/dynasties involved) forced themselves into a gridlock that they do not know how to get themselves out from except through adopting two choices. The first option is to initiate a new global war that would engulf the world in conflict. The second is to make compromises, which means shrinking the three values they care the most about in life—their power, status, and wealth.

I cannot know how the heirs of the old powers expect to emerge unscathed from the political, economic, and social stalemate caused by their impulsiveness if the laws passed by their critical thinkers and servants in UN member states continue to displease the people.

Readers should remember that the world's political, economic, and social stalemate was mainly created by the "inexperience" or "naivety" of the families/dynasties who won WW2 (the old powers), not their "evilness." This is because if the families and dynasties that won World War II had truly wanted to dominate the world, they would have rejected the idea of making the war aims focus on securing the aspirations outlined in the UN Charter. The current stalemate in the world is primarily due to a poor understanding of their own mission by thinkers associated with intergovernmental organizations, including the United Nations, the five permanent members of the UN Security Council, NATO, the World Bank, and the IMF. The specific reason is that all the aforementioned bodies have deviated from the work program proposed by the founding fathers of the UN, as outlined in the UN Charter and the UDHR. That is to say, the United Nations, the five permanent members of the UN Security Council, NATO, the World Bank, the IMF, and all others are using their enormous wealth, power, and status to lead people into perceiving that the purpose of the coming together of nations in the aftermath of WW2 is to maximize the chances of every individual so every newborn can realize the full

development of his personality. In other words, arrange for people in all nations to have access to the same living standards. Humans cooperate on the basis of trickling down to designated individuals the social space they freeze or the material things they accumulate on a cumulative basis. The methods of cooperation among people differ significantly from how the United Nations, the five permanent members of the UN Security Council, NATO, the World Bank, the IMF, and others have utilized their wealth, power, and status to rebuild after World War II. This tactic helps every individual, whether rich or poor, to fully develop their personality, but it does so by shifting power from a vertical structure to a horizontal one. In other words, this strategy allows the rich to maintain high factory output while the poor strive for a better future; however, it ultimately makes everyone worse off because it creates a zero-sum game when individuals work to maximize their own chances at the expense of others.

For example, officials from the intergovernmental organization known as the United Nations are attempting to make the world a better place while simultaneously improving their own lives by freezing social space, accumulating material wealth, and distributing it to selected individuals. Can mankind improve political processes if the members of the formal organization responsible for coordinating relations between nations are simultaneously deepening poverty, corruption, intolerance, hate, immorality, or irreligion?

Hence, the only social impact that the United Nations, the five permanent members of the UN Security Council, NATO, the World Bank, the IMF, and others are producing in the world is none other than increasing fear and compromising moral importance; this then signifies that mankind could not be united to improve individual reasoning or cognition to strengthen institutional decision-making but rather to weaken such instruments.

Additionally, people often refuse to do the right things or live honest lives while insisting on making the world better for future generations; however, without adhering to established standards, their ongoing efforts to improve the world have primarily resulted in raising awareness about the need to address global issues alongside the United Nations, the five permanent members of the UN Security Council,

NATO, the World Bank, the IMF, and others. There are many urgent global issues, making it impossible to rank them in order of which ones will most improve the future. In my opinion, the biggest problem (threat) facing the world today is how to make the United Nations, the five permanent members of the UN Security Council, NATO, the World Bank, the IMF, and many others (in the millions) stop meddling in the social order to do "good" and thus forgo the security of others in the process. This is urgently needed to stop those powerful bodies from continuing to produce tools, trainings, or research into how to eradicate poverty or improve the rule of law when the strategies to achieve this goal have already been detailed in the work program that the founding fathers of the UN suggested in the UDHR.

Furthermore, since the formal organizations and the powerful nations that are administering those legal entities, and who are the principal reason for the failure of mankind to make progress on the UN goals, are also legal entities that the individuals who control those organizations and nations want to be given the least attention to recalibrate their interferences or mindfulness in the social order, this means that people would be working on solving all the challenges that they could be thinking of in the future minus the matters that have the potential to reduce risks of global catastrophes. This challenge is how to balance risks and benefits, thus arriving at promoting positive values that would spare the world from sparing via a new global war to create a new balance or reset.

Simply put, if the formal organizations and nations were really leading by example or doing their job while exercising any sense of altruism, people would not be putting pressure on their governments in UN member states to be devoted to increasing their happiness or to solving the world's most pressing problems. This is because people came together in the aftermath of WW2 to expand the circle of morality and not the circle of fear. In other words, mankind did not come together after World War II to replace the disregard shown by Great Britain, France, and other old powers with the selfishness exhibited by the United Nations, the UN Security Council, NATO, the World Bank, the IMF, and similar organizations.

The fear that the United Nations, the five permanent members of the UN Security Council, NATO, the World Bank, the IMF, and many other legal entities (in the millions) are creating around the world to orient people to accept that liberal democracies and totalitarianism are making the world fall apart when we all know that those two concepts are just being used as a tool (a ladder) to help those who benefit from such ideas to reach their goals and have generated good and perverse outcomes so far. This tactic appears to have weakened governance and international coordination in general and, most importantly, incentivized or persuaded citizens to intervene next to rulers and the political class (and judges and law enforcement officers) in UN member states to locate solutions to all the problems (social, economic, environmental, political, etc.) that exist.

I have no way of knowing how effective the changes that are ongoing in UN member states to institute reforms that have the potential to improve institutional decision-making, governance, coordination, etc., would be on the work of the United Nations, the five permanent members of the UN Security Council, NATO, the World Bank, the IMF, and many others that are striving to improve global governance, as this outcome would depend on the progress that citizens and leaders and the political class (and judges and law enforcement officers) in UN member states would be making to enforce weak governing mechanisms.

It is important to keep in mind that it was the weak governing mechanisms that existed before WW2 that led to the creation of the United Nations, the UN Security Council, NATO, the World Bank, the IMF, and many others in the aftermath of this global war.

I don't know if people can solve the world's problems now that every human and legal entity is trying to figure out how to provide everyone equal living standards to reduce the global catastrophes that happened before and during WWII.

Having agreements on how natural and legal rights should be divided between people could put an end to this apathy that the rich have manifested throughout history against governance reforms that have the potential to stop any person from continuing to be bound by his

personal power and conscience and to avoid future conflicts. However, the pressing question is how we can ensure that the growing mindfulness among people aimed at improving the long-term future does not lead to a social revolution that could undermine all the milestones humanity has achieved in creating stable and well-being conditions tailored to each individual's needs. In other words, all the solutions proposed by their critical thinkers and servants (including governments and international institutions) are designed to benefit the individuals involved, whether through laws or tax increases, and the solutions put forth by the United Nations are similarly intended to benefit those individuals as well. Would it be possible for the heirs of the old powers to continue to transform the conditions and outcomes that matter to them when every person starts to weigh in on how natural and legal rights should be divided between people?

Similarly, this disposition that the heirs of the old powers manifested so “good” prevails in the world, and that the fear and want that the poor were knowing before WW2 erupted shrinks is contrary to the aspirations that their predecessors had in the past, keeping their ambitions limited to serving, and that was to ensure that their wealth, power, and status did not diminish and thus be absorbed by another growing power. Building capacity to explore and solve problems that can achieve practical results for the greater well-being of society can reduce the dynamics that the world has known until the end of WW2, but at the same time, this aspiration that the heirs of the old powers manifested toward reducing fear and want in the world is not something that those powerful families/dynasties could decide, because no one has tasked them to lead the world toward a civilization mission that has the potential to reduce fear and want even though this mindfulness is the only instrument to reaffirm faith in the dignity and worth of the human person.

In essence, Jesus asserted that he was God's son, and that God had sent him to earth to alleviate fear and want. The victors of WW2 (the old powers) or their heirs did not claim that God commissioned them to reduce fear and want but commissioned critical thinkers and servants (governments and international institutions). Second, the people who subscribed to Jesus's teachings were surrendering their freedom and relinquishing their power. The instruments that the heirs of the old

powers rely on to achieve their goal, such as the United Nations, the five permanent members of the UN Security Council, NATO, the World Bank, the IMF, and many other legal entities, are not surrendering freedom to the work program that the founding fathers of the UN suggested in the UN Charter or the UDHR, because if this were the case, the United Nations would have not become, 70 years later, nothing different than the synagogue that Jesus visited in Jerusalem and found people buying and selling in this temple in the same way they do on the outside.

If all the passionate yearning for freedom that people are manifesting and the decisive role that the United Nations, the five permanent members of the UN Security Council, NATO, the World Bank, the IMF, and many others (minus the United States) have played to create conditions of stability and well-being have increased dynamism rather than reduced it, then continuing to consider that those bodies continuing to play a role in assisting the heirs of the old powers or mankind to secure the UN goals would be equivalent to believing that the miracles that the New Testament reports Jesus performed are true.

Hence, many people still doubt Jesus' divinity, and in theory, only monks and children are the true believers; thus, we can say that people's desire to increase their happiness would remain irresistible and irreversible. In other words, dynamism in the world would continue as long as people do not prioritize the values that Jesus preached or until the world's population is reduced.

If human choices are motivated by the desire for happiness, then when the heirs of old powers ask the United Nations, the five permanent members of the UN Security Council, NATO, the World Bank, the IMF, and other organizations to help create stability and well-being, it shows that these groups might actually be risking their own power, status, and wealth instead of boosting them. None of these organizations or countries are putting the needs of the poor before their own. None of those bodies and nations are putting the well-being of the poor before theirs.

In other words, if the United Nations, the five permanent members of the UN Security Council, NATO, the World Bank, the IMF, and many

other legal entities are impeding the development of social, cultural, and economic development and cooperation, this means that the increased reliance by people around the world in recent years on their awareness and knowledge to create conditions of stability and well-being affirms that such a disposition is resulting from the lack of understanding by the United Nations, the five permanent members of the UN Security Council, NATO, the World Bank, the IMF, and many others of their own mission and the increased denial by governments (leaders, political class, judges, and law enforcement officers) in UN member states of natural and legal rights. This is very serious and worrisome.

Simply put, if the ongoing dynamism of the international postwar world order that began after 1945 is a result of most people being unprepared to surrender their freedom for the work program outlined in the UDHR, then mankind is doomed. In other words, if the increase in dynamism in recent years is linked to people's unpreparedness to set aside selfishness in order to create a stable world, then efforts to promote joint civilizational resilience might actually pose a threat to the Anglosphere instead of strengthening it. This is because the reason why humans have made little progress since 1945 to reduce fear and want is tangled in all people having different levels of courage or aspirations, power to give or be generous, and awareness or knowledge.

If the United Nations, the five permanent members of the UN Security Council, NATO, the World Bank, the IMF, and many other legal entities are teaching people why they should not wait for the afterlife to have access to what they are unable to obtain on earth, then there is a good chance that only a new flood could save the heirs of the old powers, just as the flood that is reported in the Old Testament saved Noah and his family. This is because the Bible reports that when wickedness on earth intensified, God helped Noah and his family take refuge in an ark (boat) until the floodwaters he commanded destroyed all the creatures that had the breath of life in their nostrils on dry land.

The heirs of the old powers don't have to wait for God to act if the violence and corruption that people are complaining about continue to grow. The heirs of the old powers can board any of the existing space

shuttles and take refuge on the moon or in the International Space Station if poverty, corruption, intolerance, hate, immorality, or irreligion continues to deepen on earth.

The heirs of the old powers and the world at large face the same challenges as our ancestors did before the flood mentioned in Genesis. I cannot know if the bodies and nations that the heirs of the old powers are relying on will reduce the abnormal intolerance or violence that emerged in the world before the violence fills the earth, as was the case before God interfered. Evidently, our predecessors failed to address the issues of poverty, corruption, intolerance, hate, immorality, and irreligion that have plagued the world, which ultimately led God to intervene and save the day.

Before Jesus was crucified, the New Testament of the Bible reports that Jesus was waiting in the garden of Gethsemane, preparing for the hardship in front of him. In the Gospel of Mark, Jesus is reported to have said, 'Abba, Father,' and then added, 'everything is possible for you.' Take this cup from me. Yet not what I will, but what you will [Mark 14:36]. Jesus failed to prevent the suffering that awaited him from going away (i.e., the corruption, intolerance, hate, immorality, or irreligion that was waging from sparing him).

If the constraints that caused the rise of poverty, corruption, intolerance, hate, immorality, or irreligion today are the same as those that caused the flood and Jesus' suffering, can the heirs of the old powers save the world? This fact highlights the unpreparedness of those who claim to prioritize the well-being of others or expect their opinions to be considered before others take action to uphold the natural and legal rights they advocate. In other words, could the heirs of the old powers manage to prevent that violence from engulfing the full earth if the constraints that are preventing people from cooperating with one another based on the principles set forth in the UDHR are not challenges that are related to what the founding fathers of the UN asked us to cooperate together to strengthen in 1945, but to challenges related to where the United Nations, the five permanent members of the UN Security Council, NATO, the World Bank, the IMF, and many other legal entities are taking us (mankind) hence?

I have no way of knowing what the social order on Earth was like before the flood story reported in the Old Testament of the Bible. Many factors can make a business, nation, kingdom, or empire collapse or deal with constraints that are different than the ones anticipated. If a society allows its naïve thinkers and writers to be its policymakers, its criminals to be its soldiers, its traitors to be its politicians, its corrupt to be its administrators, and its hypocrites to be its spokespersons, it is likely to confront a total breakdown. Could the reason why not a day passes without us reading, hearing, or seeing about a failure or mistrust be tangled in us working to resolve challenges that are not related to what we should have encountered had we stayed cooperating to secure the goals that the founding fathers of the UN initially proposed and not deviated from them?

Could the work program that the United Nations, the five permanent members of the UN Security Council, NATO, the World Bank, the IMF, and many other legal entities have been sponsoring since 1945 help the heirs of the old powers to continue to solidify their power, or is the mere fact that we are solving constraints that are not related to what the founding fathers of the UN asked us to cooperate together to strengthen in the aftermath of WW2 such that the challenges that the world started encountering would continue to grow and their effect would equally deepen people's impairment to do the right thing?

Said differently, since all people want to make their only project to be about how to free themselves from any political or social order but without any individual being prepared to cooperate in accordance with the work program that was laid out in the UDHR, then it would not be possible to improve virtues, goodness, giving, transcendence, love, or dignity, but we should expect violence, grudges, envy, hatred, and revenge.

Throughout history, before a nation or a kingdom collapsed, values had collapsed first. Since more governments (leaders, political class, judges, and law enforcement officers) in UN member states continue to prioritize their self-interests instead of prioritizing the self-interests of the work program that the founding fathers of the UN laid out in the UDHR, more poverty, corruption, intolerance, hate, immorality, or irreligion will be on the rise, and then more division will rise. In

addition, when people stop being able to understand each other or to speak the same language, then their reasoning and cognition capacities would be getting a lot weaker. For example, the political gridlock that exists in Lebanon today could be considered an example.

Generally speaking, when people's reasoning or cognition capacity shrinks, people stop being able to give considerations to each other or promote positive values. I recommend continuing to study if such impairment can spoil the plans people make.