

Word Lost

The Changing Anglosphere
Under the United Nations

The Human Jungle

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 Melissa, Olivia, Kayla and Andrew Hankash

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

Impulsive Hypocrisy

Impairment is a condition in which a part of the human body or mind is damaged and does not work well.¹ "Impairment" is also used to describe any downward or diminishing in quality, strength, or value of an asset.² This term is also used to classify poor water quality. When waterways or water bodies become polluted or otherwise degraded to meet the water quality standards set by states, the body of water is considered impaired.^{3,4}

Mental impairment can be a permanent impairment or a temporary impairment. Love, alcohol consumption, or substance abuse prompts a temporary impairment.

The cause of the temporary impairment that a person experiences from alcohol consumption or substance abuse is known. So far, everyone can control their actions, but no one can control their feelings. Some can walk away from love or hate, but most can't.

For example, many people support the idea that when a couple starts a relationship, every partner tries to show his best side. Each partner strives to highlight their strengths and minimize their flaws or less appealing viewpoints. No one knows why most people display their sweetest attitude when they are dating, but then when things get sour, we find that in certain cases, the impairment that results prompts not

¹ <https://www.merriam-webster.com/thesaurus/impairment>

² [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Impairment_\(financial_reporting\)](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Impairment_(financial_reporting))

³ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Water_quality#United_States

⁴ <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/>

[Clean_Water_Act#Water_Quality_Standards_Program](#)

only a breakup or separation in the relationship, but also in certain cases one person in the relationship harasses and even murders a partner. If love impairs the ability of a person to rightly judge the quality of others, then jealousy or hate could be a feeling that impairs the ability of a person to see the good in others. If so, this also means that any person whose jealousy or hate prevents him from doing the right thing cannot distinguish between right and wrong.

Two people cannot fill the same void space. If two people wish to occupy the same void space, one must voluntarily agree to allow the other to do so, or they must resort to force to decide who will occupy it.

If, in theory, no doctrine is fairer than the political order suggested by the victors of WW2 in the UN Charter or the UDHR to enable a person to reduce fear and want and to increase his happiness, and as of 1948 most people are refusing to surrender freedom to this work program to obtain its benefit, this means that all those people who are refusing to do it are doing the wrong thing to advance good and are preferring to live insecurely. This also means that either the thinkers and writers, soldiers, politicians, administrators, or spokespersons that the heirs of the old powers are counting on their wisdom to transform the conditions that matter to them and for the world at large are naïve, criminals, traitors, corrupt, and hypocrites, or the common people have gone insane. However, because the common people are legitimizing the work plan of the thinkers and writers, soldiers, politicians, administrators, or spokespersons of the heirs of the old powers, then either the powerful heirs of the old powers are impaired (i.e., naïve, criminals, traitors, corrupt, and hypocrites), or the thinkers and writers, soldiers, politicians, administrators, or spokespersons whom the heirs of the old powers assembled and tasked with determining and enforcing on their behalf natural and legal rights are the ones who are compelling the insecurity that the world is increasingly knowing.

I have no way of knowing which scenario between the aforementioned two could be compelling to this rise in intolerance that emerged around the world in recent years. What I do know is that anytime a business, nation, kingdom, empire, or religion allowed naïve, criminal, traitorous, corrupt, or hypocritical thinkers and writers; soldiers;

politicians; administrators; or spokespersons to guard secrets or go on a shaming frenzy, it was reverted to a simpler form in the course of time and things.

Edmund Burke⁵ (1729–1797), an Anglo-Irish statesman and philosopher, was very concerned in his treatise *Thoughts and Details on Scarcity*,⁶ about the people whom the government was planning on recruiting or cooperating with “biting the hands that would be feeding them.” The heirs of the old powers delegated to the thinkers and writers, soldiers, politicians, administrators, or spokespersons of the United Nations; the five nations who deputize on their behalf at the UN Security Council; the UN member states; the World Bank; the IMF; NATO; etc., the responsibility of transforming the conditions and outcomes that matter to them.

If whenever a business, nation, kingdom, empire, or religion failed to make its thinkers and writers, soldiers, politicians, administrators, or spokespersons guard secrets or stop them from shaming one another and was not capable of preventing its resizing, could the heirs of the old powers manage to prevent their own resizing if the thinkers and writers, soldiers, politicians, administrators, or spokespersons of the United Nations, the five nations who deputize on their behalf at the United Nations, the UN Security Council, the UN Member States, the World Bank, the IMF, NATO, etc., are not cooperating in accordance with the work program that the founding fathers of the UN suggested in the UDHR? In other words, will the heirs of the old powers regret having agreed to deviate away from the work program that the founders of the UN counselled them to remain faithful to its principles to maintain their strength and stability in order to let the thinkers and writers, soldiers, politicians, administrators, or spokespersons of the United Nations—the five nations that deputize on their behalf at the United Nations, the UN Security Council, the UN Member States, the World Bank, the IMF, NATO, etc.—adopt a new work program to reach this end?

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

⁶ <https://www.econlib.org/book-chapters/chapter-vol-4-miscellaneous-writings-thoughts-and-details-on-scarcity/>

I have no way of knowing if all the thinkers and writers, soldiers, politicians, administrators, or spokespersons whom the heirs of the old powers tasked to deputize on their behalf on how to transform conditions and outcomes that matter to them at the United Nations, UN Security Council, the UN Member States, the World Bank, the IMF, NATO, etc. “would not bite the hands that fed them” after they decided to make them their partner in securing the things they deeply care about. That is to say, allowing thinkers and writers, soldiers, politicians, administrators, or spokespersons of the United Nations, UN Security Council, UN member states, World Bank, IMF, NATO, etc., to secure the goals suggested in the preamble of the UN Charter and the new standards (laws) that those bodies and nations constantly legitimize while considering themselves exempt from obeying the natural and legal rights they legitimize (lead by example), enjoying privileges and immunities, and buying and selling resolves and determinations in the same way Jesus found people doing when he visited a synagogue cannot secure the things they care about.

Throughout history, no ruler managed to protect his power, wealth, and status without forgoing the security of others, including murdering all his enemies and particularly the people who envied his authority. Could the prevailing rise in insecurity, disregard, or contempt that emerged in the world after World War II be a result of people globally adopting the elimination methods that the fittest used to maintain their power?

Commutative algebra is the branch of algebra that studies commutative rings, their ideas, and modules over such rings.⁷ Commutative algebra is also “the main technical tool in the local study of schemes.” In mathematics, a binary equation is commutative if changing the order of the operands does not change the result.⁸ If changing the order of the operands changes the result, it is called noncommutative.

If the heirs of the old powers believe that adopting elimination method strategies such as divide and rule, assassination, violence, and murder could eliminate variables (rivals) but without such a strategy

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

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

weakening their strength and stability (i.e., producing commutative and not noncommutative operands), this means one of two things. The first possibility is that the heirs of the old powers are actively searching for a simple theory to help them create a single political authority, similar to how scientists have sought a theory of everything for over 2000 years, dating back to the days of Pythagoras. The second is if the heirs of the old powers believe that extending the same elimination tradition that their predecessors adopted to maintain their strength and stability (i.e., relying on divide and rule, assassination, violence, and domination) would not prompt their resizing and collapse.

I have no way of knowing which of the two aforementioned scenarios the heirs of the old powers are adopting to solidify their strength and stability. Nonetheless, the heirs of the old powers cannot be working, searching for a simple theory that can help them to create a single political authority in the same way scientists have been doing for 2000 years, because if this were the case, rulers in UN member states would be cooperating and working together like scientists are doing to come up with a theory of everything.

The abnormal level of disregard and violence that has emerged in the world since 1945 indicates that the heirs of the old powers are actively seeking a way to create a single political authority, similar to the efforts of their predecessors over the past 2000 years, by continuing the tradition of elimination through tactics such as divide and rule, assassination, violence, and domination.

When we compare how societies (kingdoms) established relations with one another before World War II to the way they began interacting after the war, we observe that prior to the war, whenever one society (kingdom) conquered another, both the conquering and conquered societies managed to identify common ground, with the weaker society accepting subservience to the stronger.

Strangely, as of 1945, neither the weak society (kingdoms and nations) is prepared to accept surrendering freedom to the mightiest, nor the mightiest (kingdoms and nations) is prepared to accept letting the weak society (kingdoms and nations) have any degree of freedom.

Organizational hierarchies have existed since the dawn of time. Natural division of labor requires hierarchies for proper functioning. If, as of 1945, humans stopped being able to be organized in a way that everybody had someone to answer to for whatever they were doing, then one of two scenarios could be creating this drawback. The first scenario involves a shift in human nature following World War II, leading to the encoding of violence into newborns' genes. The second scenario considers whether a flaw is responsible for the abnormal rise in disregard, contempt, or violence that has occurred worldwide since 1945.

I have no way of knowing what could be driving this abnormal rise in human intolerance between the two scenarios suggested above since 1945. Humans have no control over their genes. Could this abnormal rise in disregard, contempt, or violence that has swept the world since 1945 be due to the heirs of the old powers having allowed a change in organizational hierarchy that was not adopted before WW2 erupted? The consequence of this change has caused significant disruption to the hierarchical decision-making processes and patterns that form the traditional political and social structures of societies.

Could the decision of the heirs of the old powers to allow that the thinkers and writers, soldiers, politicians, administrators, or spokespersons of the different UN member states and the different human development institutions, agencies, and entities (such as the United Nations, World Bank, NATO, IMF, and NGOs) maintain relationships with them (i.e., granting them rights to deviate away from the work program they determined and enjoy privileges and immunities) be what has knocked out completely this traditional political and social hierarchical decision-making process and pattern?

For example, could the reason why the traditional political and social organizational hierarchy that is required for things to work properly be not working at all as of 1945 be due to the heirs of the old powers allowing the nations that are permanent members of the UN Security Council to create bodies, institutions, coalitions, agreements, and contracts and to staff them with thinkers and writers, soldiers, politicians, administrators, or spokespersons who are not obeying the

work program that the founding fathers of the UN suggested in the UDHR, which could be causing this breakdown?

Said differently, could the reason for the abnormal rise in disregard and contempt that emerged in the world in recent years be due to having thinkers and writers, soldiers, politicians, administrators, or spokespersons of institutions, agencies, entities, bodies, or coalitions who are not obeying the work program that the founding fathers of the UN suggested in the UDHR, preparing people to consider their opinion before taking actions of their own, which has compelled this rise in intolerance that emerged in the world in recent years, knowing that the people who are refusing to obey are doing it because of the take they have against those units of authority for their unpreparedness to practice what they preach?

Let us take two examples to understand how this aforementioned conjecture could be affecting the behavior of people by studying its effect on the United States and the international postwar world order.

Let us assume that the laws that lawmakers in the United States started passing frequently in recent years to permit the government to approve programs that freeze the assets of individuals, businesses, nations, etc., are not intended to further the international postwar world order but its own national security and foreign policies. The United States is required to create bodies and institutions to enforce in the different UN member states those new programs that its lawmakers pass afterwards. The thinkers and writers, soldiers, politicians, administrators, or spokespersons whom the United States is hiring to administer the different newly created units of authority in the different UN member states are not obeying the work program that the founding fathers of the UN suggested in the UDHR. All that the United States is doing by creating bodies, institutions, coalitions, agreements, and contracts to employ them against the people who are refusing to surrender freedom to its political order or the international postwar world order is weakening its reputation and its strength and stability.

The founding fathers of the UN proposed that the intergovernmental organization known as the United Nations should coordinate the efforts of UN member states to achieve UN goals, rather than

determining political, economic, social, and cultural solutions alongside governments. The United Nations System is composed of thousands of bodies, institutions, coalitions, etc., and its members are failing to obey the work program that the founding fathers of the UN suggested in the UDHR. By creating bodies, institutions, coalitions, agreements, and contracts at the United Nations and staffing them with thinkers, writers, soldiers, politicians, administrators, or spokespersons who do not adhere to the work program proposed by the founding fathers of the UN in the UDHR, UN member states are weakening both themselves and the international postwar world order.

In addition, if we take into account that as of the date the United States and the nations with whom this country is involved in a close web of allies and alliances began to sanction individuals, businesses, or nations around the world such as Hezbollah, Cuba, Venezuela, Iran, North Korea, China, etc., this strategy has not had any effect so far on improving peace and security worldwide or its security. This means that all the bodies, institutions, coalitions, agreements, and contracts that the United States has created to accelerate the preparedness of people to surrender freedom to the international postwar world order are not reducing fear and want but rather accelerating its disintegration.

Said differently, we know that the rulers and political class who control Hezbollah, Cuba, Venezuela, Iran, North Korea, China, etc., are not cooperating in accordance with the work program that the founding fathers of the UN suggested in the UDHR. When we create new units of authority to reverse this disregard by using actors (thinkers and writers, soldiers, politicians, administrators, or spokespersons) who fail to cooperate with the work program suggested by the UN's founding fathers in the UDHR, we accelerate disregard and contempt around the world.

Since 1945, only the United States has engaged in wars to ensure the success of the international postwar world order, while every other UN member state that participated in a war or fought alongside the United States did so to advance its own nationalistic ambitions. This means that if rulers and political classes in UN member states continue to refuse to cooperate with the work program suggested by the founding

fathers of the UN in the UDHR, and if the United States persists in meddling in the political affairs of UN member states through agents (thinkers and writers, soldiers, politicians, administrators, or spokespersons) who do not practice what they preach, the United States may be digging its own grave.

Could this increased aggressive behavior that swept the world in recent years be due to the heirs of the old powers allowing thinkers and writers, soldiers, politicians, administrators, or spokespeople to invite people to surrender freedom to them, but while they are not cooperating in accordance with the work program that the founding fathers of the UN suggested in the UDHR? Could this increased activism or emphasis on reducing poverty and injustice be what has contributed to the international postwar world order failing to work as it should? The drawback of creating bodies, institutions, coalitions, agreements, and contracts and staffing them with agents (thinkers and writers, soldiers, politicians, administrators, or spokespersons) who are refusing to surrender freedom to the political order caused people's behavior on both sides to become very impulsive and thus harder to control.

A specific environment caused people to withdraw their obligations to observe the political order set by the victors of WW2 in 1945, leading to the opposing developments that emerged, such as increased civil disobedience and challenges to authority that undermined the established order.

We have no way of knowing if people work in deterministic ways or in probabilistic ways. Nonetheless, all the predispositions that people form and subsequently violate suggest that humans operate in a probabilistic manner, particularly regarding issues related to wealth, power, and status, rather than in a deterministic way.

If all the bodies, institutions, coalitions, and agreements that the victors of WW2 granted the UN member states and the United Nations rights to create in the aftermath of WW2 to solidify their power, and which were far above what the founding fathers of the UN counselled them to create to achieve the same end, failed to nest the right political, social, religious, and cultural environment, then there is a

good chance that the increased aggressive behavior that we started observing to be the product of the energy that is resulting from all the excitation or expectations that the thinkers and writers, soldiers, politicians, administrators, or spokespersons of those new units of authority are creating in the social order, just as happens when a musician plucks the string of a musical instrument.

If all the excitation or expectations that the thinkers and writers, soldiers, politicians, administrators, or spokespersons of the new units of authority are creating in the social order are affecting people in the same way when a musician plucks the string of a musical instrument, then there is a good chance that the violent behaviors that people are exhibiting in recent years could be accelerating the reversal of the heirs of the old powers to a simpler form rather than reducing it. This is because if higher tensions and vibrations in the social order work in the same way when higher tensions and vibrations break a musical instrument's string, then if the heirs of the old powers are letting thinkers and writers, soldiers, politicians, administrators, or spokespersons provide political and economic solutions while disobeying the work program that the founding fathers of the UN suggested in the UDHR, they would be unable to prevent their collapse.

Said differently, if human behavior works like a rubber band and the sum of all the behaviors depicts the way the international order resonates, then if the heirs of the old powers continue to allow UN member states and the United Nations to create bodies, institutions, coalitions, and agreements that their thinkers and writers, soldiers, politicians, administrators, or spokespersons devote themselves to, practicing what they are not preaching, then it would not be possible to induce conduct that runs in accordance with the legitimized political paradigm.

Hypocrisy is defined as “the behavior of people who do things that they tell other people not to do.”⁹ Since the dawn of time, only a few people have practiced what they preach. Most people say one thing and then do another.

⁹ <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/hypocrisy>

Hypocrisy is not new and will never end. It must be tolerated as long as the heirs of the old powers appoint immature believers to legitimize their interests. The heirs of the old powers will have to figure out how to ensure that the hollow promises, carnality, and damages that the thinkers and writers, soldiers, politicians, administrators, or spokespersons of those units of authority are creating for them would be strengths that would reinforce their wealth, status, or power. This is because it is not possible to know how the violent behaviors that people exhibit are impacting the international rule-based postwar world order, which the heirs of the old powers depend on to continue to get their ways despite the resistance of others.

For example, Ibn Khaldun believed that “sticking to traditions does not signify that the dead are living but rather that the living are dead.”¹⁰ In other words, governments repeatedly searched for wrongdoings, exposed them, and condemned them, but refused to examine their own actions to see if they were in line with their preaching, as they could be neglecting the most important matters. This dilemma leads people to later regret their actions.

I have no way of knowing how the heirs of the old powers plan to prevent their collapse after they decided to deviate from the work program that the founding fathers of the UN counselled them to not tamper with to solidify their power in favor of creating new units of authority whose thinkers and writers, soldiers, politicians, administrators, or spokespersons are sticking to doing what the founding fathers of the UN were themselves devoted to doing before WW2 erupted, but then when the barbarous acts that they lived through during WW2 outraged their conscience, they regretted their conduct and counselled people to work together instead to not experience them.

Said differently, the phrase “actions speak louder than words” means that people are more likely to believe what you do rather than what you say; there is a difference between the two.¹¹ In other words, it's easier to lie with words than actions, as actions are closely tied to one's beliefs and desires. As of 1945, the heirs of the old powers chose to

¹⁰ <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=K1pZwpl85Rk>

¹¹ <https://writingexplained.org/idiom-dictionary/actions-speak-louder-words>

rely on the concepts of liberal interventionism and self-determination to get their way despite the resistance of others. The heirs of the old powers decided to rely on the idea of liberal interventionism and self-determination to get their way despite the resistance of others as of 1945. Could the heirs of the old powers continue to make people believe that the state of insecurity that exists in the world is due to the accelerated rates of growth of population, knowledge, technology, communications, commerce, weapon destructiveness, and environmental degradation, and not necessarily to the actions of the thinkers and writers, soldiers, politicians, administrators, or spokespersons of the new units of authority that the heirs of the old powers granted rights to UN member states and to the United Nations to create when their actions speak louder than words? In other words, can the heirs of the old powers expect that people around the world trust the thinkers and writers, soldiers, politicians, administrators, or spokespersons of the United States, Great Britain, France, and other NATO nations when their actions in Iraq and Afghanistan speak louder than words? That is to say, the thinkers and writers, soldiers, politicians, administrators, or spokespersons of those NATO nations pushed people in Iraq or Afghanistan to flip against the existing political order, to consider their opinion before taking action of their own, and not to invite the Iraqi and Afghani people to cooperate in accordance with the principles of the international rule-based postwar world order. Likewise, the people of Iraq and Afghanistan rebelled against the existing political order to increase their own happiness, not the happiness of the NATO nations' thinkers, writers, soldiers, politicians, administrators, or spokespersons, who pushed them to pay the price they paid while rejecting cooperation with the principles of the postwar international rule-based world order.

It looks as if the most significant peril that started confronting the planet's human communities in the aftermath of WW2 is how to make the heirs of the old powers recognize that all the societies and kingdoms whose thinkers and writers, soldiers, politicians, administrators, or spokespersons wanted to play the "Big Brother" role but without leading by example ended up becoming resented by the "Smaller Brother" and not loved when the exploitation of the "Big Brother" was gradually pushing the happiness of the "Smaller Brother" backward.

In other words, the decision of the “Big Brother” to increase the access of the “Small Brother” to knowledge, technology, communications, commerce, weapon destructiveness, and awareness about environmental degradation made people around the world understand that in the choice between abuse of government power and civil liberties, the majority are prepared to choose the latter. In other words, people are uninterested in following the government's advice or trusting the pledges made by government officials that they will uphold the status quo, which has benefited the wealthy and disadvantaged the poor since 1945.

Historians report that Albert Einstein said, “Insanity is doing the same thing over and over and expecting different results.”¹² People can continue to create options that conceal the truth about what everyone needs to do in order to genuinely reduce fear and want around the world. However, since people have chosen to achieve different outcomes by repeatedly doing the same thing (i.e., relying on Stalinist-type governance and policies, where the idealization of a heroic leader is replaced by unquestioned loyalty to an idea), can the heirs of the old powers compel individuals to eliminate behaviors they perceive as threats in order to enhance their well-being? This threat arises from the unpreparedness of the authorities responsible for protecting the heirs of the old powers (i.e., governments and international institutions), who are failing to adhere to the work program outlined in the UN Charter or the UDHR.

In other words, when Joseph Stalin adopted socialism as state policy and began to strengthen his grip on power in Russia, the mass repression, ethnic cleansing, religious persecution, and forced deportations carried out by his thinkers, writers, soldiers, politicians, administrators, and spokespersons were intended to prioritize use-value over law-value.

In the 1990s communism collapsed, so people could switch to prioritizing law-value instead of use-value. At the start of the 21st century, the plan by the United States, Great Britain, France, and other

¹² <https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/einstein-s-parable-of-quantum-insanity/>

Western European nations to portray Islam as the enemy of the people failed to attract sympathizers. Can the heirs of the old powers prevent the rich and the poor, or the fittest and the weak, from becoming entangled in a permanent revolution pursuant to their decision to deviate away from the world program that the founding fathers of the UN counseled them to stay faithful to its principles to continue to transform the conditions and outcomes that matter to them in favor of letting UN member states and the United Nations aggravate or radicalize the poor and to compel them into believing that governments are the enemies number one of the people?

Hence, all the popular unrest, civil unrest, civil wars, wars, etc. that the world has known over the last 70 years appear to be persuading every member of the human family. business, society, and nation to start to pursue their own interests independently and without compromise or alliance with opposing sections of society. This means that the thinkers and writers, soldiers, politicians, administrators, or spokespersons of the nations who are playing the Big Brother role failed to develop the productive forces that would achieve the sort of advanced capitalism that will make every person perceive that the world is cooperating to achieve the ends that are suggested in the preamble of the UN Charter. To the contrary, the preoccupation of the nations with great power with creating new units of authority and enlisting the thinkers and writers, soldiers, politicians, administrators, or spokespersons of those institutions, bodies, coalitions, etc. to radicalize the poor and make them perceive that governments are the enemies of the people has instigated the need to intensify the struggle to seize the social, economic, and political power of standing regimes to combat the hegemony of governments over how direct democracy should work.

In this regard, since none of the strategies that the thinkers and writers, soldiers, politicians, administrators, or spokespersons of the new units of authority that UN member states and the United Nations created in the aftermath of WW2 managed to prevent wars or to create synergy that would make newborns or the poor perceive that they need to surrender freedom to the international postwar world order to strengthen the law of value (i.e., the regulative principle of the political and economic exchange of the products of human work), but rather the agents of those newly created institutions, bodies, coalitions, etc., are

securing the readiness of people to surrender freedom because they are claiming that they can transition them toward use-value ends (i.e., the redistribution of wealth based on equal outcomes), we can then say that the longer the heirs of the old powers take to create a new reset, the harder it will be for those powerful families/dynasties involved to preserve the essence of the modern state. In other words, when the state ceases to be viewed as an end in itself, rivalry increases. When rivalry rises, the international postwar world order could collapse, bringing along all the families/dynasties who depend on its essence to get their way despite the resistance of others.

Furthermore, if the recent increase in aggressive behavior worldwide is due to the poor becoming unprepared to live without their own agency (or to accept the unwillingness of rulers and the political class to relinquish control of the regime despite policies that do not enhance their happiness), then the heirs of the old powers would inevitably extend the system of terror that most rulers in Western Europe relied on during the second half of the second millennium to pursue their interests, especially if rivalry and intolerance are inherent in all people. This is very serious and worrisome.

Said differently, if the heirs of the old powers perceive that their strength and stability are increasingly threatened, it would not be possible for them to prevent that fear and jealousy from starting to play a role in the decisions they would be making. This also means that the apprehension felt by those powerful families and dynasties could drive them to take despotic actions in order to eliminate threats to their wealth, power, or status. If the families/dynasties involved fail to make the people whom they suppress surrender freedom to their political subjection, then there is a good chance that the independent attitude that people would be bound by while pursuing their own interests will make them become unprepared to consolidate, as we saw happening in Lebanon since 1975 or in Iraq since 2003. In fact, in Lebanon, the Lebanese are unwilling to surrender freedom to the international rule-based postwar world order since 1945 or abandon their revolutionary aspirations to eliminate the state of Israel since 1990 despite all the alms that the international community made to them to disavow such aspirations.

Since the heirs of the old powers chose to change how governance should continue to be structured, like in the aftermath of WW2, whereby only the king (president) was granted rights and immunities to be the chief executive, and preferred instead that thinkers and writers, soldiers, politicians, administrators, or spokespersons who normally would have been devoted pre-1945 to leading by example and redistributing tribute also be buying and selling like them (i.e., the president), then we can say that the fate of the successors of those families/dynasties could evolve in two ways. The first is the decay of the wealth, power, and status of the families/dynasties that won WW2 (i.e., the families/dynasties who control the international order and the money supply of the world) along with the ideas that thinkers and writers, soldiers, politicians, administrators, or spokespersons are telling the powerful families/dynasties involved to depend on to transform the conditions that matter to them. The second scenario would involve institutionalizing force or employing tricks to mitigate threats that could destabilize their strength and stability.

Throughout history, numerous powerful families and dynasties have attempted to prevent their own decline or eventual collapse by implementing various ideas and strategies, but they have all ultimately failed. It is important to note herein that many families/dynasties tried to preserve their wealth, status, or power by blending their superiority into the idea of good (God, religion, democracy, justice, etc.); hence, such a concept that the human imagination or human ingenuity formulates or pens in this domain is immortal, but later they failed.

The heirs of the old powers (the families/dynasties who control the money supply of the world) could continue to allow their thinkers and writers, soldiers, politicians, administrators, or spokespersons whom they depend on to transform the conditions and outcomes that matter to them to lead the poor into believing that they can make the rich give up the means of production, which they own, to ensure the perpetuation of the economic supremacy and standing they enjoy in society. Similarly, they can make the poor cooperate based on principles that those servants are not ready to relinquish freedom to exhibit, but I am sure that those powerful families/dynasties also know that “no man likes to be chained even if his chain is from gold.”¹³

¹³ <https://books.google.com/books?id=miDRw3VLbtgC&printsec=frontcover>

If “no man is good enough to govern another man without the other's consent”¹⁴ as Abraham Lincoln suggested, then those powerful families/dynasties should also be aware that putting their trust in those thinkers and writers, soldiers, politicians, administrators, or spokespersons who are working on transforming the conditions and outcomes that matter to them instead of putting their trust in the work program that the UN founding fathers of the UN (their fathers) counselled them to be faithful to would produce two outcomes. The first outcome is that the ideas or plans they develop may appease the poor and convince them to surrender their freedom, thereby allowing the powerful families to continue transforming the conditions and outcomes that matter to them. The second outcome is that their actions would serve as a new lesson in life for all future rulers, similar to the kings or emperors who failed to prioritize the truth.

I cannot know how the thinkers, writers, soldiers, politicians, administrators, and spokespersons that the heirs of the old powers count on to secure the implicit and explicit goals of those powerful families/dynasties are transforming the conditions and outcomes that matter to them. What I do know is that whenever people feel that their political leaders are not increasing their happiness, their readiness to obey diminishes. Throughout history, no ruler managed to obtain or keep the support of his dependents independently when he behaved immorally or allowed the people who protected him to behave equally.

Civil unrest, riots, civil wars, etc. are all effective methods that people of distinct and shared ethnic background, religion, occupation, geographical region, or other basis could depend on to let certain ideological or religious beliefs provide mutual aid to them. In fact, in some countries a person can be imprisoned or simply face murder charges in the name of morality or religious piety. In simple terms, people often use the concept of faith and adherence to religious practices as a means of control, even though most religious texts allow individuals the freedom to choose their belief in God.

In the next chapter, I plan to continue to investigate if the heirs of the old powers can transform the conditions and outcomes that matter to

¹⁴ <http://www.phnet.fi/public/mamaa1/lincoln.htm>

them while their critical thinkers and servants are regarding themselves as exempt from observing the work program suggested in the UDHR or if this strategy would accelerate their collapse, just as happened to the Israelites when they began to be against dividing the spoils among the people involved fairly.

2

Doctrinal Dishonesty

When Moses was leading the Israelites to the promised land, the thinkers, writers, soldiers, politicians, judges, law enforcement officers, administrators, or spokespersons who assisted him during this journey or the wars they waged along the way obeyed him and did not consider themselves exempt from the rules he legitimized. In other words, the critical thinkers and servants who were helping him were not prioritizing their self-interests over the common interests. Most importantly, the critical thinkers and servants who helped him shared the spoils they salvaged during battles with the community.[Numbers 31: 27] Likewise, the heads of the communities were dividing the plunder and spoils with each household and were not freezing all the articles (people, gold, silver, sheep, cattle, and donkeys) recuperated and handing them to their heirs. Therefore, since the strategies that the heirs of the old powers want their critical thinkers and servants (rulers, political class, judges, law enforcement officers, thinkers and writers, soldiers, administrators, or spokespersons) who are helping them to solidify their powers to involve practical democratic principles that do not intersect with the direct democratic principles that the founding fathers of the UN counselled them (the powerful families/dynasties involved) to be faithful to its principles to prevent their collapse, then we cannot say that their power could not disappear or be absorbed by another growing power. In other words, as long as the heirs of the old powers allow their critical thinkers and servants to legitimize and enforce laws that do not equally distribute happiness like Moses and his helpers did, people's distrust of the international rule-based postwar world order—which the powerful families and dynasties depend on to solidify their power—will continue to grow, so we should expect that governments will institutionalize force to stay in power. Force is an

instrument that the societies that obey the political order that governments legitimize reject, and the societies that oppose it fight it. This situation transforms the social order into a battleground where its members continuously cancel each other out (i.e., multiplying, dividing, adding, and subtracting) until a victor ultimately emerges, similar to solving systems of equations by elimination.

If the heirs of the old powers believe that the natural and legal rights that their critical thinkers and servants are legitimizing and enforcing to forcibly strip and eliminate threats that the mindfulness of specific societies pose on their own power, wealth, and status can enable them to continue to push their brands or to get their ways despite the resistance of others (i.e., freedom, domination, justice, democracy, wars, etc.), then either the families/dynasties involved believe they are invincible or they believe that the substitution of permanent war for permanent revolutions would continue to permit them to mutate the wealth, power, and status of people, thus keeping their authority intact.

It is important that readers keep in mind that the heirs of the old powers do not become involved in determining or enforcing laws directly. That is to say, if a civil war erupts in the United States and this country is partitioned or a war erupts between the United States and China, whoever is the victor would not have any bearing on weakening the power, wealth, and status of the heirs of the old powers for as long as the victor does not demonetize the existing money system and legitimize a new currency system as India did in 2016 on certain banknotes.¹⁵

To put it differently, the heirs of the old powers control the international order and the money supply of the world through the intermediary of two instruments: doctrine and money. All the doctrines that people depend on do not threaten the power, wealth, and status of the families/dynasties who won WW2, because a doctrine does not devalue existing wealth but reconfigures hierarchical organization.

For example, people shield themselves under different religions, doctrines, or constitutions to dominate others. In many Arab countries,

¹⁵<https://www.theguardian.com/world/2016/nov/08/india-withdraws-500-1000-rupee-notes-fight-corruption>

individuals can be imprisoned or murdered by the faction that controls the nation in the name of morality or religious piety, even though most religious texts leave the choice of belief in God to the individual, and both law and political order are human creations rather than natural. If, for example, Saudi Arabia becomes engulfed in a civil war and the winning faction decides to abandon Islamic laws in favor of a liberal approach, despite resistance from others, this transformation would not affect the power, wealth, and status of the families and dynasties that control the international order and the global money supply. However, if Saudi Arabia becomes engulfed in a civil war and the winning faction decides to abandon the current money supply system (i.e., the US dollar) used to generate wealth in the country and creates its own currency without involving the financial systems controlled by the families and dynasties that won World War II, this change would threaten the power, wealth, and status of the heirs of the old powers, especially if alternative energy sources are not available and everyone continues to rely on Saudi oil.

Furthermore, since advances in science naturally alter the distribution of wealth, the heirs of the old powers can only rely on deceit or the use of force that governments (including rulers and the political class) in UN member states employ to preserve their wealth, power, and status.

Again, it is important that readers keep in mind that the type of deceit that the heirs of the old powers sponsor is not material dishonesty (i.e., arms control measures and transparency measures) but doctrinal dishonesty (i.e., stability measures). A typical example occurs when the president of the United States, or the president or prime minister of a Western European country, delivers a speech about their country's commitment to basic principles but then fails to respect dissent in a democracy or declares that all nations have the freedom to set their own course and choose their associations, while simultaneously opposing those nations that stand up for their beliefs. For example, the United States would not allow Russia or China to interfere in Mexico or Latin America, nor would it permit Iraqi, Syrian, or Lebanese groups to ally with Iranian, Russian, or Chinese entities.

Hence, UN member states could only support governance models in which rulers and political classes advocate for the people of another

country to determine their own future, rather than for the people they control or dominate. This means that as governments overreach by cracking down on freedom under the pretext of protecting the people, sovereignty, security, and the economy, the resulting increase in intimidation, harassment, and expressions of hate from law enforcement will lead to a loss of support from the people, creating a stalemate where both parties are unprepared to listen to each other or communicate effectively.

As citizens increasingly defend democracy, truth, accountability, and transparency, government overreach is likely to escalate, as seen in nearly all UN member states; governments can only take two actions to maintain their grip on power and avert eventual collapse. The first is to resort to force to curtail any attempt to destabilize the legitimized rules. The second action involves freezing the resources that people rely on for their survival and to satisfy their basic needs, which can include measures such as imposing famine or freezing personal bank accounts and assets.

Throughout history, no regime managed to prevent its collapse when its rulers started to use force to get their way despite the resistance of others or whenever rulers began to purge the individuals whom the government regarded as a threat to its own survival. Regimes that use their power to deny people the rights necessary for survival typically find this practice very effective in making individuals or societies surrender and obey. As of 1945, no nation has placed a food or water embargo, medicine embargo, etc., on another nation to make it yield to its demand. However, the United States regularly passes laws allowing it to have banks worldwide freeze the personal accounts of individuals and nations threatening its sovereignty or not supporting its imperialism.

During the aftermath of World War II, a centralized monetary system interconnected all nations. In other words, any person who deposits his money in a bank account controls nothing from his wealth except the bank statement that the bank makes available to depositors. However, the individuals who control the centralized monetary system hold the overall power because they can prevent the transfer of funds between

banks for individuals whose wealth has been frozen by the United States.

As of 1945, no regime has frozen on a mass scale the personal accounts of citizens who disagreed with the legal and natural rights that its lawmakers usually pass to provide them leverage over individuals involved in foreign-influenced activities or espionage. For this reason, it is not possible to know if such a tactic can threaten democracy and civil liberties. The individuals and nations on whom the United States applied financial sanctions did not react in a way that significantly helped the US enhance its authority or democracy.

If the United States has imposed embargoes on entire countries, such as Cuba (since 1960)¹⁶ or Iran (since 1979)¹⁷, and these measures did not result in citizens acting unlawfully to undermine or overthrow the constitutionally established governments, then we can conclude that the effectiveness of sanctions in deterring acts of serious violence motivated by economic, political, religious, or ideological objectives is low.

As of 1945, none of the solutions that governments worldwide have employed against each other or their own citizens to compel them to surrender their freedom to the prevailing political order—ranging from force to compromise, including sanctions—have improved democratic standards or the rule of law. Furthermore, as governments create more units of authority and laws, common values such as solidarity are increasingly backsliding. This indicates a failure to establish consensus around the international rule-based postwar world order laid out by WW2 victors in the UN Charter, as governments undermine this order.

Generally speaking, people fail to reach a consensus when they do not unite around a goal. Likewise, people usually fail to produce a goal when they do not know what they want. Hence, if the heirs of the old powers seem uncertain about what they want, it is reasonable to say that people will continue reaching agreements in the future without the differences that exist between them lurking.

¹⁶https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/United_States_embargo_against_Cuba

¹⁷<https://sgp.fas.org/crs/mideast/RS20871.pdf>

When people reach agreements comprising differences, the agreement usually signifies that the people involved believe resolving their differences is impossible. Likewise, when people reach agreements that include differences, it also indicates that, aside from the agreed-upon arrangements, normal business operations continue, which may lead to a superficial sense of stability while underlying tensions remain unresolved.

Hence, in the near future, the maxim of people around the world could be set to "business as usual" or, as per the way Winston Churchill suggested to the British people to be doing during the early years of the First World War when he was speaking at Guildhall on 9 November 1914, i.e., to be working to maintain a stable and functioning country in the same manner as before the war¹⁸, then it would not be possible to avoid that morality, solidarity, rule of law, or democratic standards continuing to backslide.

If the underlying assumption in the near future is that consensus between people (citizens and governments) on issues of common interest will decline, then only if a higher number of decision-making processes are delegated could such a planning process crumble or reduce the morale-eroding change in behavior that most societies would experience when the push is toward deepening democracy rather than authoritarianism in the existing social order.

The challenge that the two aforementioned plans pose is that they produce the same outcomes when the individuals involved do not observe the standards legitimized.

When the opportunities of citizens to take interest in public affairs increase (i.e., decentralization), poverty, corruption, intolerance, hate, immorality, or irreligion deepen. Similarly, when governments reduce the opportunities for citizens to take interest in public affairs (i.e., authoritarianism), poverty, corruption, intolerance, hate, immorality, or irreligion deepens.

¹⁸The Oxford Library of Words and Phrases. Vol. I. Oxford University Press. 1981. p. 71.

As long as people continue to refuse to use their increased awareness and knowledge to surrender their freedom to the work program outlined in the UN Charter or the UDHR, neither decentralized nor centralized approaches can help them become accustomed to improved stability, freedom, morality, solidarity, rule of law, or democratic standards; thus, people might have united since 1945 to pursue a "post-ruinous" agenda instead of a "post-constructive" one.

The way people are cooperating to spread and uplift "good" since 1945 is strange. Humans reject "evil" as a dogma but are willing to commit "evil" acts in the name of "good."

A system is a group of interacting or interrelated elements that act according to a set of rules to form a unified whole.¹⁹ Systems can be natural or man-made. Hence, the political, social, or economic systems or orders (i.e., perspective, including levels, spheres, sectors, and functions) that people are organized around to build are not natural but human creations. This signifies that if the emergent phenomena that resulted from the interactions that were carried out since 1945 have increased dynamism (evil) instead of reducing it (improving good), then one of two scenarios could be true. The first scenario may arise from rulers and the political class (including judges, law enforcement officers, thinkers and writers, soldiers, administrators, or spokespersons) compelling people to pursue development goals that were not intended by the force that designed human behavior. The second scenario may be due to humans' inability to tell right from wrong. In other words, human life exists at a level that is lower than the ascension achieved by other living creatures.

I cannot determine which of the two scenarios mentioned is compelling people to violate or erode international human rights norms as found in the UDHR, thus pushing the world to prioritize policies improving economic decline or the government's constant decline in performance. Again, the continuous demand by human ingenuity (human imagination) for a greater say in governance, despite people's capacity to recognize that the weakest is naturally obliged to surrender freedom to the fittest, and its insistence on changing this equation (reality) through the intermediary of force instead of through

¹⁹<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/System>

the weakest making the fittest develop the understanding he (she) needs of himself (herself) to consequently be able to correct the distortions that skew one's own analyses of benefit and cost, could be an input that the human ingenuity (human imagination) of the weakest invented to keep the world insecure, just as this aptitude invented the idea of God or its latest proclamation about "all men having been created equal," which figures in the US Declaration of Independence.

If we go back in time to between 1765 and 1791, we find that it was the weakest who proclaimed during the American War of Independence that "all men have been created equal," and not the fittest. In addition, since the date humans started to keep records, it is the fittest who deny the existence of God, not the weakest.

Again, the preparedness of human ingenuity (human imagination) of existing people, fit or weak, rich or poor, to take at face value the idea of "good" and "evil," "God," or the proclamation about "all men having been created equal," which our predecessors reached not too long ago, and to ignore the toll it took to reach them signifies that existing people are either undermining the human ingenuity (human imagination) or the conclusions (truth) that those predecessors reached.

I have no way of knowing how our predecessors reached the convictions that they passed on to us about "good" and "evil," "God," or the proclamation about "all men having been created equal." But since ancient times, those who used the idea of "good" to get their way despite opposition have only received the permanence of the good they used to solidify their power and the brief reward (i.e., power, wealth, and status) they gained from this tactic.

Accordingly, no one knows if the failure of any authority to prevent its collapse is due to the existence of divine justice (i.e., God), who is tasked with keeping balance between people, or because there are no sophisticated surveillance technologies that make it possible to track people better, thus enabling the detection of threats earlier.

Even if people develop methods to achieve surveillance by replicating brain functionality in software, I do not believe that those who would

benefit the most from such advancements could successfully steer the world order according to their envisioned civilizing mission.

In other words, "evil" and "good" can be understood as two-sided concepts, similar to a coin or a piece of paper that has an observed face and a reverse side. In other words, a person cannot achieve "good" without first prompting "evil" or vice versa—forgoing something for another.

If scientists manage to replicate the functionality of the brain in software, as they are now capable of doing in brain-chipped bird drones^{20,21}, but without figuring out how to extend longevity forever (which is the only reason why theoretically people explore), it would not be possible to render the relation between "good" and "evil" irrelevant, thus stopping this function from impacting negatively and positively, at the same time, on the strength and stability of the individuals who stand to gain the most from the development of such technology to prevent their reversal to a simpler form.

In other words, all the changes the human body makes in matter are planned to figure out how to extend longevity forever. It is impossible to reach this end without creating changes in matter, but we have no way of knowing if the changes that the human body is effecting are indeed helping to figure out how to extend longevity forever. This means that whether scientists manage to replicate the functionality of the brain in software or not would not be useful to the individuals who want others to consider their opinion before taking action of their own to get their way despite the resistance of others. This is because the information gained from such technology does not indicate whether scientists are close to discovering eternal longevity, leaving individuals unsure which actions to limit or permit.

In addition, hence, as I said, the actions in the matter that people class as "good" and the actions that people class as "evil" are both required to help mankind to figure out how to extend longevity forever. The laws that the individuals who want others to consider their opinion

²⁰<https://united24media.com/latest-news/russia-launches-first-brain-chipped-bird-drones-for-surveillance-over-cities-13769>

²¹<https://theweek.com/science/russia-pigeons-brain-control-drones>

before taking action of their own could be impeding on the efforts of mankind to make progress to figure out how to extend longevity forever when they forbid actions, irrespective of their nature. Furthermore, even if we are to assume that the laws that the individuals who want others to consider their opinion before taking action of their own are on the right track to help mankind to make progress to figure out how to extend longevity forever, when those individuals who consider themselves exempt from obeying the laws that are legitimized and persuade others to disobey the laws for self-interests motives, this attitude delays mankind even more.

Therefore, no matter how much "good" or how much "evil" an individual who wants others to consider his opinion before taking action of their own does, his efforts would not help him to avoid others not threatening him if he disobeys or allows his dependent to disobey the rules he fixes. This means that the decisions of the heirs of the old powers to let their critical thinkers and servants (governments and international institutions) disobey in UN member states the work program suggested in the UDHR and to start to come up with new goals could be weakening their power, strength, and status rather than strengthening it. This is very serious and worrisome.

In other words, the decision by the heirs of the old powers to allow their critical thinkers and servants (governments and international institutions) to disobey the work program suggested in the UDHR and to create goals that differ from those legitimized in the UN Charter or the UDHR could trap them in a dilemma similar to that faced by most people when judging distances by brightness at night.

All else being equal, more distant objects (a light, a house, a boat, a star) tend to look smaller than objects that are closer to us.²² In other words, we perceive distant objects as being farther away because they occupy less space in our visual field. Again, when "two lights are equally bright, but one appears less bright to us, then the easiest solution is that the dimmer light must be further away. This shortcut works well almost all of the time," but not all the time. The problem comes when "there happens to be a brighter light a bit further away than a less bright one nearer. This trips our brain up, and the further

²²<https://youtu.be/QGYQgoyJzbU>

one can appear nearer to us." The inability of people to accurately judge distances at sea or on land at night presents a challenge that can be resolved by waiting for daylight, but this optical illusion does not resolve itself when a person is in a tunnel.

If humans cannot always trust common sense because intuitions can sometimes lead us astray, can the heirs of the old powers avoid the possibility that their brain or the brains of their critical thinkers and servants (rulers, political class, judges, law enforcement officers, thinkers and writers, soldiers, administrators, or spokespersons) whose knowledge and awareness they are relying on to continue to condition people to change their behavior and to surrender freedom to the political order they are legitimizing happen to play a perceptual trick on them?

In other words, if a perceptual hypothesis leads us to interpret things based on our expectations or assumptions, then the heirs of the old powers may be misinterpreting their sensory experiences.

In other words, if all human creations demonstrate that human ingenuity and imagination constantly seek shortcuts, then it is highly likely that the top-down and bottom-up processing relied upon by the heirs of the old powers, which uses stimuli to shape their expectations or beliefs (i.e., make judgments), can lead them to fall victim to naïve realism.

Naïve realism is the belief that we see the world precisely how it is now. If this were true, all the businesses, nations, kingdoms, empires, and religions that formed and then vanished would have been able to predict and avoid their demise. If the heirs of the old powers see a distorted reality, then it is highly likely that the increases in poverty, corruption, intolerance, hate, immorality, irreligion (and authoritarianism) that we started observing in recent years mean that their power, wealth, and strength are on the decline.

Said differently, the law of effect states that if a response in the presence of a stimulus is followed by a satisfying state of affairs, the

bond between the stimulus and response will be strengthened.²³ If poverty, corruption, intolerance, hate, immorality, or irreligion increased in the world post-1945, then one of two scenarios could have compelled this outcome. The first is if the operant conditioning that the rulers and political class (including judges, law enforcement officers, thinkers and writers, soldiers, administrators, or spokespersons) whom the heirs of the old powers are depending on to solidify the power of the families/dynasties involved are erroneous. The second scenario is if the heirs of the old powers believe that the rewards or punishments relied upon by rulers and political classes (including judges, law enforcement officers, thinkers and writers, soldiers, administrators, or spokespersons) to achieve the UN goals are fostering the appropriate sensitization. In other words, the heirs of the old powers believe that the scientific knowledge produced by thinkers and writers to guide the learning process is assisting them in making sound judgments.

I have no way of knowing which scenario between the aforementioned two is correct. Confirmation bias is a tendency to seek out evidence that supports our beliefs while denying, dismissing, or distorting evidence that contradicts them.²⁴ Once again, humans lack the ability to falsify philosophical or religious claims, and they cannot prove that the mere association of two things automatically implies that one causes the other. Even though it is very hard to rely on intuition and common sense to make judgments about the world, every person can say that if humans continue to be divided over determining who could have a greater say in governance, humans will reach agreements that compromise differences.

Hence, there cannot be any rival hypothesis that any person could think of to rule out that people's unpreparedness to surrender freedom to the work program suggested in the UDHR would eventually cease if rulers and the political class (including judges, law enforcement officers, thinkers and writers, soldiers, administrators, or spokespersons) do not lead by example. We can say that all the educated and intuitive guesses that the heirs of the old powers would be relying on to transform the conditions and outcomes that matter to

²³<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=d5gK0CMEXHE&list=PLazWOWC5YGBZufHvAe7FVQQQMOq985KGN>

²⁴<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ysb3e08xuUc>

them would not produce the outcome they anticipate because every person is cooperating to strengthen perceptual constancy instead of demonstrable constancy.

Furthermore, for as long as the heirs of the old powers allow rulers and the political class (including judges, law enforcement officers, thinkers and writers, soldiers, administrators, or spokespersons) to use the idea of good as a tool to create perceptual constancy in UN member states instead of demonstrable constancy, the more this tactic would be placing the families/dynasties involved in a situation that would not be any different in complexity than the dilemma that people who need to be judging distances by brightness at night confront. This means that it would not be possible for the families/dynasties involved to know if the reinforcement or punishment that their different units of authority are compelling are weakening or strengthening their wealth, power, and status.

Until now, humans have known four types of operands that increase / decrease behavior. Those four operands are positive reinforcement (adding something pleasant or desirable to increase behavior), negative reinforcement (taking something away to increase behavior), positive punishment (adding something to decrease behavior), and negative punishment (taking something away to decrease behavior).

I have no way of knowing which type of stimulus among the four mentioned is used by the heirs of the old powers to continue to get their way despite the resistance of others; hence, confirmation bias makes people become divided over a common sensitization approach to reinforce learning.

Human choices, in my opinion, appear driven by the pursuit of happiness. For this reason, humans explore. In addition, all the exploration people carry out is later used to deny others their natural and legal rights, often to maintain the status quo rather than to increase practical results or improve social cohesion, as most people believe.

For example, in my case, I believe that the heirs of the old powers perceived that if they deviated away from the work program that the founding fathers of the UN (i.e., their fathers) proposed to them to

continue to solidify their power, to let rulers and political classes (including judges, law enforcement officers, thinkers and writers, soldiers, administrators, or spokespersons) in UN member states accelerate the distancing of people from continuing to be devoted to dominating and subjugating each other through reliance on the human mind as was done before WW2 erupted and to start to rely on technology, such a tactic can permit them to make people surrender freedom to them better. Unfortunately, this strategy has created two significant problems so far. This tactic distanced the rich and the poor from continuing to be devoted to doing what the natural force (or God) programmed people to be dedicated to doing because tools are now doing the lion's share. Second, the tools (i.e., technology) that the heirs of the old powers agreed to allow rulers and political classes (including judges, law enforcement officers, thinkers and writers, soldiers, administrators, or spokespersons) to use have distorted the ability of people (the poor) around the world to know which sensory inputs they need to prioritize and which ones to ignore.

I cannot know if the heirs of the old powers' decision to let their critical thinkers and servants (rulers, political class, judges, law enforcement officers, thinkers and writers, soldiers, administrators, or spokespeople) overload people with stimuli that confuse prioritization is helping to solidify their power. I think this strategy should weaken the heirs of the old powers' wealth, status, and power instead of strengthening them, because only monks and children avoid using their awareness and knowledge to increase the propensity of their human imagination instead of the propensity of the natural force (or God) that programmed them and expected them to be dedicated to doing. This approach aims to enhance awareness and knowledge in order to strengthen the relationship between individuals and the natural world, rather than focusing on the relationship between individuals and the man-made creations derived from terrestrial materials. In other words, if the natural force (or God) that programmed people wanted this species to be devoted to displacing this mass from one place to another using a tool (airplane, car, ship, etc.), it could have programmed people with wings as it did to other living creatures and spared people from all the hassle that mankind has lived through to reach this stage. Second, as long as people remain focused on distancing themselves from a horizontal relationship with the natural world in favor of a

vertical one, their preoccupation will shift from figuring out how to be devoted to understanding their connection with the environment to determining who has greater influence in governance. Additionally, as science increasingly overwhelms people's sensory stimuli, the resulting bottleneck will raise entropy (disorder, heat, etc.) among individuals. The more the entropy (the disorder) of people rises, the more the odds of the power, status, and wealth of the heirs of the old powers shrinking would reciprocally rise.

It is important to keep in mind that science is a double-edged sword. Science disengages the human body from fulfilling the role intended by the natural force (or God) for this mass. This focus is on sustaining the happiness of the natural world through toiling and working the land, as other living creatures do, rather than prioritizing the happiness of human imagination or the ingenuity of men in inventing tools for agriculture. The free time gained by human imagination and ingenuity, due to the reduced time the body needs to meet survival requirements, allows these two aptitudes to focus on improving democracy, the rule of law, freedom, and other societal values. People use the idea of good (God, democracy, rule of law, freedom, etc.) to deny each other rights and to achieve practical results for the greater well-being of society at the same time. After WW2, the victors (the old powers) and their heirs decided to use science to provide continuous reinforcement, replacing the partial reinforcement that had been used before the war. Hence, the more the families/dynasties who won WW2 favor that science provide continuous reinforcement, the more the free time that people would be gaining would be making them focus on improving governance to strengthen democracy, justice, and rule of law instead of being grateful for what the rich are granting them (the poor) access to; this means the more the heirs of the old powers rely on science (technology) to solidify their power, the more the unpreparedness of people to surrender freedom to the international postwar world order (the rich) would diminish. This is because two people cannot fill the same void space. The more people compete to determine who gets to make decisions favoring the weak, the more people will be disenchanted with rulers and the political class (including judges, law enforcement officers, thinkers and writers, soldiers, administrators, or spokespersons) failing to lead by example. The more people's preparedness to accept the hollow promises of rulers and political

classes (including judges, law enforcement officers, thinkers and writers, soldiers, administrators, or spokespersons) diminishes, the more the choices of the heirs of the old powers to sustain their strength and stability narrow. The heirs of the old powers would have only two options left for solidifying their control. The first is engulfing the world in a new global war to create a new reset. The second is to let the rich and the poor quarrel to create a new balance. Either option threatens the power, wealth, and status of the heirs of the old powers if the situational forces are changing in an unfavorable way.

To put it differently, social comparison theory posits that people seek to evaluate their abilities and beliefs by comparing them to others either in a downward comparison or upward contrast. If people compare themselves to people who are better off to rival those who are wealthier than them, or compare themselves to the people who are beneath them to ensure that those who are worse off never surpass them, then the more the heirs of the old powers permit their critical thinkers and servants (rulers, political class, judges, law enforcement officers, thinkers and writers, soldiers, administrators, or spokespersons) to use the idea of "good" as a tool to create shortcuts, the more the social environment will be influencing people's emotions to interpret the world based on social experience (wealth, power, status) instead of based on natural phenomena such as love, compassion, etc.

Furthermore, if we examine the solutions that rulers and the political class (including judges, law enforcement officers, thinkers and writers, soldiers, administrators, or spokespersons) have implemented in the social environment over the last 70 years to sensitize people, we find that most of the ideas they introduced to assist people's emotions or behavior in securing UN goals have influenced attitudes in a way that contradicts the expectations of the victors of World War II regarding how the liberation of people would unfold.

In addition, despite all the crackdowns that law enforcement authorities are employing to improve interpersonal connection, the social pressure that such tactics have been creating has time and again crashed the crisis response system of the societies that adopt such

approaches rather than help improve them, leading to increased distrust among citizens and a deterioration of community relationships.

If rulers and the political class (including judges, law enforcement officers, thinkers and writers, soldiers, administrators, or spokespersons) have been consistently underestimating the power of situational forces on behavior, then it is highly possible that all the solutions that the different units of authority are coming up with to solidify their power and the power of the heirs of the old powers may compel a future that would be entirely different from the one they are looking at with their thinkers and building on its arrangements and their calculations.

Said differently, if it is not possible to calculate the dispositional factors or the situational factors that change in the environment to know if the concerted efforts that rulers and the political class (including judges, law enforcement officers, thinkers and writers, soldiers, administrators, or spokespersons) are waging to transform the conditions and outcome that matters to them (because no one in the system is cooperating in accordance with the work program stipulated in the UDHR), then the more the different units of authority add punishment (laws) in the social order, the more the frustration that people would be knowing would be dividing cognitive bias (the political and economic order) in half.

When people become divided into one group that feels that the weakness of the crisis response system is denying them the lawful use, enjoyment, and operation of their rights (property and businesses), and another group believes that the crisis response system used is the culprit for their mischief, then only negative reinforcement or negative punishment can be used to create balance. This is very serious and worrisome.

In other words, if the group who feels that the weakness of the crisis response system is denying them the lawful use, enjoyment, and operation of their rights (property and businesses) and the group who believes that the crisis response system used is the culprit for their mischief are both using the idea of "good" (God, democracy, rule of law, freedom, etc.) as a tool to deny each other rights, then this rise in

insecurity that emerged in recent years around the world could be due to the rise in the number of people who are ruthlessly fighting each other to determine who could control the idea of "good" for their own benefit. Said differently, people could be united as of 1945 to distance themselves from securing the ideals that are specified in the preamble of the UN charter, rather than to bring themselves closer. This is very serious and worrisome.

Simply put, when people persecute and murder in the name of "good," or compel disregard or contempt in the name of improving human rights, it is not possible to know if this disposition is due to internal factors or situational factors.

I have no way of knowing if people alter their behavior due to internal factors or situational factors. Generally speaking, people alter their behaviors in response to group pressures (laws, customs, convictions), even when disagreeing with the group. For example, humans advocate the existence of an afterlife, and a good number accept that in the afterlife there is "good" and "evil." Accordingly, the people who believe in the existence of an afterlife advocate that an individual's chance to occupy a spot among the righteous ones grows when an individual increases good in the world or devotes time to ensure that good deepens in the world. Humans add good in the world by increasing negative reinforcement and negative punishment (laws and political order are not natural but human creations). If all that humans do is explore and rely on negative reinforcement and negative punishment (laws) to protect the material interests that result from any scientific, literary, or artistic production, then people would never be able to reduce fear and want. This is because all that people do after birth is to create changes in matter to produce tools or means.

In addition, when people practice spirituality in thought but not in action, or when people undermine the weight of internal natural factors on the behavior people exhibit, then people would be relying on the conjectures that human imagination is construing to strengthen learning or obedience and not on the instinctive intuition that is inherent in every human person.

Said differently, when the victors of WW2 (the old powers) or their heirs let their critical thinkers and servants (rulers, political class, judges, law enforcement officers, thinkers and writers, soldiers, administrators, or spokespersons) use scientific progress as a tool to increase positive and negative reinforcement and to decrease behavior, but while allowing those social actors to regard themselves as exempt from cooperating in accordance with the UDHR, what the powerful families/dynasties involved would be doing is relying on false teachers (evil conduct) to help them increase good. When rulers and political classes (including judges, law enforcement officers, thinkers and writers, soldiers, administrators, or spokespersons) use science to improve compliance but without being prepared to lead by example (practice what they preach), the immoral behaviors or immoral acts that those social agents would be provoking would not be reducing fear and want (improving social cohesion) but increasing destruction and death. Furthermore, when the heirs of the old powers accept to let their critical thinkers and servants (rulers, political class, judges, law enforcement officers, thinkers and writers, soldiers, administrators, or spokespersons) decay the social order by teaching people about democracy and equal rights while they are regarding themselves exempt from cooperating in accordance with the UDHR and while pursuing the realization of the full development of their personality (i.e., continuing to freeze social space and to accumulate material things on a cumulative basis and to trickle it down to designated individuals), then those powerful families/dynasties involved would be giving their non-objection to letting the idea of democracy or rule of law, which is not a natural order but a conjecture that the fittest invented to make the weakest surrender freedom to them and vice versa, compete with the inherent inclination that every person is usually programmed with one, which could be good or evil. This inclination cannot be evil because humans do not show this tendency when the matter involves cooperating with their loved ones or when the matter involves getting something they really want and cannot rely on force or deceit to obtain it.

Humans have been refusing to listen to their natural tendencies since they began to focus on addressing fundamental questions about their place in the universe instead of focusing on addressing the inherent values that each cohort that lived has counselled its successors to

prioritize to prevent the disregard and contempt that they lived from going on. This is very serious and worrisome.

In other words, if rulers and the political class (including judges, law enforcement officers, thinkers and writers, soldiers, administrators, or spokespersons) cannot use the incoming information that we are always testing or learning from to enhance our learning, it means the new incoming information we are currently learning is causing us to forget the old information we learned yesterday or initially. However, since the information we learned initially consists of the inherent values we are programmed with, this indicates that proactive learning is competing with our natural predispositions and retroactive tendencies. This is very serious and worrisome.

To put it differently, the more the heirs of the old powers let their critical thinkers and servants (rulers, political class, judges, law enforcement officers, thinkers and writers, soldiers, administrators, or spokespersons) make people focus on new learning (democracy, rule of law, computer usage, philosophy, science) instead of on tolerance, religiosity, love, etc., the more people are likely to forget to keep their inherent values (morality, love, compassion) in check. The more the heirs of the old powers allow their critical thinkers and servants to encourage people to prioritize wealth, power, and status (such as democracy, rule of law, and freedom) without being prepared to lead by example, the deeper the chaos will become, diverting the future of the world away from the paths that the involved powerful families and dynasties are considering. This is very serious and worrisome.

Said differently, an individual can rely on his wealth, power, or status to make others consider his opinion or on the power of the natural inherent values (love, compassion, common sense). In the aftermath of WW2, the victors (the old powers) linked the maintenance of their strength and stability (wealth, power, and status) to the progress that humans are making in the field of science (military superiority, economic superiority, etc.) instead of the field of religiosity (love, compassion, etc.). This indicates that the victors of WW2 (the old powers) associated the preservation of their strength and stability with self-help methods (such as human imagination and ingenuity) that rely

on coercion, rather than depending on the power of widely accepted natural values.

As I just said, the heirs of the old powers could continue to let rulers and political classes (including judges, law enforcement officers, thinkers and writers, soldiers, administrators, or spokespersons) decay, on one hand, the social order (by not leading by example), and on the other, work to establish ordered relations between people (societies). However, until now, no authority managed to prevent its collapse and reversal to a simpler form when it tried to create ordered relations from disordered ones, even though theoretically it is possible to produce certain patterns (repetition, self-similarity), which is known as deterministic chaos.

Many questions beg answers. For one, can the heirs of the old powers manage to prevent all the chaos, disorder, or conflict that they are allowing rulers, political classes, judges, law enforcement officers, thinkers and writers, soldiers, administrators, or spokespeople to compel from preventing their collapse and reversal to a simpler form when, throughout history, the fittest was not necessarily the person who possessed the mightiest military force but the one who possessed the mightiest conviction (trust), and the central criteria that those servants are violating is trust? In other words, the critical thinkers and servants (rulers, political class, judges, law enforcement officers, thinkers and writers, soldiers, administrators, or spokespersons) of the heirs of the old powers are failing to practice what they preach and are regarding themselves as exempt from cooperating in accordance with the work program suggested in the UDHR. Said differently, the families/dynasties involved are preserving their wealth, power, and status by having their critical thinkers and servants determine the future, knowing that violating the work program specified in the UDHR does not approximately determine the future.

Put differently, water becomes colder with depth. If we are measuring the average temperature of the ocean surface water and the thermometer reads -2°C , for example, this means that if we measure the temperature of the water at 10 meters below the surface, we might be reading -4°C or higher. When the thermometer is reading -4°C , the result means that there is less heat in the water than when the

thermometer reads -2°C or -1°C . When people resort to civil unrest, riots, civil wars, or wars to resolve conflicts instead of resolving disputes peacefully, what people are doing resembles the case of a swimmer who, instead of choosing to swim at the surface in -2°C water, for example, chooses to swim underwater at the 10-meter level below the surface or where I said the water temperature is -4°C .

The body reacts differently when a person is swimming at the surface as compared to when a person is swimming underwater. Moreover, the deeper a person swims, the longer it would take him to get to the surface. The criteria for a swimmer to survive underwater do not depend only on his actual depth but also on the condition of his ability to hold his breath, as well as underwater currents, harmful fish, visibility, and many other factors.

This also means that when the heirs of the old powers allow their critical thinkers and servants (rulers, political class, thinkers and writers, soldiers, politicians, administrators, or spokespersons) whom they are counting on for their ideas or wisdom to transform the conditions and outcomes that matter to them, they deepen distrust (poverty, corruption, intolerance, hate, immorality, or irreligion) in the world; the civil unrest, riots, or civil wars that such disorder produces should be making the preparedness of people to trust the international postwar world order shrink or sink to deeper depths. The deeper people swim below the surface of the water, the greater the efforts the body needs to make to avoid drowning. If the heirs of the old powers do not mind that the thinkers and writers, soldiers, politicians, administrators, or spokespersons whom they are counting on their ideas to transform the conditions and outcomes that matter to them increase distrust (poverty, corruption, intolerance, hate, immorality, or irreligion), this signifies that the heirs of the old powers are either perceiving that they are invincible or they believe that the world lacks a supreme authority (God, force, etc.) that could be the highest law there is. In other words, the force that programmed the world runs human relations in the same way a pendulum functions. When humans deepen poverty, corruption, intolerance, hate, immorality, or irreligion, this force triggers people's true nature to create balance.

"Agree to disagree" is a phrase in English referring to the resolution of a conflict whereby all parties tolerate, but do not accept, the opposing positions.²⁵ Throughout history, humans have consistently agreed and disagreed with each other. In the meantime, there are those who believe that all people are programmed to die, and therefore, if all people are "dead men walking,"²⁶ then it is not worth it to focus on created things (physical or philosophical) if all the exploration that people make has a lifespan. There are others who, despite knowing that all living are just awaiting an avoidable outcome-death, they are not prepared to abandon pursuing wealth, power, and status till the last breath of life in them.

For example, George V (George Frederick Ernest Albert; 1865-1936) was King of the United Kingdom and the British Dominions and Emperor of India from 6 May 1910 until his death in 1936.²⁷ On 15 January 1936, the king took to his bedroom complaining of a cold and remained in the room until his death.^{28,29} Before his death, The Times of London reported that Prime Minister Stanley Baldwin³⁰ (1867-1947) provided an update about the health condition of the king. Baldwin said that the king was weak, drifting in and out of consciousness, and that each time he became conscious, "it was some kind inquiry or kind observation of someone, some words of gratitude for kindness shown."³¹ The Times of London reported in the same article that the king said to his secretary when he sent for him, "How is the Empire?" and that the secretary said, "All is well, sir, with the Empire." The same article also reports that the king smiled at his secretary before slipping back into unconsciousness.

Indeed, the empire was all well as the king's secretary perceived. The fact that Great Britain had won nine years later in WW2 asserts this perception. A completely different question that many people from around the world are asking today, 70 years after Great Britain's

²⁵https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Agree_to_disagree#:~:text=From%20Wikipedia%2C%20the%20free%20encyclope

²⁶ https://en.wiktionary.org/wiki/dead_man_walking

²⁷ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/George_V

²⁸ Pope-Hennessy, James (1959), Queen Mary, London: George Allen and Unwin, Ltd

²⁹ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/George_V#Declining_health_and_death

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

³¹ The Times (London), 22 January 1936, p. 7, col. A

victory in WW2, is whether the royal family and the families that govern the country can prevent their resizing and collapse. For one, can the royal family, which serves as the head of state for Great Britain, along with the families that govern the country, prevent their resizing and collapse, given that people around the world are not united in implementing the work program that the founding fathers of the UN advised them to adhere to, but instead are pursuing a completely different agenda?

I do not know the answer to the aforesaid question. What I do know is that it is not the poor who legitimize natural and legal rights in UN member states, but the critical thinkers and servants (governments and international institutions) of the heirs of the old powers and the rich. Most importantly, it is not the poor who lose when insecurity erupts in a UN member state but the rich. In other words, if the international postwar order remains dynamic or collapses, it would not hinder the poor's ability to change the conditions and outcomes that matter to them, but rather it would affect the rich.

In the next chapter, I plan to continue investigating whether the heirs of the old powers will be able to pass their political power and influence to their own heirs as their fathers did, or if their decision to allow their critical thinkers and servants (including rulers, the political class, judges, law enforcement officers, thinkers and writers, soldiers, administrators, and spokespersons) in UN member states to consider themselves exempt from adhering to the principles outlined in the UN Charter or the UDHR could result in significant consequences.

3

Disordered Vertical and Horizontal Deprivation

The monarchy of the United Kingdom, commonly referred to as the British monarchy, the United Kingdom, Great Britain, and Ireland, traces its origins from “the petty kingdoms of early medieval Scotland and Anglo-Saxon England, which consolidated into the kingdoms of England and Scotland by the 10th century.”³² This monarch has navigated through many turbulent times from the 10th century to now. Most importantly, the period from 1649 to 1660, when the monarchy's political power diminished and the three kingdoms of England, Scotland, and Ireland, which were ruled by a single sovereignty, became engulfed in a series of conflicts that are known as the Wars of the Three kingdoms.³³ This conflict, which historians also refer to as the English Civil War,³⁴ propelled the breakup of the single sovereignty that the three kingdoms enjoyed, thus forming in lieu of that the Republican Commonwealth of England.³⁵ The restoration of the three kingdoms of England, Scotland, and Ireland under a single sovereignty took place in 1660.³⁶ In 1922, Ireland was divided into two geopolitical spheres. One part of Ireland is recognized as the Republic of Ireland, a sovereign nation, and the other part remains a dominion within the British Monarchy.³⁷

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

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

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

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

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

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

The Wars of the Three Kingdoms was one of several intervals in the history of the British monarchy when this realm experienced civil unrest leading to civil war. Unlike other English civil wars, which were fought over who should rule,³⁸ the wars of the three kingdoms also concerned how the three kingdoms of England, Scotland, and Ireland were to be governed.³⁹

Most historians believe that tensions over religious and civil issues propelled the wars of the three kingdoms, we know that the uprising and disregard that led the three kingdoms to slide into a war should have centered, as in the case of most civil wars, on money, reform, or how to limit the interference of a person or group in power. In other words, the dispute must have centered, in all likelihood, on whether “ideas” shall be dictated by what one person (or group) deems right or by choice. Likewise, it is important to consider whether the extent of power that one person (or group) should possess should be constrained. This allows us to assert that, regardless of the specific challenges that led the three kingdoms to war, if King Charles I (1600–1649), who reigned before the breakup, had succeeded in persuading those who disagreed with him through his discretion or charisma, this civil war would not have erupted.

Most importantly, we could also say that if there were no wise Englishmen who possessed discretion or charisma during the Interregnum period (i.e., 1649–1660) of the English Civil War, thus managing to convince all the people who were disputing with one another about how tolerance and negotiation could serve them better than force or stubbornness, perhaps the three kingdoms would have been politically and economically paralyzed like Lebanon has been since the start of the Lebanese war in 1975 (or almost 37 years later).

First and foremost, we could also say that if King Charles II (1630–1685), i.e., the son of King Charles I, and the members of his government had not acted judiciously from 1660 onward, most likely, the three monarchs would have continued to interact as the other European monarchs did from 1660 to 1945. This means that King Charles II's complete understanding with his government about their

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

³⁹ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/English_Civil_War

specific commitments to preventing instability was crucial in avoiding a relapse into civil war for the three English kingdoms. In other words, King Charles II and the other families/dynasties that were vying for power were able to agree on who should rule or how the three kingdoms should be governed, unlike the Lebanese.

The durable peace that the English people managed to uphold in the aftermath of the three kingdoms wars aided the British monarchy in transforming from being a petty kingdom into becoming an empire, which covered a quarter of the world's land area at its greatest extent in 1921.

However, most historians agree that after the restoration of the British Monarch (also known as the Stuart Monarchy) in the 1660s, the extent of power that the Crown (i.e., the British monarchy) could wield changed significantly compared to the period before the English Civil War. The type of "absolutism" that the Stuart Monarchy (i.e., British monarchy) could exercise was no longer the same from before and after the English Civil War.

In theory, the world knew events before and after the First World War that were similar in terms of overall tests to what had transpired during the English Civil War.

Before the First World War erupted (i.e., the interregnum), most of Europe (or the world to a great extent) was ruled by monarchs related to King George V (i.e., the grandfather of the late Queen Elizabeth II, Queen of the United Kingdom, and other commonwealth).⁴⁰ During and after the First World War, the monarchies of Austria, Germany, Greece, and Spain, like Russia, fell to revolution and war, but there were at the same time winners. Most importantly, life continued as usual at the end of the First World War, a phenomenon known as restoration. In other words, although people were very upset or affected by all the destruction and the number of lives lost during this First World War, they had no choice but to carry on living normally.

However, the British monarchy and its allied nations secured a short-lived victory when they formally declared World War One over in

⁴⁰ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/George_V#Postwar_reign

1918. In other words, this victory did not lead to a broad and lasting peace, unlike the way the leaders of the three kingdoms in the 17th century successfully convinced all the rival families and dynasties that tolerance and negotiation were more effective than force. The families/dynasties that were rivaling for power refused to settle disputes through negotiation and arbitration.

A few years later (in 1939), the same disregard and contempt for human rights exhibited by the nations competing to determine the extent of their horizontal territorial power during WW1 resurfaced in a new conflict (known as the Second World War) aimed at deciding who would govern the international postwar world order, which is characterized by both horizontal and hierarchical power.

Interestingly, the British monarchy and the allied monarchies/nations declared victorious in the aftermath of WW2 did not get any time to celebrate their victory this time around at all. Since 1945, when WWII ended, the victors (or the nations that the families/dynasties involved depend on to change the conditions and outcome that matter to them) seem unable to control the insecurity that has engulfed the world.

Evidently, the abnormal rise in insecurity that has pervaded the world since 1945 is not a spontaneous phenomenon, but rather a result of the strategies implemented by the World War II victors and their heirs, both before and after the war, which sparked its development.

For example, if we compare the families and dynasties that controlled the events of the English Civil War with those that have been influencing global events since 1945, we observe a significant difference in their approaches.

For instance, the families/dynasties who were ruling the three kingdoms seem to have understood that humans could be a “mass” (i.e., a substance) that behaves in the same way particles behave. In other words, those families/dynasties that lived in the 17th century and who I just said had discretion or charisma managed to convince all the people who were disputing with one another that negotiation and tolerance could serve everyone better than force, seem to have understood how particles behave in solid, liquid, or gas and applied

this knowledge to help them figure out how to control people. The arrangement and movement of particles in a solid, liquid, or gas state are entirely different.

Putting it differently, it looks as if the families/dynasties who ruled those three kingdoms knew that "solids have a fixed shape and cannot flow because their particles are only able to vibrate about a fixed position." They cannot move from place to place."⁴¹ 17th-century families/dynasties seem to have understood how liquids or gas particles are arranged and how they move around each other. In other words, those families and dynasties that lived in the 17th century understood that liquid and gas particles are randomly arranged; liquid particles move around each other until they take the shape of the container, while gas particles move quickly in all directions.

Most importantly, we also find that those families/dynasties that lived in the 17th century understood that "substances expand (increase in size) when they get warmer, and they contract (decrease in size) when they get cooler."⁴² In other words, those families/dynasties that lived in the 17th century and whose discretion or charisma managed to end the disputes that were waging between the three kingdoms to the point of restoring them back under a single sovereignty seem to have understood how "heat" and "cold" could be used to control materials or substances.

To give an example, those families/dynasties that ruled those three kingdoms in the 17th century seem to have understood that "thermometers work because the liquid inside them expands and rises up the tube when it gets hotter." In other words, those families/dynasties that lived in the 17th century seem to have understood why mercury is a better liquid to be used to measure temperature and not another liquid. In short, 17th-century families and dynasties knew who should do what and didn't assume that everyone could produce the same result just because they had the same education.

⁴¹ <https://www.bbc.co.uk/bitesize/guides/zc9q7ty/revision/1>

⁴² <https://www.bbc.co.uk/bitesize/guides/zc9q7ty/revision/3>

Likewise, those families/dynasties who ruled those three kingdoms in the 17th century seem to have understood that “metal parts can be fitted together without welding, using shrink fitting.” In other words, those families and dynasties that lived in the 17th century understood the importance of fitting an object while it is hot, as cooling could make it very difficult to reshape it without welding.

Most importantly, those families/dynasties who ruled those three kingdoms in the 17th century seem to have understood that “when substances expand or contract, their particles stay the same size. It is the space between the particles that changes.” In other words, those families/dynasties that lived in the 17th century understood that “the particles in a solid vibrate more when it is heated and take up more room.” The particles in a liquid move around each other more when it is heated and take up more room. When heated, gas particles move faster in all directions and take up more space. This insight also means that those families/dynasties who ruled those three kingdoms in the 17th century understood why it was important to ensure that no kingdom should be wealthier than the other two. Those families/dynasties understood that when a kingdom became wealthier than the other two, this process would start to cause a problem that could lead the other two to ally and to plot to resize the kingdom whose wealth and power surpassed the others. This also means that those families/dynasties that lived in the 17th century understood that when a kingdom became wealthier than the others, this would create the same phenomenon that engineers take into account when building bridges. Bridges expand in the summer heat and require special joints to prevent them from deforming. First and foremost, those families/dynasties who ruled those three kingdoms in the 17th century seem to have understood that if they let the people's unhappiness go on for a longer period of time, they would be unable to make them ready to surrender freedom to obtain the benefit of the political order, thus avoiding the insecurity that exists in the world as of 1945.

For all those reasons and others, we could say that those families/dynasties controlling the three monarchs in the 17th century seem to have understood that if they failed to contain the uprising and conflicts waging between the three kingdoms to quickly restore the English monarchy, they might face the same events that the heirs of

the old powers or the nations that deputize on their behalf in UN member states have confronted since 1945. This is to make people be ready to surrender freedom to obtain the benefit of the international postwar world order, which the founding fathers of the UN (their fathers) designed and counselled them to observe to enable them to control with it the individuals (societies) who would be rivaling them, including using it to rule over the common people.

The peace and security conditions that exist in the world post-1945 do not seem to reflect the same political settlements that the families/dynasties that were controlling the three monarchs in the 17th century were instrumental in bringing to pass.

In fact, the widespread disenchantment expressed by people, including large anti-government protests occurring in many nations since 1945, seems to mirror the events experienced by the British monarchy before and during the English Civil War; however, these current tribulations are unfolding across the entire globe rather than being confined to the British Isles as they were in the 17th century.

For instance, historians assert that religious, political, and social conflicts gripped England prior to the outbreak of the English Civil War. Evidently, this showdown occurred due to a conflict between the policies that the monarch and government believed should guide people's behavior and the policies that the people felt were failing to produce benefits that would increase their happiness.

Experts who investigate the cause of civil wars suggest that people rebel over issues of identity, i.e., ethnicity, religion, social class, or greed and economics. In addition, experts suggest that if the deprivation that people are perceiving is related to greed or economic disparity, civil wars are an efficient instrument to resolve vertical inequality. However, when the perceived deprivation is related to ethnicity, religion, etc., civil war resolves horizontal deprivation.

I will provide two examples to show the difference between horizontal and vertical deprivation. The American Revolutionary War and the French Civil War resolved a vertical inequality. When those two wars ended, the people involved in them resolved the vertical deprivation

that existed in each social order. That is to say, cultural divergence, economic differences, etc., between the individuals involved shrank.

If we take the Lebanese or Iraqi civil wars, we observe that when those two wars ended, the people who were involved in those two conflicts created a horizontal deprivation. In Lebanon and in Iraq, each civil war resulted in a sectarian group controlling a geographical or territorial social space based on distinct ethnic and religious backgrounds.

It is important that readers keep in mind that the Lebanese or Iraqi civil wars were fought to resolve a vertical inequality or vertical deprivation by citizens initially and not a horizontal deprivation. The horizontal inequality that emerged in Lebanon and Iraq, manifesting as cultural divergence and economic differences, resulted from the failure of the individuals involved in each civil war to defeat those who were perpetuating vertical inequality.

Additionally, because the motive for the deprivation was mainly economic or greed in the American and French wars, those two countries managed to improve their power or wealth when the conflict ended. Regarding the Lebanese and Iraqi wars, the nature of deprivation shifted during each conflict from vertical (focused on greed and economic disparity) to horizontal (centered on ethnic and religious division). As a result, both countries failed to enhance their power or wealth globally after each conflict ended and continue to experience total insecurity today.

Furthermore, if we compare the deprivation experienced by the American and French people since 1945, we observe that its nature includes many visible signs of horizontal deprivation rather than being solely vertical. This is very serious and worrisome. Put differently, the understanding that the American and the French gained over the years helped them to resolve vertical deprivation and served them to learn about the power of meddling in the religious and ethnic status of other nations to create horizontal inequality, including retarding any vertical deprivation to keep their superiority. For example, in recent years, the United States and France have been attempting to create horizontal inequality or deprivation in the political and economic status of China and Iran, with the aim of inciting ethnic and religious disputes that

would destabilize those countries and undermine their plans to increase vertical deprivation.

If the social order in the United States or France persists in displaying signs of ethnic and religious division, it could potentially ensnare these two countries in the same challenges that the Lebanese and the Iraqis have been struggling to resolve. In recent years, the Lebanese and Iraqis have been working diligently to shift their challenges from a horizontal posture to a vertical one through diplomacy, but they have been unable to achieve the necessary transformation due to ongoing political instability and external pressures that hinder their efforts.

However, if we compare the evolution of the English Civil War to the behavior of the four civil wars mentioned earlier, we see that the English Civil War initially arose from issues of ethnicity and religious deprivation, which should have led to a horizontal deprivation by the end of the conflict, similar to what occurred in Lebanon and Iraq. Strangely, this division did not happen.

Furthermore, if we compare how Great Britain evolved from the 1660s to 1945, we observe that its political leaders refused to remain divided, unlike the Lebanese and Iraqis who have been divided since their civil war ended. As a result, Great Britain transformed from a petty kingdom into an empire that covered a quarter of the world's land at its greatest extent in 1921, as I mentioned earlier.

World War 2 was not a war that was fought between Great Britain and its allies against Germany and its allies to resolve ethnic, religious, or social class deprivation between those two adversaries, but rather, it was fought to resolve grievances related to power deprivation (i.e., greed and economics). When wars resolve vertical deprivation, the country that gains economic prosperity should reap the benefits. We have not observed this outcome in Great Britain's case from 1945 to the present.

If we compare the evolution of peace and security between Great Britain and the other Western European powers, as well as the nations they dominated or administered before granting independence, we observe that they face a similar challenge to the one currently

experienced in Lebanon, where competing factions are vying for control, reflecting a larger struggle over who will govern the international postwar world order.

If the aforementioned relationships contain any elements of truth, this suggests that humanity may be in the midst of a world revolution, where the gridlock in Lebanon reflects how this upheaval is occurring on a smaller scale, specifically at the national level.

The Lebanese have only two options to escape the political and economic bottleneck they have been aware of since 1975. This is true only if the Lebanese choose to remain unprepared to voluntarily surrender their freedom in exchange for the work program suggested in the UN Charter or the UDHR, and if the families and dynasties that won WW2 decide to refrain from instigating a new global war to reset or rejuvenate their power. The first solution is a new civil war to reduce the population and create a new balance. The second solution consists of Syria agreeing to be resized so Lebanon is granted more social space, or the Lebanese and the Syrians agree to merge to form one country. The Israelis and the Palestinians face a social space shortage problem similar to that of the Lebanese, which prevents them from contributing any social space.

Evidently, there are many bailout solutions that the Lebanese could consider to help them escape the political and economic bottleneck caused by the ineffective policies of their elected politicians, which have been entangled in a complex web since 1975. However, none of the proposed measures will help achieve equal rights in the country or lift everyone out of their current situation, because they would only serve as temporary solutions. In other words, if humans behave similarly to how substances change state when heated (becoming frustrated) or cooled (experiencing increased happiness), then we can conclude that the same parameters important for particle state changes—such as closeness, arrangement, and motion—are also applicable criteria for humans.

For example, “when a substance is heated, its internal energy increases:

- the movement of its particles increases

- bonds between particles break”

This means that any elaborate bailouts to prop up businesses and furlough schemes to keep workers tied to their jobs would increase people's movement in the tight social space that they are in, thus breaking their bond faster. This is because an increase in movement encourages theft, betrayal, corruption, irreligiosity, and other negative social behaviors that can erode trust and community bonds.

Likewise, “when a substance is cooled, its internal energy decreases:

1. the movement of its particles decreases
2. bonds between particles form”⁴³

This implies that providing the Lebanese people with social space to sustain themselves will strengthen their bonds with each other.

If the Lebanese have only those two solutions to stop their despair from growing and relapsing into a new social war, this signifies that if the heirs of the old powers want to prevent the world from relapsing into a global war to increase death and create a new balance, they must consider one of those two choices to salvage the international postwar order. The first is to begin to implement the solutions that the Lebanese have ahead of them to prevent their relapse into a new civil war (i.e., redraw the territories of the nations they share borders with, including creating an economic reset). The second option is to consider reverting to the work program proposed by the UN founding fathers, which aims to save both the Lebanese and the heirs of the old powers from the challenges of uncertain events that may not yield favorable outcomes. It is important that readers note that the heirs of the old power do not need to resort to a global war to create a reset since there are other options that can achieve the same results. Man-made famine or biological warfare have the potential to increase mortality rates without necessitating the destruction of physically created objects.

I am unsure of how the heirs of the old powers intend to force people to relinquish their freedom, to avoid the same fate that befell the British monarch prior to the outbreak of the English Civil War.

⁴³ <https://www.bbc.co.uk/bitesize/guides/zc9q7ty/revision/4>

Evidently, the choices made by those powerful families or dynasties will determine whether the world spirals into a new global war to control the abnormal rivalry or intolerance that emerged after 1945, or if the ongoing wave of civil wars will continue to lead to lower levels of peace and security, resulting in the same destructive effects typically associated with global wars.

If the heirs of the old powers choose to create a new balance in the world by increasing death rates (i.e., by reducing desires, rivalry, adversaries, etc.), they will need to decide whether to pursue this goal through a global war or by continuing localized civil wars.

The powerful families and dynasties involved want to avoid destabilizing the balance of power between them, regardless of which method the heirs of the old powers choose to increase death rates. In other words, the powerful families/dynasties involved do not need to resize the power that each one of them possesses, regardless of the method they choose to increase the death rate, whether through a global war or localized civil wars. This is because those powerful families/dynasties involved have access to weapons of mass destruction, and if they rival each other, they can create irreparable damage in the world. This also signifies that to avoid significantly threatening their strength and stability, the heirs of the old powers' best option would be to program the type of technique they want to use to increase death jointly.

Evidently, the scenario that the heirs of the old powers want to avoid if they decide to choose to increase death to maintain their strength and stability is that they become unable to control the peace and security situation in the world in the same way King Charles I dealt with during the English Civil War when things got out of hand. This scenario could happen if one family/dynasty crisscrossed the others, but it could develop on its own or without any specific individuals prompting its events. In other words, despair, confusion, or fear could prompt this out-of-control condition, leading to a societal collapse and not necessarily only due to rivalry or greed.

Then again, the heirs of the old powers would want to avoid King Charles I's fate during the English Civil War, where he failed to

achieve his desires. Therefore, those powerful families would always favor preventing a global war, as total wars create despair, confusion, and fear. Moreover, we could also say that those powerful families/dynasties would be more in favor of increasing death through localized civil wars because recourse to such a type of resizing is much easier to keep under control, allowing them to maintain their influence and power without facing the widespread chaos that accompanies total wars. Of course, the key tactics would be to avoid destabilizing the nations where the heirs of the old powers reside, to protect their own lives and the lives of their heirs.

Readers should note that even if the heirs of the old powers succeed in preventing civil war and revolts against the designated leader in their nations, or if they fail to do so, the powerful families and dynasties involved expect that the next person in line will be a son or brother who can reclaim the power that was stripped away from the ruling family or dynasty. For example, after the death of King Charles I, the family/dynasty that was controlling the British Isles and all the citizens that were supporting them elected his son, Charles II, as king, thus keeping the authority of the Stuart House alive until now. People around the world still observe this practice today.

Then again, if it is possible to show that the abnormal rivalry that emerged post-1945 along with this accompanying abnormal rise in intolerance that swept most societies could depict that the world is perhaps in the midst of world revolution, or show that even if the heirs of the old powers choose to increase death rates through employing localized civil wars instead of a global war, this tactic would not prevent them from facing the same fate that King Charles I faced even if they keep the societies in which they live in stable, or support that if the individual that is acting as leader among them is killed as happened to King Charles I, there is no guarantee that their heirs or the next person in line would be able to reclaim power in the same way the families/dynasties that were controlling the British Monarchy managed to name his son Charles II as king so the authority of the Stuart House lives until now, then the plans that the heirs of the old powers are working from to keep their power intact may need to be revisited.

Earlier, I said that the disenchantment people are expressing—including large anti-government protests—its drawback affecting every nation post-1945 appears to replay the events the British monarchy experienced before and after the English Civil War erupted, except these tribulations are playing out over the entire earth this time instead of the British Isles, as in the 17th century. If so, it should be possible to show how such a relationship exists. This should also help us better understand how the decision by powerful families and dynasties that control the international order or the global money supply to deviate from the work program established by the founding fathers of the UN may have contributed to the widespread disenchantment that emerged in the world after 1945.

Many historians provided similar accounts of the causes of the English Civil War, including descriptions of the events that led to the collapse and subsequent restoration of the monarchy. In brief, most accounts of the English Civil War depict the struggle of King Charles I of England and his supporters, including the Church of England, against a counterculture that believed true power in England resided not with the King, his supporters, or the church, but with God.

This counterculture, which King I of England, his supporters, and the Church of England persecuted, burned its books, and imprisoned its clergymen before the English Civil War erupted, was a religious group that became fed up with government-backed policies. This counterculture, whose members were also known as “Roundheads”⁴⁴ or “Parliamentarians,” challenged the very system that King Charles I of England and his supporters, who were also known as “cavaliers”⁴⁵ or “Royalists,” wanted to uphold, subsequent to deeming (perceiving) that it was a framework for injustice.

I have no way of knowing if King Charles I of England and the various government bodies supporting him were providing genuine, credible, and moral leadership in the fight against the controversial issues that were dividing different societies within the kingdom. If the king had relied on the masses' support and the unquestioning backing of the

⁴⁴ <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Roundhead>

⁴⁵ <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Cavalier>

government or the Church of England, the monarchy's civil war and collapse could have been avoided.

The apartheid in South Africa was a system of institutionalized racial segregation that existed in South Africa from 1948 until the early 1990s.⁴⁶ Historians claim that the political regime that was in power in South Africa during apartheid was governing without having respect for the laws of the land or any fear of either God or man. The South African regime was ready to commit all manner of outrage and violence during apartheid.

In theory, the injustices that the Black in South Africa had to yield to during Apartheid until it ended in the 1990s could be regarded as analogous to the type of persecution or injustices that the “Roundheads” or “Parliamentarians” were dealing with until the date when the British monarchy was resized (King Charles I beheaded).

According to historians, internal resistance to apartheid became increasingly militant during the 1970s and 1980s. This development prompted brutal crackdowns by the National Party government and protracted sectarian violence against Blacks, leaving thousands dead or in detention.⁴⁷ In fact, because of all the government-backed injustices, apartheid sparked significant international opposition. The discrimination experienced by Black South Africans in all aspects of their lives led to the emergence of some of the most influential global social movements of the twentieth century. Such discrimination was also the target of frequent condemnation in the United Nations.

When we compare the pre-war events of the English Civil War with the events leading to the end of apartheid, we observe that the crisis in South Africa unfolded in a way that did not necessitate South Africans becoming involved in a civil war, unlike the “Roundheads” and “Royalists” who chose to settle their differences in Great Britain to achieve the changes each faction sought. The two crises resulted in the removal of the political system that was in power (change of government). The two conflicts addressed vertical deprivation, which the parties in revolt formalized by employing horizontal deprivation

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

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

strategies, such as protests and negotiations in South Africa, while the English Civil War involved direct military confrontations between the factions. But, as I just said, in the case of South Africa, this political change happened against a backdrop of political violence between the white and the Black populations in the country. South Africa did not spiral down into a civil war to create the change. In the case of the conflict between the “Roundheads” or the “Cavalier,” this change happened against a backdrop of intense armed conflict between the monarchy and its supporters and the people who were opposing them.

If the South African managed to resolve their grievances through negotiation and avoided civil war, while the “Roundheads” or the “Cavalier” caused the Kingdom to spiral into civil war to create change, this means one took specific actions that the other did not.

If the South Africans managed to not let death on both sides not galvanize a radicalized opposition liberation movement, in the case of the conflict between the “Roundheads” and the “Royalists,” the party in revolt and the de jure government were not able to demonstrate the same degree of tolerance, preferring to resort to an intense armed conflict so each party could transform the conditions and outcomes that each group deeply cared about. This signifies that the South Africans were protesting to achieve targets that are measurable, and when the resisting government agreed to concede to their grievances, they ceded. In the case of the conflict between the “Roundheads” or “Royalists,” the targets that the party in revolt was pursuing had to have been attributed to unmeasurable “greed” or unmeasurable “grievances,” which seek to resolve horizontal deprivation.

In other words, the deprivation that the two parties in revolt were pursuing during the English Civil War revolved around aspirations that are inherently unquantifiable, because they involved ambitions (i.e., horizontal deprivation and vertical deprivation) that are inherently immeasurable. Simply put, it is impossible to replace the emptiness that those ambitions prompt, to convert them into actions that would make a person ready to voluntarily stop pursuing them. An example of such ambitions would be the pursuit of good, power, wealth, knowledge, happiness, etc. People's unpreparedness to resist vertical or horizontal deprivation, which drives them to either freeze social space

or covet resources controlled by others, supports the idea that one can never be satisfied with the deprivation they create.

I have no way of knowing the exact nature of the deprivation that the "Roundheads" or the "Cavaliers" became entangled in its complicated web while fighting the English Civil War, thus prompting them to believe that force was a better option for them to attain their goal (i.e., keep their wealth, power, and status) than seeking to do it through passive means such as negotiation or arbitration. What I do know is that throughout history, all the individuals who endeavored to uphold goodness were undermined by those seeking greater power, wealth, knowledge, and happiness. Likewise, all the people who used their wealth, power, and knowledge to deny other people rights to power, wealth, knowledge, and happiness were destroyed.

However, the American Revolutionary War crisis involved a more diverse group of people than the South African apartheid crisis, which should have made them more volatile and intolerant. For example, during the crisis of the English Civil War, the opposing parties shared the same color and faith. The opposing parties in the crisis that has been raging in Lebanon since 2019 are of the same color and faith, yet they have not been able to unite their voices due to deep-seated political divisions and historical grievances that have created a complex environment of mistrust and rivalry.

In theory, rivalry is endemic. Hence, rivalry appears to be an inherent aspect of human nature; it is the societies composed of diverse multicultural backgrounds that tend to experience violence more rapidly than those whose members do not possess a strong loyalty to their own religion, gender, race, political opinion, etc. This is because when humans compete for status, power, wealth, knowledge, happiness, etc., they generally insist on compulsory power-sharing strategies whose aim centers on how to grant the benefiting members a blocking power at every level of government, including demanding straightforward majority rule.

Strangely, during and before apartheid and the American Revolutionary War, we observe that although those two societies were composed of diverse multicultural backgrounds, they successfully

advocated for a relationship that alleviated the fears each tribal group sought to dissipate in order to ensure its self-determination. In other words, they successfully moderated the arrogance exhibited by many specific racial, religious, or political majorities.

If we take the Lebanese Civil War and the English Civil War, we find that those two events had a lot in common. They both began as conflicts aimed at resolving a specific type of vertical deprivation, but later transformed into efforts to address a more abstract and unmeasurable form of deprivation. In the case of the Lebanese people, this society remains unable to cultivate the courage that could help its members walk away from the stress they are experiencing, unlike the South Africans or Americans who resorted to violence to resolve vertical deprivation in their countries. In the case of the English people, the “Roundheads” or “Royalists” did possess the courage to recognize that negotiation could serve them better than force to increase their happiness. However, this outcome occurred only after the British monarch first paid a significant price. The outcome was the scarification of Charles I, the King of England, and the stripping of the absolutism that the monarch exercised.

Most people are ready to accept that we live in a world whose stability shifts between turbulent times and peaceful times. Unfortunately, humans have only one life to live, while this persisting cycle also rotates how happiness changes between people in function of the bad and good times that the world knows as well. It is a fact that even in the face of adversity, life persists, and the impacted individuals eventually adjust and progress. But when we analyze very closely what the civil war in Lebanon and the English Civil War have in common, we find that they depict a series of events that could be said to form part of a life cycle that starts off involving suffering and pain, which leads back to the same starting point. The British people were wise enough; hence, they allowed this cycle to only last for a short period of time. Since 1975, the Lebanese have been unable to escape or alter their situation (52 years now). This is very serious and worrisome. If the heirs of the old powers can't stabilize the postwar international order, the world could face the same insecurity as Lebanon. No one knows why the Lebanese are incapable of speaking the same language. I strongly believe that the Lebanese cannot

overcome their challenges because they are ignoring Buddha's counsel to practice truth and overcome suffering.

Buddha (also known as Siddhattha Gotama or Siddhārtha Gautama) was a philosopher, mendicant, mediator, spiritual teacher, and religious leader who lived in Ancient India (c. 5th to 4th century). He is revered as the founder of the world religion Buddhism.⁴⁸

Buddhism fundamental tenets are comprised in the Three Universal Truths and Four Noble Truths.⁴⁹

The Three Universal Truths are:

1. Everything in life is impermanent and always changing.
2. Because nothing is permanent, a life based on possessing things or persons doesn't make you happy.
3. There is no eternal, unchanging soul, and "self" is just a collection of changing characteristics or attributes.

The Four Noble Truths⁵⁰ are:

1. All life involves suffering (the Truth of Suffering) - Dukkha
2. Suffering is caused by desire, craving and attachment (the Origin of Suffering) - Trishna
3. Desire and attachment can be overcome (the Truth of Cessation) - Nirvana
4. The way to overcome them is by the Eightfold Path (the Truth of the Path).

Buddha suggests an Eightfold Path to end or extinguish suffering and attain Nirvana (experience). Buddha suggests that the Eightfold Path consists of behavioral attitudes requiring a person to possess right views, right resolve, right speech, right action, right livelihood, right effort, right mindfulness, and right concentration in order to overcome suffering. Buddha characteristically depicts the eightfold attitude that a person needs to manifest to liberate himself from suffering by displaying those rules on a wheel with each one of those eight

⁴⁸ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Gautama_Buddha

⁴⁹ <https://uri.org/kids/world-religions/buddhist-beliefs>

⁵⁰ https://www.bbc.co.uk/northernireland/schools/11_16/citizenship/pdfs/ctz_rel_pg01_tn02.pdf

mindsets being represented in the same way the time of the day is shown on the watch face. This wheel is referred to as the wheel of Dharma (or teachings).

Dharma is a “key concept with multiple meanings in Indian religions. In Hinduism, dharma signifies behaviors that are considered to be in accord with Rta, the order that makes life and the universe possible, and includes duties, rights, laws, conduct, virtues, and the "right way of living.”⁵¹

In the Vedic religion, Rta (rta, "order, rules; truth") is “the principle of natural order which regulates and coordinates the operation of the universe and everything within it. In the hymns of the Vedas, Rta is described as that which is ultimately responsible for the proper functioning of the natural, moral, and sacrificial orders.”⁵²

If we take an imagery wheel similar to the one Buddha employed to show the attitudes that a person must be aware of at all times to end his suffering and consider the Universal Truths and Noble Truths that Buddha observed or perceived to reflect true conjectures, we could say that the reason why the Lebanese people have not been able to end their suffering as of 1975 is perhaps due to the existence of a “natural order” that the Lebanese are resisting that makes a full turn to enable them to begin to experience nirvana. In other words, the Lebanese resorted to violence to change the conditions and outcomes that mattered to them, but they did not try to change the commitments they made to advance to the next position in this wheel, like the time of day moves to the next hour on the watch face. This signifies that for as long as the Lebanese refuse to be wise and to put into practice all the commitments that they pledge to implement into actions so the changes that result would be aiding them to eliminate the suffering that they are knowing, they would not be able to improve the quality of their lives. In the case of the people who lived during the English Civil War, those individuals managed to end their suffering because they arrived at applying the teachings of Buddha in their processes and relations, thus helping them to ultimately become capable of balancing

⁵¹ <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Dharmachakra>

⁵² <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/%E1%B9%9A>

the proper functioning of the natural, moral, and sacrificial orders that they were operating within.

If for as long as the Lebanese refuse to be wise as the Eightfold Path proposes that a person be to alleviate his suffering, then we can say that the longer the Lebanese take to become consciously aware of the need to begin to cooperate based on what Buddha proposed to end their suffering, they would have no other choice but to be engulfed in a civil war to increase death to create a new balance (unless, of course, the Lebanese prefer staying dominated and exploited to reduce death rates). Moreover, the longer the Lebanese take to pick any one of those two prevailing choices, the longer their demise will last.

This allows us to also say that because right after WW2 ended, the state of affairs in the world did not produce the same peace and stability dividends that the Englishmen experienced in the aftermath of their civil war in 1660 or the Americans in 1776 or the South Africans in the 1990s, this means that the international postwar world order could be respecting the pattern that the Lebanese are confronting since the Lebanese civil war ended in the late 1980s. Furthermore, if there is a “natural order” that regulates the international postwar world order or steers it to respect a life cycle that puts mankind back right where a person started each time an individual refuses to be more consciously aware of what it is we do and how we react to things in the world, then this signifies that mankind could be progressing in the same turbulent water that the Lebanese are navigating in since 1975. In addition, since the Lebanese have no other choice but to cooperate based on what Buddha proposed in the Eightfold Path to end their suffering or to be engulfed in a civil war to increase death to create a new balance, this means that if the heirs of the old powers do not begin to become consciously aware of the need to cooperate based on the principles that are suggested in the UN Charter so as to steer the international postwar world order in the right path, it would not be possible to create a new balance without engulfing the world in a new world war.

If the world’s insecurity continues to spiral down and the heirs of the old powers continue to be unprepared to do something about reversing this trend to spare the world from becoming engulfed in a new global war, it is not the poor who would be resized only but the rich as well.

This means that it is very important to detect what could be instigating this rise in intolerance that people are expressing post-1945 around the world to prevent perturbation or destabilization of the international postwar world order. This is because the international order does not resemble a high-rise building; when a fire engulfs any one of its floors, the people trapped on that floor can bypass the fire using the emergency staircases. In contrast, the international order is structured like a building that is reinforced and only collapses due to a natural disaster, such as an earthquake, or when construction workers demolish it with explosives. In other words, when the international order collapses, it would do so in a manner similar to how the Twin Towers in New York crumbled in September 2001. Therefore, since the international postwar world order resembles a ship, and when a ship sinks, not everyone who is on board usually gets saved, it is in the best interests of everyone to know if the heirs of the old powers and their critical thinkers and servants (rulers, political class, thinkers and writers, soldiers, politicians, administrators, or spokespersons) are steering the international postwar order (or this ship) in high seas, near icebergs, near rocks, etc., or if the international postwar world order (i.e., ship) is taking water (or flooding) because of wear and tear of the ship's own structure (i.e., corrosion or metal fatigue).

The international postwar world order is not a ship or a vessel, so we can say that its structural integrity can become damaged or fatigued. This continuous perturbation or imbalance affecting the international postwar order can only be due to negligence or human errors.

I plan to continue to investigate if the heirs of the old powers are steering the international postwar order (or this ship) in calm water or high seas and near icebergs in the next chapter.

4

Navigating Slippery Noble Cause Corruption

Ships are “large structures that take time to respond to maneuvering inputs from the bridge. On average, it may take a ship hundreds of meters to come to a complete stop and time to turn effectively.”⁵³ When crews are not properly managed or fatigued, a ship has a high chance of sinking. In other words, ships are large structures that require time to respond to maneuvering inputs or to come to a complete stop; therefore, if negligence or human error is not identified in time (such as loss of stability or poor weather conditions), a vessel can easily collide or sink.

Could the reason for the mounting pressures on the international postwar world order post-1945 be due to the heirs of the old powers allowing non-state actors such as the United Nations, World Bank, IMF, NATO, EU, NGOs, etc., to interfere in the maneuvering of the international postwar order? If negligence or a simple mistake can contribute to a number of disasters at sea, could the perturbation that has been pounding the international postwar order since 1945 be because the heirs of the old powers deviated away from the work program that the UN founding fathers counselled their heirs to be faithful to its principles and allowed non-state actors such as the United Nations, etc., to implement policies that prevent a person from managing to apply the Eightfold path that Buddha developed in his relations to experience nirvana (i.e., less suffering)?

⁵³ <https://www.marineinsight.com/naval-architecture/why-ships-sink-10-major-reasons/>

Vessels do not sink when they are in motion only but can sink when stationary if they lean at dangerous angles. For example, a dam is “a barrier across flowing water that obstructs or directs or slows down the flow, often creating a reservoir, lake, or impoundments.”⁵⁴ A dam failure or dam burst is a “catastrophic type of failure characterized by the sudden, rapid, and uncontrolled release of impounded water or the likelihood of such an uncontrolled release.”⁵⁵ In 1975 the failure of the Bangiao Reservoir Dam and other dams in Henan Province, China, killed an estimated 171,000 people, and 11 million people lost their homes.^{56,57}

Many causes could prompt a dam to fail or collapse, and one of them is negligence and human error.⁵⁸ For example, engineers postulate that the Malpasset Dam⁷ failed due to geological instability caused by changes to water levels during filling or poor surveying. Poor maintenance, especially of outlet pipes, was the cause for the failure of the Lawn Lake Dam⁸ or the Val Di Stava Dam.⁵⁹

The international postwar world order (or the United Nations, which is the primary formal organization coordinating its activities between states on a global scale) is a “legal” entity just as in the case of companies or governments. It is formed by a group of individuals to engage in and operate the international order. If the international postwar order is essentially an artificial person in the same way companies (or governments) are also known as "corporate personhood" in that it is an entity separate from the individuals who own, manage, and support its operations, this means that if the individuals whom the heirs of the old powers delegated to them the task of planning the policies of the international postwar order are improperly managing this task, they could be driving the international order toward collapse.

⁵⁴ <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Dam>

⁵⁵ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Dam_failure

⁵⁶ <https://www.internationalrivers.org/resources/the-forgotten-legacy-of-the-banqiao-dam-collapse-7821>

⁵⁷ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Banqiao_Dam

⁵⁸ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Dam_failure#Main_causes_of_dam_failures

⁵⁹ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Val_di_Stava_dam_collapse

Companies are generally organized to earn a profit from business activities.⁶⁰ Governments are also organized to provide benefits for the people who become public servants. This indicates that the heirs of the old powers, who are controlling and regulating the international postwar order (including the United Nations, World Bank, IMF, NATO, and others), are profiting from the behavior of the social order.

According to the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics⁶¹(BLS), approximately 20% of new businesses fail during the first two years of being open, 45% during the first five years, and 65% during the first 10 years. Only 25% of new businesses make it to 15 years or more.⁶² Seventy-five years have now elapsed on the United Nations (WB, IMF, NATO, and others) managing the international postwar order on behalf of the heirs of the old powers, and the only dividends that those families/dynasties involved have to show are that peace and security have been going from bad to worse.

If negligence and human error are regarded as the most common reason why companies or governments fail, this signifies that the heirs of the old powers could be allowing the United Nations (WB, IMF, NATO, and others) to sink the world in insecurity until the social order is completely inundated with violence and conflicts, thus putting the maintenance of their strength and stability under great risks.

Structural integrity and failure is “an aspect of engineering that deals with the ability of a structure to support a designed structural load (weight, force, etc.) without breaking and includes the study of past structural failures in order to prevent failures in future designs.”⁶³ Structural integrity is “the ability of an item—either a structural component or a structure consisting of many components—to hold together under a load, including its weight, without breaking or deforming excessively.” Structural failure “refers to the loss of structural integrity, or the loss of load-carrying capacity in either a structural component or the structure itself.” Structural failure is

⁶⁰ <https://www.investopedia.com/terms/c/company.asp>

⁶¹ <https://www.investopedia.com/terms/b/bls.asp>

⁶² <https://www.investopedia.com/financial-edge/1010/top-6-reasons-new-businesses-fail.aspx>

⁶³ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Structural_integrity_and_failure

initiated when “a material is stressed beyond its strength limit, causing fracture or excessive deformations.”

As I said before, the international postwar world order is not a structure, so we can say that its structural integrity can become damaged or fatigued. However, we cannot determine whether the continuous pressures exerted by the United Nations (including the World Bank, IMF, NATO, and others) on the international postwar order will stress this "legal" entity, which I previously described as an artificial person, similar to how companies (or governments) are recognized under corporate personhood. But since it is real humans who own, manage, and support the operations of this international postwar order, and humans are known to break down when they are stressed or to commit errors, then there is a good chance that the United Nations (WB, IMF, NATO, and others) could be piloting or maneuvering the international postwar order to an eventual collapse.

Given that the international postwar world order is not a structure (or a vessel), it fails in the same way such materials do. Likewise, it is a system that can tolerate localized failures without causing immediate or even progressive collapses. To the contrary, it is a system that would collapse in its entirety. This suggests that the heirs of the old powers may be allowing the United Nations (including the World Bank, IMF, NATO, and others) to position them for a fate similar to that of King Charles I of England if they continue to permit intergovernmental organizations to interfere in the social order, compelling people to focus on eradicating poverty and injustice in all its forms. If poverty and injustice could be eliminated without the people involved following the rules they are legitimizing, our ancestors would have done so, and the UN and other non-state actors wouldn't be needed.

As I mentioned earlier, the international postwar world order serves merely as a means to an end—the benefit of the individuals involved—and is considered legitimate only to the degree that people are willing to surrender their freedom in exchange for its benefits. This signifies that if the heirs of the old powers continue to allow people to use the international system as a ladder to increase their happiness rather than to secure the aspirations suggested in the UN Charter, the

powerful families and dynasties involved would be expressing agreement with people putting their interests above theirs. This also means that there is a big chance that this strategy will prompt people to withdraw their obligation to obey to satisfy the best interests of society in order to prioritize their own.

Humans use two methods to avoid collision. Humans can either make bold course alterations or adopt a series of relatively small course changes. I have no way of knowing how the heirs of the old powers expect to prevent their interests from colliding with the interests of people after they let the United Nations lead people to believe that the purpose of the coming together of nations post-1945 was to promote equal rights of outcomes.

The sea is defined as the connected body of salty water that covers 70% of the earth's surface. The sea is a large, unobstructed open body of water. One could suppose that because there are only over 50,000 merchant ships trading internationally,⁶⁴ the sea is huge, ships do not go fast, and lots of navigation technology exist now that ship accidents would be low, but ship collisions are common and happen from time to time. In 2017, the US Navy destroyer the John S. McCain and a larger oil tanker smashed into each other, and this accident resulted in ten US Navy sailors losing their lives as a result of the crash.⁶⁵

The collision of the US Navy destroyer the John S. McCain and a larger oil tanker in 2017 could be, of course, just a deeply unfortunate coincidence that two ships that supposedly maintain visual lookout and are fitted with the latest radar and navigation system, GPS tracking, radio communications, alarms, etc., would have prevented such a tragic collision, but the collision of the US Navy destroyer with the oil tanker in 2017 supports that no person can claim that he can prevent a collision or maneuver events to create near-misses.

If humans cannot avoid accidents to save themselves from imminent danger, then it is highly likely that if the heirs of the old powers

⁶⁴ <https://www.ics-shipping.org/shipping-facts/shipping-and-world-trade#:~:text=The%20international%20shipping%20industry%20is,would%20simply%20not%20be%20possible.>

⁶⁵ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/USS_John_S._McCain_and_Alnic_MC_collision

continue to let the United Nations (WB, IMF, NATO, and others) teach people that they have every right to share on equal rights created things, it would not be possible to alter the course of the international postwar order for collision avoidance.

In the shipping industry, shipmasters are instructed to prevent collision with other ships, even if their ship has every right to be at its current location. We can argue that maintaining good order is crucial for preserving peace. In this regard, one would also suppose that the heirs of the old powers gain a lot when the laws are followed, designed to catch offenders, and serve justice rather than protect the rich.

For example, before the modern idea of policing was invented, citizens were responsible for seeing that the law was not broken, and if it was, they had to catch the offenders themselves or they risked receiving a fine. Thus, the heirs of the old powers believe that everyone should change their behavior to align with the UN Charter's principles to avoid conflict with their own traditions and values. One would expect those families/dynasties to ensure that people do not break the laws.

I have no way of knowing what peace and security were like in antiquity, when citizens were responsible for seeing that the law was not broken and, if it was, for catching the offenders themselves or risking receiving a fine. However, we could say that law and order should not have been anything that is different than what the case became like now post-1945, or after the heirs of the old powers delegated to the United Nations and to governments the role of keeping the peace. This is because what we do know is that if heirs of the old powers did not choose to combine their love for wealth, prestige, or power with what should have been very logically expected of them to be doing post-1945, and that was to be doing the policing themselves, perhaps peace and security would have been different.

If, in theory, law and order should not have been any different in antiquity than what has been the case since 1945 and/or when the wealthy or powerful families/dynasties who in antiquity began to delegate to others (i.e., pay others) to take over their policing duties, this then signifies that the heirs of the old powers cannot be expecting the state of affairs in the world to develop in any shape or way other

than the events that the powerful families/dynasties adopted or resorted to implementing to transform the conditions and outcomes that mattered to them in antiquity.

As of the date the wealthy or powerful families/dynasties in antiquity began to delegate to others (i.e., pay to others) to take over their policing duties of law and order, the world spiraled down into many wars before two world wars ensued to choose the families/dynasties who would be calling out how all people should behave to maintain their strength and stability.

This also signifies that if the heirs of the old powers do not start doing the policing of the international postwar order themselves or reform it so its policing goes back to being done in the same way as over a thousand years ago, our ancestors were seeing that the laws are not broken; they could not alter the course of events to avoid that people's continuous pursuit of happiness does not collide with theirs.

I have no way of knowing what the heirs of the old powers count on doing to prevent the decision of their predecessors to deviate away from the work program that the founding fathers of the UN counselled that they remain faithful to its principles to avoid positioning themselves on a collision course with people's continuous pursuit of happiness. What I do know is that post-1945 peace and security in the world do not seem to differ from the law and order of antiquity, when the rich and powerful began paying others to take over their policing duties.

For example, before 1663, citizens were required to serve for a year without earning any salary in policing their community.⁶⁶ People were expected to combine this service with their ordinary work. Over time, Londoners lost interest in balancing their daily responsibilities with maintaining law and order in their communities. Evidently, the wealthy people began to pay others to take over their policing duties. Consequently, the Londoners decided to formalize the system they were using to maintain good order as the population increased and

⁶⁶

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Law_enforcement_in_the_United_Kingdom#History

communities grew larger, making local policing require constant attention.

Most historians agree that as the Industrial Revolution transformed England from a rural to an industrial country, this transformation was also breeding crime at a staggering rate. Yet most historians also agree that the police force established by the residents of London (and Great Britain) became a respected law enforcement agency until 1945.

One would assume that the successes that the policing scheme that Great Britain managed to erect from 1663 to 1945 would be aiding this country in guarding its streets in the same way the people who were in charge of maintaining the public order before 1945 were doing. Yet most historians agree that the severe public disorder and the major crimes committed by British police disqualify this force from being reputed as the finest in the world, as it was pre-1945.

If, post-1945, the police in Great Britain are unable to ensure law and order in this country, then one of two motives could be prompting this rise in intolerance that people are expressing. The first could be due to human nature having worsened. The second is if the families/dynasties who control the policing force in Great Britain act in their own interests rather than in the best interests of the heirs of the old powers.

Since 1945, there has been no new evidence to support that human nature has changed. If the number of people who are refusing to surrender freedom to obtain the benefits of the political order in Great Britain has increased, this signify that, for one reason or another, the families/dynasties who are controlling the policing force in Great Britain are not acting in the best interests of the heirs of the old powers but their own.

In the British model of policing, “policing by consent” expresses an idea whereby police officers are regarded as citizens in uniform.⁶⁷ In other words, police officers in Great Britain “exercise their powers to police their fellow citizens with the implicit consent of their fellow citizens.”

⁶⁷ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Peelian_principles

If in Great Britain "policing by consent" indicates that the legitimacy of policing in the eyes of the public is based upon a general consensus of support that follows from a conviction by the people about the transparency, integrity, or accountability with which police forces are exercising their powers in the country, but as of 1945, public unrest and disorder have been on the rise in this nation, this signifies one of two things. Either the police force in Great Britain has become much more powerful than the families/dynasties who control this country suppose they are capable of inflicting damages on them to resize them and revert them to a simpler form, or the families/dynasties who control this country decided to let people whom they regard as citizens in uniform sail or drive on a head-on collision with their citizens.

A head-on collision is an event in which one object strikes against another object. There are two types of collisions in physics: elastic and inelastic.⁶⁸ An inelastic collision occurs "when two objects collide and do not bounce away from each other." A high-speed car collision is an "inelastic collision." An elastic collision occurs when two objects "bounce" apart after colliding. Two rubber balls are a good example.

Inertia is defined as a "property of matter by which it continues in its existing state of rest or uniform motion in a straight line, unless that state is changed by an external force."⁶⁹ Humans have a tendency to do nothing or to remain unchanged. However, humans believe that they were programmed for a purpose other than to serve the natural world, and therefore, they believe that their human ingenuity was programmed to provide practical results for their human bodies. Human ingenuity inhabits the human body. Human ingenuity relies on two methods to prevent people from colliding with one another. The first is through the use of force, and the second is through the idea of good. Hence, all the disregard for human rights that humans commit arises from the denial of freedom by people with dominant power against people with soft power and vice versa; humans prefer to legitimize the idea of good so it becomes a means to allow a person to transform the conditions and outcomes that matter to him.

⁶⁸

http://ffden-2.phys.uaf.edu/211_fall2002.web.dir/ben_townsend/TypesofCollisions.htm

⁶⁹ <http://english.oxforddictionaries.com/inertia>

Unfortunately, humans are not an elastic object, meaning that when they collide (i.e., resort to violence) to determine whose happiness overtakes others, the result of such an operation does not produce the same outcome that happens when two rubber balls collide. In other words, both momentum and kinetic energy stay conserved. Regrettably, when humans compete to see whose happiness prevails over others, their disputes and crises behave similarly to how inelastic bodies react.

Most people are unable to overcome their willpower weaknesses or tolerate injustice and pressure; therefore, when individuals pursue happiness (or greed) and their desires clash, the outcome is similar to that of a head-on collision between two cars or a vehicle colliding with a pedestrian. The person involved in the collision would sustain lots of injury and could even die.

Vehicle, ship, or airline collisions often result in injury, disability, death, and property damage as well as financial costs to both societies and the individuals involved. If the heirs of the old powers believe that the families or dynasties they rely on in Great Britain can ensure the willingness of the British people to support them through a police force whose members are also striving for their own personal development, this indicates that all three groups (the heirs of the old powers, the families or dynasties controlling Great Britain, and the police force in Great Britain) are prepared to accept that their pursuit of happiness is equal.

I have no way of knowing about the number of the heirs of the old powers (i.e., the number of the families/dynasties who control the money supply of the world). Bizknowledge Watch, a business magazine, reported that in 2019 there were 2,153 billionaires around the world.⁷⁰ However, Oxfam, a British charity, reported in 2019 that the world's 26 richest people own as much as poorest 50%.⁷¹ Let us

⁷⁰ <https://blog.iese.edu/bizknowledgewatch/2019/the-worlds-billionaires-2019/#:~:text=There%20are%20%2C153%20billionaires%20on,from%20%249.1%20trillion%20in%202018.>

⁷¹ <https://www.theguardian.com/business/2019/jan/21/world-26-richest-people-own-as-much-as-poorest-50-per-cent-oxfam-report>

assume that the number of the heirs of the old powers (i.e., the number of the families/dynasties who control the money supply of the world) is 26.

Forbes magazine, an American business magazine, reported in 2019 that there were 54 billionaires in the U.K.⁷² Let us assume that the number of families/dynasties that control Great Britain is 54. Likewise, I have no way of knowing how many police officers Great Britain employs. In the literature it is reported that in England and Wales there were 202,023 territorial police workers as of March 2019.⁷³

It is important that readers keep in mind that most governments are composed of a judicial branch, an executive branch, and a legislative branch. Each branch is usually made up of many departments. Policing is an independent activity intended to regulate behavior and enforce order within a state, and it is usually a department that the executive branch administers. However, as I said before, each branch of government is made of many departments, and each department operates its own policing force (or national law enforcement agency). In other words, the judiciary branch comprises many departments that range from operating courts to prisons, etc. Each department has its own miscellaneous policing force. This means that the number of law enforcement officers in Great Britain who are exercising their police powers is much higher than the 202,023 number that I reported, and the real number could be 500,000 or maybe 1 million. However, let us only use this 202,023 number reported.

Once again, the number of UN member states totals 183. Great Britain is one country whose police officers are working on preventing crime and disorder to secure the aspirations that are suggested in the UN Charter. If the heirs of the old powers (i.e., imaginary number 26) have no objection with deviating away from the work program that the founding fathers of the UN counselled them to be faithful to its

⁷² <https://www.forbes.com/sites/oliverwilliams1/2019/11/20/exactly-how-many-billionaires-are-there-in-the-uk/#:~:text=According%20to%20Forbes%2C%20there%20are,of%20the%20Labour%20Party's%20figure.>

⁷³ https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/831726/police-workforce-mar19-hosb1119.pdf

standards to maintain their strength and stability and to implement the policies that the United Nations has been determining on their behalf since 1945, this signifies that those powerful families/dynasties involved expect that the families/dynasties who deputize for them in Great Britain (imaginary number 54) and the constituted body of persons that are empowered in Great Britain to prevent crime and disorder, whom I said number 202,023, to remain faithful to them.

In other words, those wealthy and powerful families/dynasties involved (i.e., imaginary number 56) believe that the families/dynasties who deputize for them in Great Britain (imaginary number 54) and the 202,023 police officers who are in Great Britain working to prevent crime and disorder would be able to balance between managing to transform the conditions that matter to those wealthy and powerful families/dynasties and their own pursuit to realize the full development of their personalities. Simply put, those wealthy and powerful families/dynasties who are involved (i.e., the heirs of the old powers) believe that the families/dynasties who deputize for them in Great Britain (imaginary number 54) and the 202,023 police officers who are in Great Britain working to prevent crime and disorder would be able to balance between their obligation to be faithful or a loyal servant to those wealthy and powerful families/dynasties so they could continue to pursue the things they deeply care about, such as power, prestige, and wealth, and the pursuit of their own aspirations for power, prestige, and wealth at the same time.

If the wealthy and powerful families/dynasties who won WW2 (i.e., the heirs of the old powers) believe that the families/dynasties who deputize for them in Great Britain (imaginary number 54) and the 202,023 police officers who are in Great Britain working to prevent crime and disorder would be able to prevail over their will and to correct the distortions that skew one's analyses of benefit and cost, this signifies that those wealthy and powerful families/dynasties involved have to be wagering on three conditions for this to happen.

The first would entail the readiness of the people who are doing the policing in Great Britain to accept that the power or authority of the wealthy and powerful families/dynasties involved (i.e., the heirs of the

old powers) would always be above their own. In other words, British police would know that their ability to do their jobs would always depend on the approval of the heirs of the old powers of their existence, actions, and behavior.

The second would entail the readiness of the people who are doing the policing in Great Britain to observe the laws that the heirs of the old powers come up with; hence, it is a prerequisite for the public to be ready to surrender freedom to obey.

The third presupposes that the people who are doing the policing in Great Britain would be able to secure and maintain the respect and approval of the public. If the public refuses to obey, the heirs of the old powers cannot make citizens ready to voluntarily surrender freedom, which is needed to benefit the political order.

I have no way of knowing how the heirs of the old powers concluded that when they deviated away from the work program that the founding fathers of the UN counselled them to be faithful to its principles to maintain their strength and stability to implement the policies that the United Nations (WB, IMF, NATO, and others) has been determining on their behalf since 1945, they could manage to secure the readiness of the 202,023 police officials to be doing wrong when at the moment the perceived benefits could outweigh the costs. What I do know, as I mentioned earlier, is that humans do not behave like a mass of elastic objects that conserve momentum and kinetic energy when they collide. Momentum is mass multiplied by velocity. If 100 people weighing 60 kg each run at 1 km/hr toward a person of the same weight and speed, the impact force of the 100 people would be 100 times greater than the energy of the one person. Put differently, if a kid hits another person with a baseball, the energy could not impact or knock down the person hit, but if an adult is doing it, the person hit stands a big chance of being knocked down or dying from the force of the impact.

Likewise, kinetic energy is the energy of motion; it is defined as $K = (1/2) m v^2$. The relationship between kinetic energy and mass is linear, which means that an individual who masses twice as much as another person has twice as much kinetic energy. The relationship

between kinetic energy and velocity is exponential, which means that as you increase speed, kinetic energy increases dramatically. In other words, if one hundred people are charging at 2 km/hr against one person and the other person is charging in the opposite direction at the same speed, the kinetic energy would be dramatically higher.

Actually, there are two other principles that people cannot obey or can make them become irrelevant. Two people cannot go through a door at the same time. One person must wait for the other to go through first before the next can pass. Put differently, if we have a chair and three people want to sit on it, only one could sit down, and the other two must remain standing. Most importantly, when two objects collide, the duration of the change of motion between the two bodies involved in the collision is short. In the case of humans, wars or disputes between people could last for years.

If, despite all the aforementioned physical and behavioral limitations that people are plagued with and cannot alter, the heirs of the old powers believe that they could allow the United Nations (WB, IMF, NATO, and others) to preach to people about why everyone must be devoted to eradicating poverty in all its forms and/or be devoted to ending inequality to guarantee equal justice without the awareness that people gain prompting them to prioritize their self-interest, then either those powerful families/dynasties involved are undermining the obstacles that the United Nations (WB, IMF, NATO, and others) is setting them up to confront, or they stopped to care if their successors would manage to exercise the same power or authority that they are capable of leveraging to be able to continue to transform the conditions and outcomes that matter to them despite the resistance of others.

Indeed, the jam that the heirs of the old powers appear to be in needs a way out from pursuant to giving their non-objection to the United Nations (WB, IMF, NATO, and others) to determine and enforce policies during seventy years, which puts them on a head-on collision with the people who are tasked with preventing crime and disorder (i.e., the police officers) to avoid the public withdrawing their readiness to obey. This is not something that those powerful families/dynasties involved could walk out from unscratched.

In fact, to show the bottleneck that the heirs of the old powers are stuck in, I suggest showing next how the policies that the United Nations (WB, IMF, NATO, and others) are determining and enforcing are aligning the people who do the policing in a head-on collision with those powerful families/dynasties involved (i.e., heirs of the old powers) and how the United Nations and other non-state actors are aligning the public (because the people who do the policing are citizens in uniform) in a head-on collision with the same powerful families/dynasties, so this dilemma is better understood.

A government is a means used by people to balance between the principle of individual freedom and the idea of absolute state authority (tyranny). Governments (or the group of people who use the idea of government to transform the conditions and outcomes that matter to them) secure their goals by relying on two organizational sub-systems to regulate behavior. The first subsystem makes laws, and the second enforces them.

This structure enables us to assert that these subsystems also comprise the international postwar order. The heirs of the old powers delegated to the United Nations (including the World Bank, IMF, NATO, and others) the responsibility of determining the policies of the international postwar order, while assigning the task of enforcing these policies to various UN member states and other non-state actors.

The individuals determining the policies the public must consider to be prepared to surrender freedom for the benefits of the political order at the United Nations (WB, IMF, NATO, and others) are citizens fulfilling their responsibilities based on the same model used to legitimize the idea of policing. The individuals who are determining policies at the United Nations (WB, IMF, NATO, and others) on how to make people become ready to surrender freedom to obtain the benefit of the political order legitimized are also pursuing this task while they are dedicated to realizing the full development of their personalities at the same time. It is not possible for a person to work on elevating the common good while pursuing the realization of the full development of his personality at the same time.

It is important that readers keep in mind that it is the policies that the United Nations (WB, IMF, NATO, and others) are determining that would prompt the police or the public to revolt against the heirs of the old powers. If the heirs of the old powers allow the United Nations (WB, IMF, NATO, and others) to determine policies while the officials involved in such legal entities function as economic operators and platforms that elevate the common good and return to playing the coordination role that the founding fathers of the UN programmed for those legal entities, altering course for collision avoidance would be impossible. For this reason, I plan to show first how the role of governments as enforcers of the policies that the United Nations is taking could be detrimental to the heirs of the old powers. In other words, I aim to demonstrate how the heirs of the old powers may encounter themselves in direct conflict with those they rely on to enforce the policies set by the UN. Then, I plan to show how the policies that the United Nations is determining on behalf of the heirs of the old powers could lead to their resizing and collapse. In other words, I plan to show how the strategies being implemented by the United Nations and other non-state actors are programmed to serve the individuals involved at those legal entities and how they are prompting governments to withdraw their obligation to obey laws to rely on their personal power and conscience to determine what they perceive as the best interests of society.

As I said before, the police are a constituted body of persons empowered by the government to enforce the law, to ensure the safety, health, and possessions of citizens, and to prevent crime and civil disorder.⁷⁴ The lawful powers of police include arrest and the use of force legitimized by the state via the monopoly of violence. The monopoly on violence is a concept of modern public law that grants rights to the state, i.e., a group of people, to claim a monopoly on the legitimated use of physical force within a geographical area.⁷⁵ This families or dynasties that control a state grant specific individuals the power to hold exclusive rights to use, threaten, or authorize physical force against residents within their territory; this power would not exist if these families or dynasties were policing themselves.

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

⁷⁵ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Monopoly_on_violence

Police power is defined as the capacity of the states to regulate behavior and enforce order within their territory for the betterment of the health, safety, morals, and general welfare of their inhabitants.⁷⁶

In 2017, The Washington Post reported that in the United States, policing costs well over \$100 billion each year.⁷⁷ Based on how much public safety costs in the United States, we could say that policing is an industry. In fact, The Washington Post reported in the same article about the costs of policing in the United States, stating that much of policing technology is being privatized, and private vendors—who claim trade secret protection—are shielding data from the public and researchers.

Public safety is foundational in any society. It is not possible to evaluate the effectiveness of policing unless we connect the service that police officers provide to results. If the United States cannot claim that its policing strategies have improved relations between people post-1945 despite all the money that this nation spends on public safety, we could say that this policing concept seems to be only marginally effective at regulating behavior for the betterment of the health, safety, morals, and general welfare of inhabitants in this country. Conversely, given the substantial amount of money that the United States appears to be spending on policing, we could argue that as public safety declines in the country, revenues are increasing for various small and large businesses that build facilities and provide equipment (such as security systems, furniture, and clothing) and services (including transportation, communications, healthcare, and food) for the police. Likewise, we could also say that those who benefit from the rise of insecurity in the US have a strong interest in seeing peace and security diminish, as their development and prosperity directly depend on the increase in immorality.

Moreover, if we consider that modern policing has changed from simply chasing bad guys or quelling protests to also focusing on discouraging crime, this indicates that the role, administration, and scope of police authority have expanded beyond merely granting

⁷⁶ [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Police_power_\(United_States_constitutional_law\)](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Police_power_(United_States_constitutional_law))

⁷⁷ <https://www.washingtonpost.com/posteverything/wp/2017/03/10/we-spend-100-billion-on-policing-we-have-no-idea-what-works/>

police officers the right to use physical force for domestic control to include an entirely new model.

In other words, in the 18th century, the policing model was about having a group of people from different communities walk the streets to ensure that the laws are not broken. As population increased and communities grew larger, policing began to become a vocation. From the 18th century to 1945, the people who chose policing as a vocation were expected to be walking the streets, and if they saw a person breaking the law, they were tasked to arrest the offenders. This model is no longer what policing is all about post-1945.

In modern times, the new policing model is no longer about granting a limited number of people the right to walk the street carrying an official staff of offices that provides them the right to arrest people if they see a crime being committed, but this idea has become an industry. In the new policing model, the initial functions of maintaining peace and apprehending criminals have evolved into a sector of the overall policing industry that provides livelihoods for millions of people. I shall explain what I mean.

The capacity of the state is usually measured in two ways: fiscal and legal. Fiscal capacity means the state's ability to recover taxation to provide public goods. When the Anglo-Saxon kings were ruling, the kings limited the idea of policing to only serving to prevent inappropriate behavior. The Anglo-Saxon kings did not use the idea of policing so it could begin to become a source of income from which the state generates income. In other words, the Anglo-Saxon kings did not frame the rationale of policing as economic or financial benefits but left it as a social benefit to the state. Put differently, the Anglo-Saxon kings did not see the idea of policing from a cost-benefit perspective, thus factoring how much they stood to gain or lose when law enforcement became a business. In fact, during the Norman conquest, maintaining public order was regarded as a social obligation for the good conduct of everyone. The local lords and nobles were responsible for maintaining order. The institutionalized body of policing did not serve the families or dynasties who monopolized violence in their societies for profit.

Indeed, the concept of policing has evolved from being focused on maintaining public order to one that utilizes various forms of coercion to enforce conformity and deter antisocial behavior, which has changed what states aim to achieve through policing.

It should be expected that we now have in each country federal police, state police, city police, highway police, bicycle police, horse police, police dogs, and hundreds of other policing fields because policing has shifted from measuring behavioral change to measuring income generation for the policing industry. It is evident that the benefactors or principal custodians would not have profited from this new policing model if the individuals conducting the policing had continued to use wooden sticks and patrol the streets, as has been done throughout history. Instead, they needed to equip themselves with tools and machinery to aid in catching offenders.

In fact, the modern policing model is no longer just about granting a group of people rights to arrest those who commit a crime, including equipping them with tools or machinery to do their vocation better, but it has become a huge industry that seeks to privatize much of the policing technology.

For example, any private vendor can now invest and make a profit from the law enforcement industry. In other words, a private investor can partner with a police department to manage and operate a speed camera program within a specific community, where the investor and the police department share the revenue from the fines issued. In fact, on some programs that the police operate to empower and deter drivers from exceeding the speed limit, driving without insurance, vehicle registration, etc., police cruisers, in some jurisdictions, are even equipped with credit card machines for instant payment.⁷⁸

The transformation of policing from a responsibility that Anglo-Saxon kings over a thousand years ago preferred to manage at the community level into a constituted body and industry seeking to privatize much of policing technology represents a fundamental change.

⁷⁸ <https://www.washingtonpost.com/posteverything/wp/2017/03/10/we-spend-100-billion-on-policing-we-have-no-idea-what-works/>

This transformation raises numerous questions. For one, why did the Anglo-Saxon kings not adopt, when they were attempting to regulate behavior for the betterment of the health, safety, morals, and general welfare of their inhabitants, a system that converts policing into a constituted body and preferred that communities be responsible for keeping the peace?

If human nature has not changed since the appearance of man on earth, we can conclude that the nature of people who lived a thousand years ago is the same as that of people living today. This allows us to say that if the effectiveness of policing is measured based on the absence of crime instead of the number of arrests made, and if the Anglo-Saxon kings preferred policing to be a community responsibility rather than a constituted body in their dominion, then their motive should have been either a valid reason or naïveté.

We can't say the Anglo-Saxon kings were naive because their problems were about controlling the rich, not the poor, unlike ours. Since 1945, the heirs of the old powers have faced challenges that are in stark contrast to those the Anglo-Saxon kings encountered. They involve determining how to ensure that those in power effectively police the public while also preparing the public to willingly surrender some freedoms in order to cooperate based on the principles outlined in the UN Charter.

Indeed, the idea adopted by the Anglo-Saxon kings, which allowed citizens to take turns in their local communities to ensure that laws are upheld, creates a challenge for individuals trying to balance their ordinary work with civic duties; the concept presents a paradox as it requires individuals to set aside their self-interest in order to promote the common good. However, if competition is inherent in nature and humans typically compete for wealth, power, prestige, and fame, it is logical to conclude that families or dynasties with a monopoly on violence in nations would be unlikely to support the abandonment of the policing practices established by the Anglo-Saxon kings, which transformed policing into a constituted body and an industry. This is because when a large group of people become very powerful, there is a good chance that its members support unpopular rule or revolt against popular rule. In fact, even if the members of any large group agree to

remain loyal to the families or dynasties that hold the monopoly on violence in a nation, the transition of policing from a practice aimed at preventing crime and disorder to a vocation or industry that generates profit compromises the balance of power between these families or dynasties and the law enforcement group.

Furthermore, because the public views police officers as citizens in uniform, they cannot be held accountable for their role in inappropriate conduct and illegal actions, as the police and the public are inseparable. In other words, after policing became an industry, those who use policing as a vocation and the public seek to preserve public favor and pander to public opinion. This means that the balance of power between families or dynasties that hold a monopoly on violence in any nation and the law enforcement agencies was compromised. The families/dynasties holding the monopoly on violence in any nation also compromised the balance of power with the public.

Simply put, the more that families or dynasties who hold a monopoly on violence in nations empower the police to hold the public accountable for their role in reducing crime, the less equipped those families or dynasties will be to reform police powers. In other words, because policing has become a system or industry that operates like any for-profit corporation rather than a vocation focused on preventing crime and disorder, cutting police bureaucracy or ending unnecessary central interference would be impossible. Any measure that would be implemented to reduce costs and improve police value for money, would not be done because there was a drop in crime, but rather to distribute the funds available among the people who are doing the policing. Also, since law enforcers can only increase their happiness (i.e., wealth) by reducing crime, this means that as the number of people in the policing business rises, the role of those in charge of preventing crime and disorder will become more controversial. In other words, it would be harder for police to earn and keep public respect.

Furthermore, for any significant drop in crime within a society to occur, the families or dynasties that hold a monopoly on violence must enforce authoritarian rule; as authoritarianism increases, so do police brutality and corruption. Therefore, it is crucial to ensure that the

individuals appointed by these families or dynasties to prevent crime and disorder remain committed to the ethical mission for which they were recruited. This is because if those individuals who are doing the policing do not secure and maintain public respect, the families/dynasties that hold the monopoly on violence need to enforce an authoritarian rule. When authoritarianism rises in a nation, the eventual fall of the families/dynasties who hold the monopoly on violence in the country also rises.

It is important that readers keep in mind that even if those individuals who are doing the policing do secure and maintain public respect, this does not mean that the families/dynasties who hold the monopoly on violence would not be resized. This would still happen, because, as I said before, the idea of policing is no longer a vocation that the people who make their living from this profession use to ensure that the laws are not broken but to increase their own wealth (i.e., procure abundance).

Hence, we can no longer expect that people who choose policing as a vocation will demonstrate absolute impartial service to the law. This means that those becoming law enforcement officers cannot work with complete independence from policy or disregard the justice or injustice of individual laws. If the idea of policing is promoted as a way to increase personal happiness rather than to change behavior, then police officers will struggle to offer their service and friendship to all members of the public, regardless of wealth or social standing.

In the early 19th century, when the government in Great Britain tried to set up a police force in London, this idea was met with a lot of opposition. “People were suspicious of the idea of a large and possibly armed police force and feared that it could be used to suppress protest or support unpopular rule.”⁷⁹ In other words, most people did not think that it was the job of the national government to set up and control a police force and they thought it should be under local control in the same way the Anglo-Saxon kings did a thousand years earlier.

Currently, most governments place legal restrictions on police officers, such as prohibitions on industrial action and participating in active

⁷⁹ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Peelian_principles#Background

politics, to discourage police misconduct. However, the ability of the families or dynasties that hold a monopoly on violence in any nation to maintain their strength and stability depends on the willingness of the police officers who serve them to remain loyal.

When the Anglo-Saxon kings ruled a thousand years ago, the people doing the policing were not allowed to turn policing into a business where they could enforce the law and enrich themselves. Only the Anglo-Saxon kings wielded unrestricted authority and had the power to decide the methods of earning profits. Everyone else in the kingdom experienced limited authority, and those who failed to report crimes they witnessed faced severe punishment.

Indeed, the decision of the families/dynasties who hold the monopoly on violence in nations to expand the idea of policing to become not necessarily just about apprehending criminals and guarding public places such as markets, temples, and parks to keep order but also to include secret and political police forces that aid in catching potential fomentors of revolt changes the purpose of the policing idea from being one that is intended to prevent inappropriate behavior and elevate the common good of society to one that aims at stopping disturbances of the peace to ensure that the families/dynasties who hold the monopoly on violence in any nation continue to transform the conditions and outcomes that matter to them.

Since antiquity, humans have used the concept of policing to transform outcomes and conditions that are important to them. For example, in France, the police force worked within the parameters of the absolutist state until 1792 as an extension of the authority of the monarch and functioned as part of the governing state. In the 19th century, Karl Marx considered the idea of the modern state to be part of the rise of capitalism, in which the police are one component of the bourgeoisie's repressive apparatus for subjugating the working class.

This is also to say that for as long as the public tolerates that the families/dynasties who hold the monopoly on violence in the different countries use the idea of policing to combat crime as well to deter antisocial behavior that challenges the primary and predominant power in the roles of political leadership, moral authority, social privilege,

and control of property of those powerful families/dynasties, the longer the social order would remain dynamic. Similarly, as long as the families or dynasties that hold a monopoly on violence in various countries convince the public that the purpose of the police is to prevent crime, the public will continue to engage in self-deceptive rationalization.

Then again, since the idea of “military” in the defense of the state against foreign aggressors and the idea of “police” to enforce the law within the defined legal or territorial area began to be used by powerful families/dynasties to ensure their safety and supposedly the safety of their dependents, and most families/dynasties have not been able to prevent civil unrest or preserve order despite the fact that those two forces are generally legitimized as being servants to the people rather than the state.

This dynamism could be driven by one of two motives. The first motive is that the powerful families and dynasties, who hold primary power and dominate political leadership roles (i.e., as patriarchs), may be naïve. In other words, they do not have the technical ability to rationally analyze. Simply put, their critical thinking is low. The second is if those powerful people are employing ideas to transform the conditions and outcomes that matter to them, which are obsolete. In other words, they could not be used to help those families/dynasties who hold the monopoly on violence to make people be ready to surrender freedom to obtain the benefit of the political order.

I believe the families/dynasties who hold the monopoly on violence fail to establish a balance of power between themselves and the families/dynasties who control other defined legal or territorial areas, or between themselves and their public, for reasons other than naivety, lack of technical ability, emotional decision-making, or inadequate advisors.

I strongly believe that the idea of police and the idea of military as a means to enable powerful families/dynasties to transform the conditions and outcomes that matter to them have become obsolete.

The police / the military is a constituted body of persons empowered by a state, with the aim to enforce the law within the defined legal or territorial area and/or against foreign aggressors. Their ideas [i.e., the police and the military] were based on a concept (or a scheme) that was fostered to achieve a desirable or noble goal. Perhaps the best way to comprehend the teleology of the idea would be to relate what the idea of police or military was to serve and to compare it to "noble cause corruption."

"Noble cause corruption" is corruption caused by the adherence to a teleological ethical system, suggesting that people will use unethical or illegal means to attain desirable goals, a result that appears to benefit the greater good.⁸⁰ Hence, the readiness of the public to become police or military officers emerged and was not distrusted. For the public, their readiness to accept that physical force be used to apprehend thieves and robbers, stop disturbances of the peace, etc. was premised on their conviction that the families/dynasties who hold the monopoly on violence in nations would be in the context of law enforcement to benefit the greater good. The public did not support the idea of police or the idea of military, so the families/dynasties who hold the monopoly on violence in nations use them as a repressive apparatus to increase their personal gain.

In other words, the public does not want to support post-1945 policies where those two ideas (i.e., the police or the military) serve as they did before 1945 when the families/dynasties who held the monopoly on violence used those two schemes to combat crime/aggression as well to deter the nobles who were challenging them to share their power in roles of political leadership, moral authority, social privilege, and control of property.

Unfortunately, post-1945 it is not only the nobles who are challenging the families/dynasties who hold the monopoly on violence in any nation to share their power in roles of political leadership, moral authority, social privilege, and control of property based on the principles of equal rights, but 7.8 billion people are doing it. The United Nations (WB, IMF, NATO, and others) has awakened the population of the entire earth to be organized to share, not as the

⁸⁰ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Noble_cause_corruption

founding fathers of the UN suggested before 1945 that all people cooperate in the economic field based on the principles of equal rights, but the United Nations (WB, IMF, NATO, and others) is working to end poverty and injustice in all their forms. In other words, the United Nations (WB, IMF, NATO, and others) are teaching people why they need to militarize to share on equal rights outcome. The United Nations (WB, IMF, NATO, and others) are working to end poverty and injustice in all their forms by 2030 in the entire world.

I have no way of knowing how the heirs of the old powers count on controlling the five permanent nations that deputize for them at the UN Security Council or even with the families/dynasties that hold the monopoly on violence in each one of the 183 UN member states that exist in the world now, the behavior of people after they [the heirs of the old powers] chose to not be in favor of technical progress running to waste, thus increasing the awareness of people faster, and chose to have the United Nations (WB, IMF, NATO, and others) make all the people of the world become committed to doing anything within their powers to end poverty and injustice in all its forms by 2030.

It looks as if all the noble “use of violence” that the five permanent nations of the UN Security Council and the families/dynasties that hold the monopoly on violence in each one of the 183 UN member states are committing in the name of making people live “happily ever after” are not making the world a safer place to live. To the contrary, the more the five permanent nations who deputize for the heirs of the old powers at the UN Security Council or the families/dynasties who hold the monopoly on violence in each one of the 183 UN member states employ violence in the name of reducing fear and want grows, the more people are putting into question the transparency of their powers, their integrity in exercising their powers, and their accountability.

I have no way of knowing how the heirs of the old powers could persuade the working class to view that the coming together of nations post-1945 was not to create social, economic, and political equality after the United Nations spent the last 70 years mustering people to believe that the coming together of all nations to cooperate in the

economic field post-1945 was to arrange so every person can manage to realize the full development of his personality on equal rights.

As I said before, hence, humans cannot use the idea of evil as a means to increase their personal gain; the idea of good (or ethics) helps to achieve the same goal. In other words, it makes people perceive that the created things that the rich thrust people to abandon their values and traditions to pursue are providing benefits for the greater well-being of society. This conclusion is not becoming apparent as people's awareness is on the rise. Created things seem to transform the outcomes and conditions that matter to specific social classes only, often leading to a widening gap between the values of the wealthy and those of the less affluent, which can obscure the true benefits for society as a whole.

The proverb “God works in mysterious ways” denotes an expression that some people use to express confidence that a conundrum has a solution despite it not being apparent.⁸¹ In 1776, our predecessors began the process of ending the patriarchal societies that existed by declaring that “all men are created equal.” In 1945, our fathers began the process of ending the idea of capitalism that existed in the world by declaring that “all people have an inalienable right to freedom, justice, and peace.”

Unfortunately, instead of the United Nations (WB, IMF, NATO, and others), whom the heirs of the old powers delegated to its administrators the role of coordinating the work program that the founding fathers of the UN to progress mankind toward the goal that those founding fathers specified in the UN charter, which was to “practice tolerance,” so our successors could be able to use the understanding of themselves that they would have gained to cooperate based on equality of outcomes, the United Nations and all other non-state actors chose to skip teaching people about how to be tolerant and/or about how to be ready to accept the second-best choice when

81

https://en.wiktionary.org/wiki/God_works_in_mysterious_ways#:~:text=Etymology,And%20rides%20upon%20the%20storm.%E2%80%9D

the first choice is not available to teach people why everyone should reject his values and traditions to share on equal rights outcomes.

I have no way of knowing how the heirs of the old powers could, with the support of the five permanent nations that deputize for them at the UN Security Council or even with the families/dynasties that hold the monopoly on violence in each one of the 183 UN member states that exist in the world now, make the working class be ready to surrender freedom to benefit from the political order when most men seem to lack morale and leadership, and the United Nations (WB, IMF, NATO, and others) has been teaching people post-1945 to lose faith in the criminal justice system and, most importantly, to be aware that the rich are not subjected to any ethical or legal accountability.

Attitudes usually change after a great period of unrest, such as a war, or when people perceive that the power of those who are using their power to get their way despite the resistance of others is restrained.

The heirs of the old powers could attempt, with the support of the five permanent nations that deputize for them at the UN Security Council and the families/dynasties that hold the monopoly on violence in each one of the 183 UN member states that exist in the world, to accelerate the process of change towards equal rights or accelerate the readiness of people to accept absolute principles in all political, economic, or ethical matters. If all those powerful families/dynasties involved choose to back absolutism, there would be lots of questions that would be begging answers. For one, all those powerful families/dynasties and their supporters would be able to control the social order if it remained dynamic. It would also be important to know if those powerful families/dynasties were able to manage and control the balance of power among them. Most importantly, it would be very important to also know how the international postwar order would evolve in the event the social order remained dynamic. If people feel oppressed, violated, and excluded, their readiness to obey diminishes proportionately.

I have no way of knowing what the heirs of the old powers will choose to do to make people become ready to surrender freedom to obtain the benefit of the political order. If, as I said, the working class are

rejecting the idea of policing or military being used as a tool to prevent inappropriate behavior and to protect the will of the families/dynasties who hold the monopoly on violence in each one of the 183 UN member states and are demanding that this policing and military idea (scheme) be used to benefit the greater good only (combat injustice or crime), this development means that more nations could risk becoming unstable. This also means that more nations could risk spiraling down in insecurity until becoming stateless, as is the case in Lebanon since 1975. This is very serious and worrisome.

It is important to keep in mind that the policing or military idea is not used by humans to combat crime or to protect the will of the families/dynasties who hold the monopoly on violence in the different nations, but it is used to maintain the class system, which perpetuates inequality and social unrest.

For example, the Lebanese have been a burden on humanity and a threat to the international order since 1945. Therefore, whether the Lebanese become organized or remain disorganized in the near future, the international political and economic power they would wield would remain irrelevant. In fact, if Lebanon disappears or becomes absorbed by another growing power, the world will be better off after the citizens of this country demonstrated that they do not deserve to be free.

We cannot say the same about countries that are located in western Europe such as Great Britain, Sweden, Denmark, Norway, Germany, the Netherlands, Belgium, France, etc., who, even though they do not meddle in the political status of Lebanon as much as we hear the United States doing it since 1945, are powerful enough for us to think that they are, but those western European countries are the nations who won WW2. Since 1945, those western European countries have been ranked as being the wealthiest among all the other nations, and they are the ones who finance the majority of the UN subsidiary organizations and non-state actors. In fact, the United States, Russia, China, etc. could all be playing the policeman role to those powerful families/dynasties that consider those western European nations as their principal home base. Actually, the heirs of the old powers could very well be nationals of those Western European countries.

If the purchasing power of the countries that are militarily and economically weak diminishes due to internal social revolt or sanctions imposed by a great power, this reduces the ability of a dominant nation to increase the happiness of its nationals. The dominant nation becomes unable to match the increased demand by its populace for happiness because the unrest in the nation, which its nationals became idle in, diminishes the production potential of the dominant nation as well.

When public approval, actions, and behavior of leaders in dominant countries diminish, the families/dynasties who hold the monopoly on violence in those dominant nations become unable to justify to their nationals that they are using “equality” as a course of action. Furthermore, when the working class realize that the structures that the families/dynasties who hold the monopoly on violence in dominant nations are claiming are improving equality are not producing the anticipated results, this outcome would undermine the credibility of the equality agenda that those families/dynasties depend on to change the culture and attitudes of their dependent people. At this point in time, the families/dynasties who hold the monopoly on violence in dominant nations convert their nations into what the social order is like in Lebanon, Iraq, Afghanistan, etc. - chaotic, or the one that is in Egypt, Turkey, Russia, China, etc. - authoritarian.

In other words, the families/dynasties who hold the monopoly on violence in dominant nations would have to pick between letting the idea of policing and military forces serve them as per what those two bodies are doing for the families/dynasties who hold the monopoly on violence in Lebanon or in Egypt, for example.

In Lebanon, the power of the police and the military is frozen because those two bodies are divided based on religious sectarianism. Therefore, the police and the military forces in Lebanon are used by the different families/dynasties who hold the monopoly on violence in the country to serve their will through the pledges that policemen or military officers make depending on their religious affiliation to them.

In Egypt, the power of the police and the military is used to kill those suspected of being potential fomentors of revolt. In other words, the families/dynasties who hold the monopoly on violence in Egypt are employing the idea of preventive policing as a concept to deter or kill any person who expresses an opinion that challenges the sole right of those territorial families/dynasties who control Egypt to any roles of political leadership, moral authority, social privilege, and control of property.

I have no way of knowing which scenario between the political status that exists in Lebanon or Egypt as of 2015 and the families/dynasties that hold the monopoly on violence in dominant nations is going to be picked to maintain their own strength and stability if their nationals continue to be against the idea of policing or military being used to apprehend criminals, as well as a repressive apparatus to increase their personal gain.

It is important that readers keep in mind that the families/dynasties who hold the monopoly on violence in distinct nations must be able to let the division of power that exists between them and other powerful families/dynasties who control other territorial areas create a balance. For example, the United Nations report regularly states that crime is low in Scandinavian countries. This condition does not result because the nature of the Scandinavians is different than that of the people of other nations. The only reason why crime is low in Norway, for example, while it is high in Lebanon, is mainly because the Norwegians (or let us say the families/dynasties who hold the monopoly on violence in Norway) are forgoing from the Lebanese their freedom (natural wealth and resources). If the Lebanese were to manage to tilt the balance of power that exists between them and the Norwegians toward their turf, the Norwegians would know the same insecurity that the Lebanese are knowing.

Indeed, the gridlock that the families/dynasties who hold the monopoly on violence in distinct nations are grappling with after they began to use the idea of policing and military to enforce the law as well as a repressive apparatus to increase their personal gain can be depicted through the below analogy.

A hamburger is a round patty of ground beef, typically sandwiched between two buns. Let the round of ground beef refer to the families/dynasties who hold the monopoly on violence in distinct nations. Let one side of the bun refer to the political system that exists in Lebanon, which herein serves as an illustration of how the social model could look in the nations that the families/dynasties hold a monopoly on violence in if they choose to refuse to accelerate the process of change towards equal rights and choose to accelerate the readiness of people to accept absolute principles in all political, economic, or ethical matters. Let the other side of the bun represent the social model that exists in Egypt, particularly post-2014.

After a person places a round patty of ground beef between two buns, he then sandwiches everything between the teeth that are located in the upper jaw and the lower jaw. In other words, the families/dynasties who hold the monopoly on violence in dominant nations must be able to balance the division of power between the powerful families/dynasties who want to resize them to revert them to a simpler form and the less powerful families/dynasties who are also doing the same.

Surely, the preventive policing that the families/dynasties who hold the monopoly on violence in Egypt have been adopting since 1945 is a policy that the heirs of the old powers could employ to maintain their strength and stability. The strategy that the families/dynasties who hold the monopoly on violence in Egypt have been adopting since 1945 aims at imprisoning or killing any person who expresses an opinion that challenges their sole right to any role of political leadership, moral authority, social privilege, and control of property. This strategy, which the families/dynasties who hold the monopoly on violence have been adopting in Egypt since 1945, is very attractive. It aids the families/dynasties who hold the monopoly on violence in Egypt in maintaining control of the regime against the voting public so everyone can begin to cooperate in accordance with the principles that the founding fathers of the UN counselled that every member of the human family should be faithful to post-1945. However, this strategy makes the families/dynasties who hold the monopoly on violence in Egypt live in fear.

All people (nations) employ two methods to maintain their strength and stability. A person (or a nation) can practice unethical preemptive or preventive strategies (attacks) or ethical ones.

I have no way of knowing if the heirs of the old powers were programmed to maintain their strength and stability post-1945 through adopting unethical preemptive or preventive strategies (attacks), ethical ones, or both.

Throughout history, all the people (or nations) who legitimized violence or unethical actions to attain desirable goals were resized. Likewise, all the people (or nations) who legitimized ethical actions as a means to elevate the greater good were resized by the people (or nations) who were not ardent on prioritizing the common good.

Indeed, the competing ethical codes that the heirs of the old powers have to navigate between their intricate webs is not an easy task, especially since humans are a species that is known to unite in a defensive coalition if their strength and stability risk becoming destabilized. Actually, we should not also forget that we have another 183 UN member states that are controlled by families/dynasties that are all taking action well in advance of any potential threat to avoid either their dependent people resizing them or any neighboring nations doing it.

Men are all the time confronted with a choice between respecting the law, “which can allow dangerous offenders to go free, or extralegal means, which entails breaking the law to prevent truly dangerous offenders from committing additional crimes.”⁸²

I don't know if the heirs of the old powers and/or the families/dynasties who hold the monopoly on violence in each one of the existing 183 nations are capable of judging ahead to say that a certain individual or a certain country might one day down the line become a danger to permit them to take action in advance of a threat. Then again, it would be irrational to assume that the heirs of the old powers could have programmed to make the war aims of WW2 to be about organizing 183 UN member states so 183 families/dynasties

⁸² https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Noble_cause_corruption#Origin

afterwards hold a monopoly on violence to practice preventive policing in the distinct territory that they control with the aim of transforming conditions and outcomes that matter to the maintenance of their strength and stability, and not necessarily, that of the powerful families/dynasties that won WW2.

In other words, it makes no sense to suppose that the old powers (the victors of WW2) programmed before they won WW2 to extend to the Lebanese families/dynasties, whom the French left in their hands, the monopoly on violence in this country so those powerful Lebanese families/dynasties practice preventive policing against their heirs to ensure that their strength and stability do not remain destabilized. That's not all; it makes no sense to suppose that the victors of WW2 programmed that the Lebanese families/dynasties who hold the monopoly on violence in Lebanon practice preventive policing to stop the families/dynasties who hold the monopoly on violence in Norway, for example, from resizing them.

I am not sure if this preventive policing strategy, which most countries seem to have been practicing since 1945, is a tactic that transforms conditions and outcomes to make them fulfill what the heirs of the old powers deeply care about, or if those strategies are serving the families/dynasties who hold the monopoly on violence in those countries to transform the conditions and outcomes that matter for the maintenance of their own strength and stability.

In other words, I have no way of knowing if this strategy that the heirs of the old powers are permitting nations to implement, and which is based, as I said, on allowing those families/dynasties in different countries to hold the monopoly on violence to transform the political or economic situation as the case is like now in Lebanon (i.e., chaotic) or Egypt (i.e., absolute), is a way that could help those powerful families/dynasties involved to build a fairer and a more equal society. Herein, it is important to keep in mind that the victors of WW2 (the old powers) chose to make the war aims of WW2 be about building a fairer and more equal society so they could, in this way, continue to transform the conditions and outcomes that matter to them.

Indeed, the state of peace and security in the world post-1945 does not seem to indicate that the heirs of the old powers are successfully transforming the conditions and outcomes that matter to them through this strategy. To the contrary, a good number of people around the world are wondering if the heirs of the old powers are testing to find out if it would be possible for them to attain the UN goals while 183 families/dynasties and their supporters in 183 countries are, at the same time, working on monopolizing the balance of power to make it tilt in their favor. Alternatively, if the preventive policing that the heirs of the old powers are practicing is transforming the conditions and outcomes that matter to the maintenance of their strength and stability of the families/dynasties who hold the monopoly on violence in countries and not the outcomes that serve their successors.

I plan to continue to investigate the policing strategies that the heirs of the old powers are adopting in the next chapter.

5

Power as a vocation for salvation

"Politics as a Vocation"⁸³ is an essay by German economist and sociologist Max Weber⁸⁴ (1864–1920). Weber postulates in this essay that "the state is seen as the sole grantor of the 'right' to physical force." In this work, the term "politics" will refer to the efforts of all 183 UN member states to pursue the international postwar order that was declared as the only legitimate political order by the victors of World War II (the old powers) in the aftermath of this global war.

In the aftermath of WW2, the founding fathers of the UN counselled in article 2 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights that all the existing nations cooperate without distinction of any kind, such as race, colour, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth, or other status. The United Nations saw differently post-1945. This international intergovernmental organization, which all UN member states expect to lead by example, preferred to categorize all people and nations as developed, underdeveloped, or least developed. This strategy contradicts the advice given by the founding fathers of the UN in Article 2 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights on how all existing nations should cooperate with one another.

The United Nations ranks the people who live in Norway, Denmark, or Sweden as having developed an awareness of social standards that surpasses all the other UN member states. I have no way of knowing about the exact nature of the ethical balance that the families/dynasties who hold the monopoly on violence in Norway, Denmark, or Sweden

⁸³ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Politics_as_a_Vocation

⁸⁴ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Max_Weber

are providing to the heirs of the old powers as of 1945 to aid those powerful families/dynasties involved to progress toward the aspirations that were set forth in the preamble of the United Nations. That is to prevent future wars by making people practice tolerance.⁸⁵

If we take Lebanon, which is the second smallest nation in mainland Asia after Palestine (or the Palestinian territory), as a case in example, and analyze what Norway, Denmark, Sweden, Germany, France, etc. provided to help the Lebanese find their way out from the political maze that France left the Lebanese to search to find their way out from its intricate trap as of 1945, we have to regrettably say nil.

Weber postulates in the essay "Politics as a Vocation" that "the ethic of responsibility refers to the day-to-day need to use the means of the state's violence in a fashion that preserves the peace for the greater good."

If the families/dynasties who hold the monopoly on violence in Norway, Denmark, Sweden, Germany, or France, etc. are not alarmed about letting the families/dynasties who hold the monopoly on violence in Lebanon to disintegrate the health of the political, social, and economic system to the low level that this country is knowing in recent years, this means that either the families/dynasties who control those western European Nations that the United Nations rank as having developed an awareness that surpasses the Lebanese are undermining what the victors of WW2 (the old powers) counselled those nations to be dedicated to doing post 1945 to build a fairer and more equal society or those western European countries believe that the disorder that is engulfing Lebanon would not impact on the maintenance of their strength and stability.

Max Weber published his essay "Politics as a Vocation" in 1919, while the German Revolution of 1919 was underway. Weber passed away six months after publishing this essay. In the concluding sentences of the essay, he predicted that gloomy days would lie ahead for the political leaders who would win the revolt irrespective of which group seizes power. Weber's prediction materialized. The joy of the

⁸⁵ <https://www.un.org/en/sections/un-charter/un-charter-full-text/>

group that seized power at the end of the German Revolution was short-lived.

The global war that awaited the Germans and the entire world after Weber published his essay serves as a warning to current leaders of the international order, reminding them that it is impossible to control events according to one's desires, regardless of how many redundancies or preventive policing measures a person (or a nation) predicts or implements.

Edwin Chadwick (1800–1890) was an English social reformer who is noted for his leadership in reforming the poor laws in England and instituting major reforms in urban sanitation and public health.⁸⁶ In 1829, Chadwick published an article, "Preventive Police," in which he argued that prevention ought to be the primary concern of a police body. The reason, argued Chadwick, was that "preventive police would act more immediately by placing difficulties in obtaining the objects of temptation."⁸⁷

Indeed, all the preventive or deterrent measures that the nations with great power adopted from 1945 to now to make it difficult for people to obtain "the objects of temptation" have proven to be useless so far.

As I said before, the heirs of the old powers could choose to maintain their strength and stability in any way they want.

The central assertion would always be about how to ensure that the actions that the heirs of the old powers take do not destabilize their strength and stability. It is crucial to remember that the strength and stability of the involved families and dynasties must not be destabilized. This is because if the heirs of the old powers revert to a simpler form, there is no guarantee that the families or dynasties taking over their roles will support cooperation based on the principles outlined in the UN Charter.

It is important to note that humans could be practicing utilitarianism by being protected through aggressive and illegal policing tactics,

⁸⁶ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Edwin_Chadwick

⁸⁷ Marjrie Bloy, "Edwin Chadwick (1800–1890)," The Victorian Web.

while also adhering to the principles of self-determination that have guided utilitarianism since 1945.

In other words, the United States is a country that is practicing utilitarianism without imprisoning or killing any person who expresses an opinion that challenges the sole right of the families/dynasties who hold the monopoly on violence in this country to any role of political leadership, moral authority, social privilege, and control of property. In Egypt, that is not the same case. In Egypt, the people cooperate based on right and wrong actions, but any person who challenges the sole right of the families/dynasties who hold the monopoly on violence in the country to any role of political leadership, moral authority, social privilege, and control of property is imprisoned or killed.

Therefore, we cannot assert that the type of utilitarianism adopted by the Egyptian government, Russians, Saudis, Chinese, Turks, and others will help mankind achieve the goals outlined in the UN charter; however, the type pursued by the United States has a better chance of enabling mankind to do so. It is crucial that the stability of the heirs of the old powers, including the stability and strength of the United States — which acts as the global policeman of the international postwar order— remain intact. This is because if the values that the United States stands for and promotes collapse, mankind would slip backward and could start to cooperate based on the political and social status that exists in Lebanon (total utilitarian chaos) or the one that exists in Egypt (total utilitarian authoritarianism) if the heirs of the old powers choose to abandon the idea of self-determination and prefer that people go back to cooperating based on domination or colonialism. This also means that since we cannot say that the type of utilitarianism that the Egyptian government, Russians, Saudis, Chinese, Turks, etc. are adopting is “noble” no matter how noble its end is, this signifies that if insecurity continues to diminish around the world, the harder mankind would be making it on him to preserve the idea of self-determination without protecting such an idea through aggressive and illegal policing tactics.

The more nations resort to aggressive and illegal policing tactics to preserve the idea of utilitarianism, the more nations would be slipping into practicing authoritarianism or domination.

When nations practice authoritarianism to achieve utilitarian goals, governments would not be able to maintain the peace and apprehend criminals without undermining the credibility of the equality and diversity agenda. In other words, governments would not be able to make the working class perceive that the repressive actions that the government is taking are to elevate the common good. When governments preach about building fairer and more equal societies but practice the reverse, citizens can withdraw their obligation to obey. When citizens withdraw their obligation to obey, their demand for the government to secure or satisfy their best interests increases. When governments fail to satisfy the best interests of their citizens, they can stay in power only through aggressive and illegal policing tactics. As governments increasingly rely on aggressive and illegal policing tactics to maintain power or suppress factionalism and civil unrest, the social and political order becomes more dynamic, leading citizens to favor changing their leadership in order to restore balance.

Hence, as I said before, the idea of policing or military could have been developed by the families/dynasties who hold the monopoly on violence in any country to maintain the class system (i.e., deny people from the lower class any right to any role of political leadership, moral authority, social privilege, and control of property) and not necessarily to build fairer and more equal societies. There is a good chance that the citizens who perceive that their leadership is an extension of the authority of an absolutist state, those citizens who perceive that their leaders are persecuting unfairly, are in favor of not remaining faithful to their hierarchy. This is very serious and worrisome because when humans perceive that their leaders are advocating ideas that they believe are unethical, they are ready to suffer death and persecution for advocating what they believe in. This is again very serious and worrisome because when a leader becomes prey to any of his closest subordinates, friends, associates, family members, etc., that leader stops procuring abundance, but early death.

This means that leaders must be able to tell if their subordinates see their actions as a threat to their beliefs or an opportunity. Some leaders manage to determine if their closest subordinate or their citizens are perceiving them as a threat or not.

In history books, we read about all kinds of cases in which individuals or groups of people revolted against a leader because those dependents felt that their leader was advocating ideas that did not take into account the interests of the majority but the interests of their leader only.

The heirs of the old powers could employ two methods to ensure they were protected from resizing. The first method is to adopt a strategy where the families or dynasties that hold a monopoly on violence in the country remain invisible or silent, and the second method is to ensure that these families or dynasties maintain supreme autocratic authority over the day-to-day operations of their controlled domains.

For example, Egypt is a country where no families or dynasties hold a monopoly on violence over its territory. In Egypt, the president is not a member of the "noble" or "aristocrat" class, which is typically the case for heads of state in other countries. Since Egypt gained its independence, the head of state has consistently been an individual from the military complex. No one knows which families or dynasties approve the elevation of the military leader to head of state in Egypt. As of the date when Egypt obtained its independence, whenever citizens perceived that the government was failing to satisfy their best interests, they manifested their anger by assassinating the head of the state or by forcing him to step down from his role instead of taking up their anger against the families/dynasties who hold a monopoly on violence in the country.

The public elected a head of state for Egypt only one time. Then, shortly after this civilian head of state began to officially carry out his functions, the military complex in Egypt ousted him, and a person from the military institution began playing this executive role. The reason for the military complex in Egypt's interference and removal of the elected head of state remains unknown. Only one motive could have prompted this outcome: the elected head of state and his supporters may have sought to diminish the power of the families or dynasties that monopolize violence in the country.

This strategy of choosing a head of state to be the victim or the one who shall be sacrificed whenever the people in any society begin to

perceive that their leaders are advocating ideas that do not take into account the interests of the majority is a creative way to protect the families/dynasties who hold a monopoly on violence in this country because they remain out of harm's way.

In fact, many western European countries and other nations around the world also employ this strategy used by the families/dynasties who hold a monopoly on violence in Egypt. For example, the families/dynasties who hold a monopoly on violence in western Europe do not select a person from the military complex to use as a "scapegoat" for wrongdoing, mistakes, faults, etc., but use a civilian person. In western Europe, all the countries that form part of this bloc are organized as a constituted monarchy or on the basis of an elected form of government. Likewise, whenever citizens perceive that their nominated leaders are failing to satisfy their best interests, they manifest their anger by forcing those designated leaders (with their government) to step down instead of taking up their anger against the families/dynasties who hold a monopoly on violence in those countries.

It is evident that a person gains significant advantages when they transfer their power to another individual or an elected body. When citizens begin to perceive that the individuals nominated for executive roles are advocating ideas that do not consider the interests of the majority, this strategy allows for the replacement of those individuals or the elected body with a simpler alternative, rather than addressing the true families or dynasties that hold a monopoly on violence in any country.

This defense strategy, which involves blaming an individual or a constituted body for wrongdoing, mistakes, and faults, does not produce the same results as when the families or dynasties with a monopoly on violence in the country exercise supreme autocratic authority over the day-to-day operations of their domain. For example, if the citizens in Saudi Arabia, Oman, Kuwait, UAE, etc. conclude that the ruling families/dynasties who hold a monopoly on violence in those countries do not satisfy their best interests and decide to withdraw their obligation to obey, their violence would be directed at the members of those families/dynasties directly.

To begin with, I have no way of knowing who the heirs of the old powers are. Second, I have no way of knowing if those powerful families/dynasties involved are maintaining their strength and stability through elevating a person to be a “scapegoat” for wrongdoing, mistakes, faults, etc., as in the case when people force a leader or a government to step down. Alternatively, they may be exercising supreme autocratic authority over the day-to-day operations of the international postwar order, similar to how the ruling families in Saudi Arabia, Oman, Kuwait, and the UAE do.

The first person who lived did not know that death was awaiting him. The second person learned this truth after witnessing the first person's death.

It is not important to know which method the heirs of the old powers are employing to ensure the maintenance of their strength and stability, because we know the specific outcome that awaits their wealth or power irrespective of which way they conduct themselves. The first is that the heirs of those powerful families/dynasties would carry forward the power or authority that they possess presently. The second is if new families/dynasties involved start to transform conditions and outcomes that their members deeply care about despite the resistance of others.

If so, I suggest that we pick several scenarios that we know could await the heirs of the old powers if they continue to be in favor of wanting the maintenance of the international postwar order to be safeguarded by the work program of the United Nations instead of the work program that the founding fathers of the UN proposed.

As of 1945, the United Nations failed to prevent wars between nations. This signifies that if the families and dynasties that won World War II (i.e., those that control the global money supply) continue to allow the United Nations to provide solutions for managing the international postwar order, we can expect world affairs to change based on one of the scenarios outlined below. The first is the outcome that the American Revolutionary War (1775-1783) produced, and the second is the outcome of the Egyptian Revolution (2011-2014).

In those two revolutions (i.e., the American and the Egyptian), the citizen of those two countries revolted against their leaders to make them adopt policies that satisfy their best interests. The two revolutions produced two different outcomes. In the case of the American Revolution, the outcome was very successful from 1776 to 1945. In the case of the Egyptian revolution, the outcome has remained disastrous since 2014. As of 2014, the Egyptians have not made any progress whatsoever to cooperate in accordance with the work program suggested in the UN Charter or the UDHR, which has contributed to ongoing political instability and social unrest in the country, including widespread protests and a lack of democratic governance.

Given the absence of enough data to permit providing any comment on the outcome of the Egyptian revolution, I will analyze only how the American Revolutionary War behaved, which is what we care about the most here, especially since it was a successful experience.

During the American Revolutionary War (1775-1783), the working class (or citizens) in the United States challenged the families and dynasties that monopolized violence in this country. The revolution ended right when the families/dynasties who were holding a monopoly on violence in the United States agreed to relinquish control to the voting public of the political regime.

The word "independence" is defined as a condition in which a person does not require others for one's opinions or for guidance in conduct.⁸⁸ But this doesn't mean that people can do as they please right after a nation becomes independent. In most countries, 18th birthdays are often celebrated as the start of legal adulthood. Turning 18 does not mean that a young adult could start to do what he (she) wants. Normally, it is the wealth of the parents of the 18-year-old or the physical power of such a young adult that determines what degree of power or threat an individual at this age can wield.

In real life, 18-year-olds usually wield little power. The nations who do not possess military or economic strength wield power equivalent

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

to what 18-year-olds wield upon reaching their 18th birthdays. Similarly, when ranking two nations to determine which is the mightiest, the nation that commands the seas is regarded as the strongest.

From 1776 to 1939, the United States was not controlling the seas, but Great Britain was regarded to have managed to achieve this status.⁸⁹ And so, we could say that what the families/dynasties who were holding a monopoly on violence were relinquishing in the territory that became known as the United States of America post-1776 was not wealth, prestige, or power, but rather the responsibility of administering those people who revolted against them directly. In other words, the powerful families/dynasties relinquished their daily management of the political and economic situation of the territory that became known as the United States of America post-1776.

Furthermore, we could say that the families and dynasties who relinquished their day-to-day roles in administering the people living in the territory that became known as the United States of America post-1776 did not lose anything by allowing new families and dynasties to assume this role; instead, they actually gained.

A successful business is not measured by the size of its workforce, but by the profit it generates with the smallest number of employees.

If Great Britain was administering the United States until 1776, and if Great Britain was commanding the seas before 1776 and for most of the period between the 18th and the early 20th centuries, then those families/dynasties who were holding a monopoly on violence over Great Britain had to have been the same families/dynasties who were also holding control or power over the new families/dynasties who began to hold a monopoly on violence in the United States post-1776.

Furthermore, if we compare how Great Britain and other western powers decided to control or regulate China in the aftermath of the Opium Wars, i.e., through controlling ports and being granted favorable tariffs, trade concessions, and other concessions,⁹⁰ we could

⁸⁹ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Command_of_the_sea

⁹⁰ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Opium_Wars

say that the controlling (or administering) strategies that Great Britain imposed on China starting from when the Opium Wars ended in the middle of the 19th century onward could have been the same controlling strategies that Great Britain imposed on the United States in the aftermath of the American Revolutionary War, which was fought a century earlier, or in the 18th century onward as well. This conjecture about how Great Britain controlled the United States from 1776 to 1945 could be valid, as the methods Great Britain used to control China provide a logical explanation for why it might have been willing to allow other families or dynasties to take over the territory in North America that became known as the United States of America after 1776.

In other words, Great Britain was able to control (or administer) the United States from 1776 to 1945 without facing significant threats, unlike the situation in China following the Opium Wars, primarily because the British operated with a low profile. First, the American Revolutionary War took place a century prior to the Opium Wars, resulting in a more regulated awareness among the people. Second, the readiness of the families/dynasties who ruled the United States post-1776 to immediately reestablish relations with Great Britain and the unwillingness of the political leaders who ruled the United States to compete against Great Britain from 1776 to 1945, i.e., annex Canada or gain overseas holdings that Great Britain controlled, all point to one conclusion. This conclusion is that the families/dynasties who controlled Great Britain before 1776 and the United States post-1776 must also be the same ones who controlled China from the 18th to the early 20th centuries. Furthermore, we could argue that, due to the lack of significant goal overlap between Great Britain, the United States, and China from 1776 to 1945, the families/dynasties controlling these three countries were identical. In other words, the harmonization efforts of the families and dynasties controlling all three countries helped prevent conflicts from igniting.

If we look at how the wealth or power of the families/dynasties who chose to hold a monopoly on violence over the seas rather than land evolved for most of the period between the 18th and the early 20th centuries, we find that this strategy turned out to be very successful for them. This type of harmonization prevented overlapping goals and the

ignition of conflict between the different nations. This strategy also permitted avoiding conflict between Great Britain, which was commanding the ocean, and the rest of the existing nations.

The cleverness of this strategy lies in its ability to create a more balanced and less dynamic international order. On the planet Earth, the land surface area covers only 30% of the total area. The remaining 70% is occupied by the ocean.⁹¹ The adoption of a strategy that freed 70% of the planet from human competition for control allowed rivalries to be limited to only 30% of the planet's area.

In other words, the families and dynasties that controlled the world through their dominance over the ocean adopted a strategy that allowed the day-to-day operations of various nations to be managed by different families and dynasties on land, thereby maintaining control over the international order. First, the different families/dynasties who held a monopoly on violence in the different nations (i.e., on land) were not competing against the families/dynasties that controlled the international order (by virtue of controlling the ocean). This arrangement helped those families/dynasties who controlled the international order to maintain their strength and stability by holding supreme autocratic authority from 1776 to 1945.

Second, there is no better example to support how this strategy enabled the families/dynasties who controlled the international order to maintain their strength and stability than to exemplify it through this idea that man invented to let the power of the government be vested in an elected body and not in specific families/dynasties playing this controlling or administrative role.

This idea enabled the families/dynasties who controlled the international order from 1776 to 1945 to continue to maintain their strength and stability without the citizens who became dissatisfied with the performance of their government taking up their anger against those powerful families/dynasties but the constitutional body.

In other words, this strategy's adaptation allowed dissatisfied citizens to revert not to the family/dynasties that controlled the international

⁹¹ <https://www.oceanicinstitute.org/aboutoceans/aquafacts.html>

order but to the constitutional body they held responsible for the government's failure to secure their best interests. In other words, the international order, along with the families/dynasties that controlled it, remained protected and out of danger.

In simple terms, the families and dynasties that controlled the international order maintained their power and stability primarily by regulating a country's import and export activities. In other words, they were only controlling maritime activities. Those families and dynasties were also influencing the power of any nation by exercising control over the ocean rather than over humans. Furthermore, the families/dynasties who were controlling or administering the international order were not establishing the control of the international from a large country but from an island (i.e., Great Britain). Most importantly, those families/dynasties were not controlling the international order or maintaining their strength and stability through employing international organizations such as the United Nations, World Bank, IMF, etc., but they were doing it with their own hands. In other words, we cannot say that the international order became unstable because those families/dynasties had any role to play. As I said before, those families/dynasties were controlling the ocean.

Indeed, this strategy that I believe the families/dynasties adopted from 1776 up to the events of WW1 or WW2, whereby they made the United States in charge of the western continent and Great Britain and other powers with them in charge of the eastern continent, but with Great Britain controlling the ocean alone, allowed them to maintain their strength and stability and, most importantly, keep the international order stabilized. As I said before, I believe this strategy worked because those powerful families/dynasties allowed only one country to command the ocean (i.e., Great Britain).

A schism is defined as a division between people, usually belonging to an organization, movement, or religious denomination.⁹² The word is “most frequently applied to a split in what had previously been a single religious body, such as the East-West Schism or the Great Western

⁹² <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Schism>

Schism.” However, the term is also used to describe broader splits, such as those that occur between brothers, friends, partners, and lovers.

No one knows what prompted WW1 or WW2. If we are to consider that Kaiser Wilhelm II⁹³ (1859-1941), German Emperor, happened to be Queen’ Victoria’s⁹⁴ (1819 – 1901) grandson, queen of the United Kingdom, and the first cousin of Britain’s George V⁹⁵ (1865–1936), king of the United Kingdom, we could say that perhaps what triggered WW1 or WW2 was a schism, which had developed during the preceding decades/centuries in the family in the same way the schism that occurred in the 11th century between Eastern and Western Christianity.⁹⁶

Irrespective of what prompted the schism between the ‘Saxe-Coburg-Gotha’ and the ‘Windsor’ family, we do know that WW1 and WW2 were two attempts in which there were two or more families/dynasties who were rivaling each other to determine who would command the seas (or the intentional order). However, since we know that Great Britain was involved in both wars and was declared the victor in each, it follows that the families or dynasties controlling Great Britain are likely the same ones that have maintained control over the seas (i.e., the international order) to this day.

We could also say that because a number of the old powers, such as France, the Netherlands, Sweden, Norway, Denmark, Spain, and Belgium, were not resized by Great Britain (or the families/dynasties that control Great Britain) and/or prompted to confront the same regime change that many countries around the world confronted from 1945 to now, the families/dynasties that control those western European countries and the families/dynasties that control Great Britain are part of the same society or club.

If, understandably, the heirs of those families/dynasties who hold a monopoly on the international order (by controlling the ocean) are supposedly dedicated to doing what their predecessors were

⁹³ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wilhelm_II,_German_Emperor

⁹⁴ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Queen_Victoria

⁹⁵ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/George_V

⁹⁶ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/East%E2%80%93West_Schism

concentrated on doing pre-WW2, i.e., controlling the flow of money, goods, etc., between nations, we could say that this rise in intolerance that emerged post-1945 is unrelated to those traditional families/dynasties who command the seas. In other words, the policies causing intolerance among people in most nations are not the result of actions taken by those traditional families or dynasties. Those families control financial trading posts located in New York, Tokyo, and other major cities, and they are likely involved in all critical mega-projects such as the Panama Canal, Suez Canal, space programs, genome editing, and advanced weapon programs. Most likely, the countries based in western Europe finance a significant portion of all the critical communication and transportation projects pursued by people worldwide or act as investors.

Therefore, it would be illogical to assume that the heirs of the families and dynasties controlling the international order would favor conquest, wars, or similar actions; instead, they would likely support the spread of technology and commerce, particularly the development of democratic institutions, because their wealth increases only when global trade flourishes and the rule of law is upheld. Accordingly, we could say that the abnormal rise in intolerance that emerged in the world after 1945 is due to two main motives:

The first question is if this abnormal rise in intolerance is primarily caused by the families/dynasties that have monopolized violence in each nation, stopping their efforts to prepare their dependent people to surrender freedom for the benefit of their political order. The second is if there is a rule (a bug) that people paid little attention to before WW2, and post-WW2, its drawback is preventing people from surrendering freedom to obtain the benefit of the political order that is in vigor in the different societies, let alone the benefit of the new postwar international order. In other words, even the five permanent members of the UN Security Council, who represent the heirs of the old powers, are incapable of stopping the drawback of this rule.

There is only one rule that makes people unprepared: to practice tolerance and to be bound by their personal power and conscience. This rule could only be attributed to people beginning to legitimize moral authority contrary to what the founding fathers of the UN

counseled the heirs of the old powers to remain faithful to post-WW2 to maintain their strength and stability. The founding fathers of the UN (the fathers of the heirs of the old powers) did not require that people legitimize or profess specific religious or philosophical values but rather respect the free will of every single person. The only value that the founding fathers of the UN asked people to profess is the practice of tolerance as a tool to arrive at being capable of cooperating in the economic field in accordance with the “principles” of equal rights.

If we compare the work program that the founding fathers of the UN counseled the heirs of the old powers to remain faithful to post-WW2 in order to maintain their strength and stability and the work program that those families adopted or allowed the UN member states and the UN to adhere to, we discover there is one rule that was violated.

Post-1945, the entire world population, excluding the heirs of the old powers and the families/dynasties who control the different UN member states on land, began to prepare each other not to observe the work program that the founding fathers of the UN counselled everyone to adhere to as specified in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, but rather to end poverty and injustice on earth in all its forms. In other words, there are 7.6 billion people who are all presently squeezed on 30% of the surface of our planet, cooperating not specifically to secure the standards suggested in the UN Charter or the UDHR, but to end poverty on earth in all its forms and to guarantee equal justice.

In fact, if we compare all the policies that the United Nations (WB, IMF, NATO, and others) began preaching since 1945 and all the civil unrests or civil wars that emerged in the world since 1945, we observe that they were mostly about securing the teaching that the UN was emphasizing (i.e., human rights).

The law of comparative advantage describes how, under free trade, an agent will produce more of and consume less of a good for which they have a comparative advantage.⁹⁷ As I said before, up until 1945, the families/dynasties who were controlling the international order adopted policies that did not support a balanced development. Those

⁹⁷ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Comparative_advantage

powerful families and dynasties granted development rights to the United States, but they denied similar rights to the other countries in the western hemisphere. This strategy enabled those powerful families/dynasties to transform many countries around the world into raw material suppliers (e.g., Latin American and African countries) while allowing specific countries (e.g., the United States and Japan) to become industrialized.

Regrettably, the adaptation of the same unbalanced development strategy, based on the premise that those powerful families/dynasties chose to maintain their strength and stability after 1945, has backfired this time. People living in both poor nations and developed countries like the United States, Germany, Great Britain, France, Russia, Japan, Australia, and South Korea are demanding equal justice and the fair sharing of all created resources.

Likewise, even reliance on the manipulation of conflict between religious, ethnic, and racial identities is also dying out as people's awareness is growing. The classic "divide and rule" strategy is no longer working out in countries where the awareness of its people grew, such as in Lebanon, Iraq, Syria, or Venezuela, as citizens increasingly recognize and reject external manipulation in favor of unity and collective action for their rights. In recent years, we have observed that nations with a higher awareness among their people have united against the United States, viewing its interventions as those of an occupying power rather than a creator of peace.

Indeed, while the aspirations of the heirs of the old powers to have the United Nations (WB, IMF, NATO, and others) improve human rights are noble, it is naïve to assume that these powerful families and dynasties are unaware that life includes both reversible and irreversible outcomes. In other words, those powerful families and dynasties understand that the likelihood of achieving desirable goals through unethical means is low. Otherwise, those families would not use the idea of good to change the conditions and outcomes that matter to them.

Furthermore, since we must assume that granting the UN the right to operate economically and enforce policies while its officials enjoy

privileges and immunities would produce either noble causes or make people surrender freedom to the legitimized political order, one of two scenarios is true: The first is if the heirs of the old powers really believe that they could manage in partnership with the United Nations to create a common political authority for all humanity, which they would rule over. The second is if the powerful families/dynasties involved let the UN preach to people to stop being satisfied with the hand that they were dealt and to be devoted to eradicating poverty and injustice in all its forms so the poor could bury them in the grave that this organization is digging for them.

Humans were not granted the right to predict the future. No one knows if the actions taken by the United Nations (including the World Bank, IMF, NATO, and others) will achieve the noble goals outlined in the UN charter or simply serve to resize the heirs of the old powers. However, what we know is that those powerful families/dynasties do not live at sea but on land.

No one can claim that the UN's actions are making the world a safer place to live since it has become an economic operator, with its officials determining and enforcing policies while enjoying privileges and immunities, which raises concerns about accountability and effectiveness in addressing global issues. Many clergymen who devote their lives to God and their neighbors are unfaithful to their mission and succumb to temptation.

In 2017 Pope Francis proposed that the wording of the Lord's Prayer be changed so that it blames the Devil, rather than God, for "leading us into temptation".⁹⁸ Since the heirs of the old powers are the ones who granted the right to the United Nations to define goals that aim at making people stop being tolerant to become dedicated to ending poverty or injustice in the world in all its forms, including fixing dates on when mankind should attain such goals, then we can say that those powerful families/dynasties are the ones who are leading mankind into temptations. Furthermore, we can say that the more funds the heirs of the old powers inject to make the UN attain the goals that they want this organization to fix on their behalf, the faster the people who the

⁹⁸ <https://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/2017/12/13/dont-argue-devil-much-intelligent-us-says-pope-francis/>

UN is teaching to be bound by their personal power and conscience to share on equal rights outcomes would be resizing them.

In other words, if the heirs of the old powers are financing the UN to help them end poverty or injustice in the world in all its forms by 2030, this means that what those powerful families/dynasties are hoping to see change in 2030 is that on the anniversary of this future date it would no longer be them who would be able to transform the conditions and outcomes that matter to them, but 7.6 billion other people would. This is very serious and worrisome, as we don't know if all humans want to live in a world free of poverty or injustice. Second, we do know that if it were possible to distribute natural and created things on an equal basis, our predecessors would have converted the world into a better place for us to live in already and spared us from all the insecurity that we are knowing to get there.

Since the heirs of the old powers (the families/dynasties who won WW2 or the families/dynasties who control the money supply of the world) see differently (i.e., they think that they could let the UN preach to people about the importance of militarizing to end poverty and injustice and still maintain their strength and stability), this signifies that they must believe that if the world's insecurity continues to diminish, their authority or power to transform the conditions and outcomes that matter to them would not be affected.

I cannot determine whether the heirs of the old powers can maintain their strength and stability if the world remains as insecure as it currently seems, or if the insecurity that many people are experiencing is merely a temporary phase that will eventually pass, much like rainstorms.

Earlier, I stated that understanding the evolution of global peace and security is unimportant as long as the wealth and power of the heirs of the old powers remain stable. This is because we know that the heirs of the old powers are being exploited to achieve noble causes, such as promoting social justice and economic development in underprivileged areas. In other words, the heirs of the old powers are not working to increase evil in the world but good. If those powerful families/dynasties were programmed to increase evil in the world, they

would have opposed granting independence to poor people (or poor nations) and would have continued domination or colonialism after 1945, as before.

Therefore, since the heirs of the old powers could not have aspired to transform the international postwar world order after 1945 into one that becomes chaotic (as seen in Lebanon since 1975) or authoritarian (as observed in Egypt since 2014), this indicates that over time, the remaining 181 UN member states should begin to exhibit either of these patterns more clearly if global peace and security continue to decline. In other words, the international community recognizes that the political systems in Russia, China, Nigeria, Ethiopia, Saudi Arabia, and Brazil are authoritarian, but this categorization is not very apparent when it comes to other countries such as the United States, Great Britain, Norway, Germany, France, Argentina, Japan, etc. Over time, the categorization of all UN member states will become clearer.

Readers should remember that the prevailing disregard for human rights that most people are observing has risen in recent years and is not new to the international order. In other words, a decline in peace and security across all nations will not impact the strength and stability of numerous families and dynasties that maintain a monopoly on violence within their home states.

The families/dynasties who hold a monopoly on violence in powerful (or wealthy) nations such as Great Britain, Norway, Sweden, Japan, Spain, Belgium, etc. are heirs of extant monarchies that have existed for a few hundred years now. Those extant monarchies encountered lots of difficulty throughout the course of their existence, including challenges such as political upheaval, economic crises, and shifts in public sentiment that threatened their authority and relevance. The survival of existing monarchies may be due to their integration with religious patrons. In other words, they are monarchs whose fortunes or powers are blended with the powers (or wealth) of the religious doctrines that they act as patrons of. That is to say, resizing those extant monarchs is very difficult because their wealth and power are so vast that the likelihood of them losing control over governance and patronage is negligible. The only way to resize those extant monarchs and to revert them to a simpler form is if the religious doctrines that

they act as patrons for are resized or if the people who control the different religious doctrines lift their protection.

To provide an example, the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia was established in 1932.⁹⁹ Throughout the period, covering from the fall of the Umayyad Empire in 750 CE to the start of the 20th century, the Arabian Peninsula (or where Saudi Arabia's territorial sovereignty is internationally recognized presently) was under the rule of a large number of petty tribal rulers.¹⁰⁰ In other words, the Al Saud (the Saudi royal family) were a minor tribe in the Arabian Peninsula. Historians suggest that between 1902 and 1927, the Al Saud leader, Abdulaziz, carried out a series of wars of conquest in the Arabian Peninsula, which resulted in his establishing the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia in 1932.¹⁰¹

Historians also suggest that the rise of the Al Saud family (the rulers of Saudi Arabia) to power was charted based on a religio-political pact with the Al ash-Sheikh family, which is a leading religious family whose members are descendants of Muhammad ibn Abdul Wahhab, the founder of the Wahhabi Sunni sect of Islam, which is today dominant in Saudi Arabia.¹⁰² The arrangement, which persists to this day, is based on the Al Saud maintaining the Al ash-Sheikh's authority in religious matters and the Al ash-Sheikh supporting the Al Saud's political authority.¹⁰³

As can be seen, the alliance and power-sharing arrangement that began at the start of the 20th century between the Al ash-Sheikh and the Al Saud and which continues to the present day in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia could also be the same arrangement between the families/dynasties that hold a monopoly on violence in powerful (or wealthy) nations such as Great Britain, Norway, Sweden, Japan, Spain, Belgium, and different individuals (or groups) who control the different Christian religious sects that exist in Western Europe. The

⁹⁹ <https://www.britannica.com/place/Saudi-Arabia/The-Kingdom-of-Saudi-Arabia>

¹⁰⁰

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/History_of_Saudi_Arabia#Umayyad_and_Abbasid_periods

¹⁰¹ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/History_of_Saudi_Arabia

¹⁰² https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Muhammad_ibn_Abd_al-Wahhab

¹⁰³ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Al_ash-Sheikh

only difference is that in the case of those extant monarchs, this power-sharing arrangement started a few hundred years before.

Moreover, since the Al ash-Sheikh and the Al Saud's religio-political pact generates their wealth from the vast oil deposits that exist in modern-day Saudi Arabia and the pilgrimage money that this country collects, the King of Saudi Arabia acts as the custodian of the Two Holy Mosques located in Mecca and Medina.¹⁰⁴ If more nations begin to switch to clean energy, Saudi Arabia will lose the wealth that this country is accruing from oil. However, Saudi Arabia would not lose the wealth that the two families (the Al Saud and the Al ash-Sheikh) would be earning from the Two Holy Mosques, because those two sites are regarded as upholding the highest spiritual significance for Muslims worldwide.

Evidently, the ruling families of Saudi Arabia would not be able to maintain their power by keeping the monarchy as an absolute institution indefinitely. As more and more nations transition to clean energy and people's religiosity continues to decline, the power of the families/dynasties monopolizing violence in Saudi Arabia will likewise diminish. In other words, when the wealth that the ruling families of Saudi Arabia rely on to maintain control over governance and patronage decreases, Saudi Arabia will eventually need to transition to a constitutional monarchy, similar to some of the existing monarchies in Western Europe today.

As shown in the above example, for as long as the families/dynasties who control the monarch of Saudi Arabia continue to act as custodians of the Two Holy Mosques, the power of those families/dynasties who are playing this custodianship role will not diminish. The only way to resize the families/dynasties who hold a monopoly on violence in Saudi Arabia would be if Islam were abolished or new families/dynasties resized those existing families/dynasties in the same way the Al Saud and the Al ash-Sheikh families/dynasties resized the Hashemite families/dynasties who were acting as custodians of those two holy mosques until 1932.¹⁰⁵

¹⁰⁴ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Salman_of_Saudi_Arabia

¹⁰⁵ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Hussein_bin_Ali,_Sharif_of_Mecca

If this aforementioned analogy on what the families/dynasties who control the monarch of Saudi Arabia must see not to happen so they could convert their petty monarchy into an extant monarchy could be a way that depicts how some of the monarchies in Western Europe managed to survive for so long, we can then say that the families/dynasties who won WW2 or the families/dynasties who control the money supply of the world must be a powerhouse that controls all the different religio-political pacts that exist or an order that is made up of the different families/dynasties that control the different extant monarchies/religious doctrines.

Then again, hence, religion is an idea that endeavors to ensure that the moral regeneration of society is always strong; this means that it does not matter if there exists a powerhouse that controls the international postwar order or if the heirs of the old powers, whose power I said could be grafted into the different religious doctrines that exist, because the aspirations of both are embodied in the idea of good.

Moreover, if we take all the religions that exist, such as Islam, Christianity, Judaism, Hinduism, Buddhism, Taoism, etc., we observe that all those religions preach or teach the same principles. The difference is not embedded in what each religion teaches, but rather in how the custodians of each religion interpret the idea of God or good to serve their best interests.

For example, during the reign of the Umayyad¹⁰⁶ Caliph Muawiyah I¹⁰⁷ (661–680), Mecca in Saudi Arabia was the abode of poets and musicians, despite being a city that is considered in Islam to contain holy sites. Likewise, Medina eclipsed Mecca in importance for much of the Umayyad period, as it was home to the new Muslim aristocracy.¹⁰⁸

There is a big difference between the way the families/dynasties who hold a monopoly on violence in Saudi Arabia are serving to transform

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

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

¹⁰⁸

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/History_of_Saudi_Arabia#Umayyad_and_Abbasid_periods

the conditions and outcomes that matter to them since 1932 and the way the families/dynasties who were living during the Umayyad Caliphate were doing it, particularly in terms of their political strategies, social structures, and economic policies, as the former have focused on modern state-building and global economic integration while the latter were primarily concerned with territorial expansion and religious consolidation. Indeed, a significant distinction exists between the methods employed by the families/dynasties controlling violence in Saudi Arabia and those in Turkey. Turkey and Saudi Arabia are two countries that proclaim Islam as a faith. In Turkey, people can go to movie theaters, bars, nightclubs, etc. Saudi Arabia prohibits the use of movie theaters, bars, and nightclubs. In fact, the leaders of Saudi Arabia prohibit a man from talking to a woman in public unless the two are husband and wife or related.

Evidently, the families and dynasties that monopolize violence in Saudi Arabia do not represent values that benefit those who established this monarchy, as they observe stricter Islamic and traditional norms. Since establishing the Saudi monarchy in 1932, the families/dynasties ruling Saudi Arabia have not been compared to the Rashidun Caliphs, neither in political behavior nor in military expansion.

The decision by the Al Saud and Al ash-Sheikh families to dismantle the centuries-old cosmopolitan society in the Arabian Peninsula and replace it with a new compulsory Wahhabi culture raises significant questions regarding Saudi Arabia's 2017 announcement to build a new city in the Tabuk Province (i.e., Neom)¹⁰⁹, which would incorporate smart city technologies and serve as a tourist destination.

The announcement from Saudi Arabia regarding Neom, a new city that would operate independently from the existing government framework with its own tax and labor laws and an autonomous judicial system, raises questions about how a country that claims its social order is based on the Wahhabi Sunni sect of Islam can permit the operation of nightclubs, bars, movie theaters, prostitution, alcohol, and similar establishments on its soil.

¹⁰⁹ <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Neom>

Throughout history, all families and dynasties that revolted or waged wars against their leaders or dictators did so with aspirations that extended beyond merely forcing their leaders out to control the concept of good and play their roles in society. The families/dynasties that held a monopoly on violence within any country used their power to size up their neighbors, especially when the revolt was motivated to achieve religio-political aspirations they subscribed to or believed in.

For example, during the medieval period (1096 – 1271), the Latin Church directed a series of religious wars that were initiated and supported to recover the Holy Land from Islamic rule. Those wars were known by crusade.¹¹⁰

When we compare the families and dynasties fighting to maintain a monopoly on violence in the region now known as the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, we observe that their methods were similar to those of the Latin Church from 1096 to 1271 in winning the series of wars it directed.

The families/dynasties who were holding a monopoly on violence in Saudi Arabia rose to power by adopting religious wars that they were launching against other tribes in the Arabian Peninsula (or the Ottoman Empire) through the support of a Wahhabist Bedouin tribal army known as Ikhwan. For one reason or another, those families/dynasties who were leading the revolt to control the territory that is now known as Saudi Arabia shifted their religio-political expansion aspirations after they managed to hold a monopoly on violence over the territory that they still control to this day.

Strangely, the religio-political military expansion aspirations of the families and dynasties that sought to control the Arabian Peninsula diminished after they stripped the tribes inhabiting the territory now known as Saudi Arabia of their power, leading to a deterioration in their relationship with the Wahhabist Bedouin tribal military units (Ikhwan). In other words, the relation between the families/dynasties who were regarded as the administrators of the revolt and the Wahhabist Bedouin tribal military units (Ikhwan) did not stay strong as was the case between the families/dynasties who were ruling after

¹¹⁰ <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Crusades>

the death of Muhammad and the army that they were controlling, giving rise to one of the most successful religio-political military expansions in the history of Islam afterwards, i.e., the Umayyad and Abbasid Empires.¹¹¹ For one reason or another, the families/dynasties who were at the start of the 20th century administering the revolts/wars to strip the local rulers of any power in the Arabian Peninsula split with the Wahhabist Bedouin tribal military units (Ikhwan) who were instrumental in their rise to power, and massacred them.

Some historians view the wars waged by the Latin Church during the medieval period as tools that would assist the families and dynasties controlling the church in gaining political and territorial advantages.

Since the UN was founded in 1945 and made territorial expansion illegal, it is likely that the families/dynasties that fought against the Ottoman Empire and the other tribes in the Arabian Peninsula were meant to make it easier for international families/dynasties to explore the vast oil fields without local interference.

We would never know if the wealthy international families/dynasties that explored the oil reserve in Saudi Arabia post-1932 (i.e., the Western European companies) employed local families/dynasties from 1900 to 1932 to help them force the eviction of the tribes that were occupying plots of land in modern-day Saudi Arabia to make it much easier for them to extract the vast oil reserve that exists on the Arabian Peninsula. At the start of the 20th century, people's awareness of or access to communication technology was not as advanced as is the case now. The advances that scientists and engineers made in communication and transportation technology changed tremendously, and it is difficult now for any person (or nation) to keep actions or information confidential. This implies that the Saudi Arabian government and its international partners investing in the Neom project will struggle to conceal their efforts to force certain individuals or tribes from their homes against their will.

¹¹¹ <https://courses.lumenlearning.com/boundless-worldhistory/chapter/the-umayyad-and-abbasid-empires/>

It is improbable that everyone who must leave the large area where the Neom project would be built will be ready to go. Some would be forced to do it against their will.

The decision by the families and dynasties that currently hold a monopoly on violence in Saudi Arabia, to the extent that they are willing to evict people from their homes to construct this new city, clearly represents an extension of the ongoing development paradox in which a group of wealthy and powerful individuals sees significant value in transforming an underdeveloped area into a modernized one to drive much-needed business that would enhance their power or wealth. Since the beginning of humanity's pursuit to improve life by utilizing the natural resources available to all living species for greater happiness, all attempts made by mankind have failed to deliver the equitable benefits that the project's authors claim their new ideas would produce. To the contrary, many times, the projects that people are thrust to support or to involuntarily accept do not seem to be aspirations that are intended to strengthen the democratic process necessary to make people be ready to surrender freedom to obtain the benefit of the political order but rather to extend this long tradition of transforming conditions and outcomes that provide benefits to specific individuals rather than elevate the overall common good.

No one knows how humans have concluded that their brains are programmed to use aptitudes for organization and exploration to provide immense benefits primarily to themselves rather than to the natural world, of which the self (or the human body) is an integral part and on which humans depend to stay alive.

Perhaps it is alright to say, "Here are the materials, ideas, and forces at work in our world," and to continue to task newborns to figure out how to navigate through them while ensuring a minimum degree of injury. But at the same time, if people believe that it is necessary to be organized to transform the conditions and outcomes that matter to each one of us, this means that most people are aware that if they do not use their awareness wisely, the ongoing rivalry based on who can monopolize violence against others will backfire, stripping a person of wealth or power. This phenomenon is because rivalry creates winners and losers.

If a person's development mission is to advance despite others' resistance and this mission makes them unable to control violence directed at them, then even if they avoid direct involvement in rivalries to change important conditions or outcomes, the people around them will not spare them. Humans do not achieve their goals or change the conditions that matter to them by directing violence at specific individuals who obstruct their desires; instead, they pursue their aspirations by destroying everything that stands between them and the person they wish to kill or humiliate.

In other words, when two lions fight to determine who is going to lead, they do not kill every animal or destroy every tree in their way before finally meeting so one can kill the other. Humans behave differently than animals. For example, when Great Britain and its allies decided to remove Adolf Hitler from power, those countries that participated in this mission did not just go out and do what the US did when they found where Osama bin Laden was hiding and kill him specifically. Great Britain and its allies turned Germany into rubble before they were able to get to where Adolf Hitler was hiding. This means that even if a person tries to stay neutral, there is no guarantee that the people who are fighting over control would spare him or that he would not become collateral damage.

Therefore, since it would not be possible for a person to avoid being continually peering into the unknown for as long as humans are using the idea of good and evil as a ladder to obtain their way despite the resistance of others instead of to truly improve the common good, this also means that it would not be possible for humans to stop human ingenuity from continually making them confront big challenges for as long as people harness conviction that makes them use this aptitude to look for ways that can enable them to direct the benefit of created things to serve their best interests and not to elevate the common good.

If the innovation that our brain would be bringing would remain mixed, i.e., containing great good and also great harm, this means that familiarity with how the world has been functioning since antiquity cannot be the best preparation for the future. This is because since the date when humans began to depend on the brain to let this aptitude

provide benefits for our societies, all that mankind gained from the knowledge that was accumulated so far is a more profound understanding of how physical things work. But the deeper understanding that was accumulated over the years has had little or the opposite effect on making people ready to change their behavior or conduct to make the world safe or correspond with the pledges that people claim their created things or ideas are serving. In other words, the more knowledge mankind seems to accrue, the more the knowledge that was added seems to be appending or taking the social order on a path that is contrary to what human ingenuity defended or postulated that its project was going to be serving, so mankind put an end to its historical dynamic.

Simply put, the idea to create self-propelled transportation started in the 17th century with Ferdinand Verbiest (1623–1688), a Flemish Jesuit missionary who was living in China during the Qing dynasty.¹¹² The automobiles that we use to help us go from one place to another are a result of the new ideas that each successive generation introduced on top of Verbiest's initial idea. Ferdinand Verbiest's idea from the 17th century demonstrated that the automobile would drive the future. However, from the 17th century to the present, Ferdinand Verbiest's invention has significantly improved mankind's ability to travel quickly, but its impact on increasing social cohesion has been minimal.

We could argue that the invention of the automobile and people's unwillingness to increase social cohesion are two unrelated processes (i.e., not interconnected). In other words, the non-dependence of one should not be the dependence of the other, and vice versa. This argument would have been valid if people (or nations) had maintained relationships based on allowing each society to regulate its own creations according to the resources available within its specific boundaries. It is important to also mention that humans use the created things to threaten each other or to make the weaker surrender to the demands of the strongest, which highlights the potential for technology to exacerbate power imbalances and conflict among societies.

Even if the invention of the automobile and people's unwillingness to increase social cohesion are unrelated, the human decision to delegate

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

the role the human body was created to serve in the natural world to tools and to go against how they were created to function would make it impossible to end this historical dynamic that has been passed down from generation to generation. Put differently, if all that humans do is create things, and all that the created things do to people is distance the human body from being dedicated to serving the natural world in the same way the rest of the living things are doing it with their own hand (body), this means that if humans continue to refuse to listen to each other's appeal to prioritize moral authority, then there is a good chance that the disregard that people express would remain equally on the rise.

In other words, our predecessors, like us, believed that allowing animals to transport them from one place to another would lead to greater happiness; however, history shows that this belief did not benefit the powerful individuals who sought to exploit this idea for control over others. Likewise, when our predecessors realized they could use cars instead of animals for transportation, this change initially benefited those who sought to exploit this idea for control over others, but its effects did not last long. As history shows, many individuals (or nations) are capable of producing automobiles.

That said, it is highly possible that the heirs of the old powers presumed they could control the world simply because they managed to split the atom (i.e., create a nuclear weapon). As we are all witnesses, the members of those powerful families/dynasties involved are afraid of walking on the street without an army of soldiers protecting them. In other words, they are denied the simple luxury of strolling on the street unprotected.

Perhaps there are powerful families/dynasties who are counting on capitalizing on the work of He Jiankui (born 1984), a Chinese biophysicist who, in 2018, claimed that he created the first human genetically edited babies, twin girls known by their pseudonyms, Lulu and Nana,¹¹³ to control the world. No one knows if this new scientific advancement, which permits scientists using CRISPER-Cas9 techniques/technology to edit human embryos (i.e., add or remove DNA) or traits by changing the blueprints inside the very early stage of human life, would also be used in ways that could permit scientists to

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

create improved versions of human beings in the same way scientists/engineers brought improvement in individual transport.

Now that a tool already exists to bypass natural selection, mankind would definitely continue to use this direct control over the levers of evolution to build on top of the work of He Jiankui in the same way scientists did when they managed to split the atom. Over time, the heirs of the old powers would have two methods to eliminate a race or nation that they deem harmful to their strength or stability: through nuclear weapons or by biologically editing and altering genes. The heirs of the old powers could annihilate a race or a nation using a nuclear weapon or biologically by editing and altering genes.

The Bible states in the Book of Ecclesiastes, chapter 1, verse 9, that there is nothing new under the sun.”¹¹⁴ The writer of this chapter adds this prose in verse 10 of the same chapter: “Is there anything of which one can say, 'Look! This is something new? It was here already, long ago; it was here before our time.’”

No one knows if the different races, such as white, Black, Asian, etc., that exist are a result of our predecessors having managed to bypass natural selection, as we are now capable of doing. But if we take into account what Ecclesiastes 1:9 says (i.e., what has been will be again, and what has been done will be done again), then the good or evil wonders or hopes that the powerful families/dynasties could be expecting or counting on the potential of this DNA editing to help them achieve may fail to materialize if “what has been done will be done again.” In other words, since one of the families/dynasties that was fighting during WW2 to determine who would be maintaining control of the international order detonated a nuclear bomb when it felt that its chances of winning this global war without the support of such firepower were low, this means that the heirs of the old powers could resort to any means available to them to protect their monopoly on how the international order should function.

¹¹⁴ <https://www.biblegateway.com/passage/?search=Ecclesiastes+1&version=NIV>

If all the eyes of people are always on the future, and humans were not granted the right to foretell the events of tomorrow and/or the shape of things to come but rather how to read the events and hope that tomorrow would be better, then there is a good chance that if the United Nations (WB, IMF, NATO, and others) continue to thrust people to be devoted to eradicating poverty in all its forms or to share on equal rights, outcomes, and justice, then people may not be ready to continue to surrender freedom to obtain the benefits of the international political order. In other words, if the Chinese scientists are presently able to change the blueprints inside the very early stage of human life, and if the Saudis are working to build a new mega-city with plans for flying cars,¹¹⁵ and another 181 nations are all working on either how to obtain nuclear weapons or altering genes so they could control the lever of evolution, it is highly likely that the historical dynamics that have been accompanying human history will slow down. ut differently, if acquiring more knowledge leads to more grief, the powerful families/dynasties counting on their heirs benefiting from their toil may not see their expectations fulfilled.

For instance, the United States concluded the 1930s with the grand opening of the 1939 New York World's Fair. The 1939 New York World's Fair is regarded as the second most expensive American world's fair of all time, exceeded only by St. Louis's Louisiana Purchase Exposition of 1904.¹¹⁶ Furthermore, the 1939 New York World's Fair was the first exposition on the future, with an opening slogan of "Dawn of a New Day."¹¹⁷ The objective of the fair was to allow all visitors to take a look at "the world of tomorrow."

Regrettably, World War II, which began 6 months into the 1939 New York World's Fair, showed mankind that what the future held was war. The different wonders that the organizers and exhibitors of the fair were telling visitors were awaiting them, such as advancements in technology and peace, which was not what ended up happening. All the hopes and dreams had to wait until World War 2 was over.

¹¹⁵ <https://www.businessinsider.com/neom-what-we-know-saudi-arabia-500bn-mega-city-2019-9>

¹¹⁶ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/1939_New_York_World%27s_Fair

¹¹⁷ <https://untappedcities.com/2020/04/30/81-years-ago-fdr-opened-the-1939-worlds-fair-in-queens/#:~:text=On%20April%2030%2C%201939%2C%2081,It%20featured%2062%20participating%20nations.>

No one knows what the future holds. However, what we do know is that in order for peace and security in the world to be maintained, people need to begin to surrender freedom to obtain the benefit of the political order. If humans refuse to obey, the international order could evolve in two ways. In the first scenario, the consequence of the disregard would lead directly to a global war. In the second scenario, people or nations would continue to size each other up through civil wars.

If the disregard that people would exhibit escalates, leading to a global war, it is highly unlikely that the powers who would be opposing each other would be in favor of squaring off their disputes by adopting a conventional total war, as was the case during World War II. Hence, more than one nation possesses access to nuclear bombs; only a preventive strike could make the difference between victory and defeat.

If a preemptive strike could lessen the damage caused by the ensuing conflict for one of the opposing powers, then the first to strike would be the one who could influence the outcome of this war to their advantage. Furthermore, since we have no way of knowing who would strike first if peace and security deteriorate and people (or nations) split to form two opposing military alliances, this means that the heirs of the old powers could be chasing the wind if they suppose that their economic, industrial, and scientific capabilities could prevent their chances of reverting to a simpler form.

Hence, the chances of the heirs of the old powers to revert to a simpler form are much higher during a total war as compared to civil disturbances or violence within the boundary of a single country or region. If people continue to resist cooperation based on the work program proposed by the founding fathers of the UN and instead choose to implement the work program suggested by the UN (including the WB, IMF, NATO, and others), it is highly likely that this ongoing conflict between two opposing organized groups, with the government perceived as biased, will persist until one group gains control of the country (i.e., civil wars).

As I said before, up until World War II, the reliance of the old powers, such as Great Britain or France, on classic "divide and rule" strategies along ethnic and racial identities helped keep the populations that they were dominating from uniting against them. Strangely, this strategy is not working post 1945.

For example, the population of Lebanon is 6 million. All the ideas or tricks that the ruling government or the international community employed to manipulate the Lebanese population to withdraw their support of Hezbollah have resulted in failure, as these efforts have not addressed the underlying issues of economic hardship and political dissatisfaction that the population faces. The majority of the Lebanese population is convinced that it is the government policies that are prompting the economic hardships that they are knowing. Likewise, the population of Egypt is 100 million. All the ideas or tricks that the ruling government or the international community employed to manipulate the Egyptian population to withdraw their support of the Ikhwan in Egypt have resulted in failure, leading to a continued belief among the majority of the Egyptian population that it is the government policies that are prompting economic hardships that they are experiencing. The majority of the Egyptian population are convinced that it is the government policies that are prompting economic hardships that they are experiencing.

"Palindromic" is a word, number, phrase, or other sequence of characters that reads the same backward as forward, such as "madam" or "racecar."¹¹⁸ If the 'divide and rule' strategy that all governments or great powers (i.e., the rich) depend on to keep the populations (i.e., the poor) from uniting against them stopped to aid them (i.e., rich) post 1945 (or after violence erupts in a country) in keeping the rivaling factions directing their violence at each other, and instead of rivaling factions continuing with preferring to direct their embitterment at each other, they are joining to take it against their governments (i.e., the rich), then there are two motives why the rich (or governments) are not able to control the violence for their own benefit.

The first is if the governments or great powers (i.e., the rich) who are financing or providing military equipment to the population (or the

¹¹⁸ <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Palindrome>

culture) that they want to divide (through agents such as Al Qaeda, ISIS, etc.) are not substantial enough to partition and create sustainable inter-communal difficulties. The second is if there is a “rule” or a “bug” that its impetus is building the awareness or resistance of the population (i.e., poor) in such a way that it is making them prioritize securing goals that are more worthwhile to them than ethnic or racial identities.

If the poor are becoming more immune to the ‘divide and rule’ strategy, this resistance may be attributed to the influences or awareness that the UN (including the World Bank, IMF, NATO, and others) have been promoting since 1945 to encourage people to resist any undemocratic political order, which affects their ability to prioritize individual or national interests.

When people make yogurt at home, they heat the milk to destroy enzymes and bacteria. The milk is then cooled before adding the starter (i.e., the good bacteria). The starter is stirred with the cooled milk. The mixture is allowed to rest for some time to convert from milk to yoghurt.¹¹⁹

Anyone who tried to make homemade yogurt, pickles, or bread saw that they are made of simple recipes. Yet definitely, any person who tried to prepare those items learned that they involve lots of science, a strong handle on technique, and a bit of art.

There are fixes when the yogurt does not turn out. In other words, when it comes out runny, foamy, too sour, too liquid, or not sour enough.¹²⁰ All the fixes involve lots of additional work with no guarantee that the result will be correct.

The heirs of the old powers could consider dismantling the interconnectivity of people by adopting pre-1945 trade or travel restrictions, which would make it much easier to address the unpreparedness of individuals who surrender their freedom for the benefits of the political order.

¹¹⁹ <https://downshiftology.com/recipes/how-to-make-homemade-yogurt/>

¹²⁰ <https://nourishedkitchen.com/troubleshooting-homemade-yogurt-questions/>

I have no way of knowing if adopting pre-1945 trade or travel restrictions could permit the heirs of the old powers to continue to maintain their strength and stability.

To put it differently, there are two ways that the heirs of the old powers (i.e., the families/dynasties who won WW2 or the families/dynasties who control the money supply of the world) could adopt to maintain their strength and stability: The first is to let peace and security remain as is while ensuring that their home countries remain stable. The second is if those powerful families/dynasties adopt pre-1945 trade or travel restrictions.

The heirs of the old powers must rely on the UN's promotion of human rights to maintain their strength and stability, regardless of their chosen option, as this is the only way to prevent subject populations from uniting against them. In other words, if those powerful families/dynasties involved did rely on a divide-and-rule strategy, they would be able to prevent people from uniting against them to request that outcomes be divided on equal rights. The only other option for the heirs of the old powers, if they choose not to rely on the UN (including the World Bank, IMF, NATO, and others) for promoting division and creating intercommunal conflicts, is to adopt an absolutist political strategy, similar to the approach taken in Egypt since 2014.

This means that if, for example, those powerful families or dynasties live in Belgium and choose to maintain their strength and stability by allowing free trade and unrestricted travel, they must ensure that the rule of law in Belgium remains strong and that the UN promotes human rights and the need for global cooperation to eradicate poverty and injustice in all forms, except within Belgium.

Presently, most Scandinavian countries are capable of obtaining the readiness of their population to surrender freedom because the access they have to health, education, jobs, unemployment benefits, social security, etc. is all subsidized by the government. This is why the population in those Scandinavian countries is peaceful and does not act against their regime in the same unrestrained manner as the Lebanese do.

I have no way of knowing how the heirs of the old powers would plan to maintain their strength and stability. I cannot think of any other strategy that can prevent the resizing of those powerful families/dynasties involved, besides adopting the work program that the founding fathers of the UN proposed. The work program that the founding fathers of the UN proposed was based on letting governments be responsible for the preparation of their citizens only and without any role to play for the UN, NGOs, private companies, foundations, rich people, etc. This work program also required that all governments relinquish control of their regimes to the voting public, rather than becoming, as is the case in many countries today, a means for individuals to achieve their goals despite the resistance of others.

Indeed, the failure of the United Nations (including the World Bank, IMF, NATO, and others) to prevent wars between nations since 1945, along with the simultaneous rise in intolerance, indicates that the heirs of the old powers may need to choose between continuing to explore whether the work program initiated by the UN could help them sustain their strength and stability, or reverting to the original program proposed by the UN's founding fathers.

Then again, after all is said and done, there are two moves that the heirs of the old powers can make to maintain their strength and stability in case they decide to continue securing the things they deeply care about through the work program that the founding fathers of the UN proposed.

The two options are

Option 1: Doing nothing to the nations whose people are proclaiming that they deserve to cooperate based on the principle of equal rights (i.e., letting the international order be as is).

Option 2: Option 1 + steering the international order to prevent a global war from erupting. Use civil wars to increase death rates or keep weaker nations destabilized. Ensure that the countries that the heirs of the old powers use as their home base remain stable and not destabilized. Restrict trade or travel between existing nations to ensure that there is no balanced development, which would further entrench

inequalities and prevent weaker nations from gaining the resources needed for growth, thereby perpetuating a cycle of poverty and dependency that benefits the heirs of the old powers.

We already have a good understanding of how the international order would continue to develop if the heirs of the old powers choose to ignore the nations whose people are demanding cooperation based on the principle of equal rights. In other words, if those powerful families/dynasties involved decide to do nothing about the UN (WB, IMF, NATO, and others) preaching to people why everyone should stop being satisfied with their status to be devoted to eradicating poverty and injustice in all their forms. The social order that exists in Lebanon (i.e., chaotic) or the one that exists in Egypt (i.e., authoritarian) serves as two constructive examples to support what the last 70 years of these types of programming could produce. There is also the option of the world spiraling down into a global crisis if peace and security remain on the decline.

No one knows how the international order could evolve if the heirs of the old powers choose to rely on using civil wars to increase the death rates (i.e., to maintain their strength and stability) instead of a global war. In other words, doing nothing to the nations whose people are declaring that they deserve to cooperate based on the principle of equal rights, including restricting trade or travel between existing nations to prevent balanced development.

We don't know how the global order will change, but we do know we don't want the heirs of the old powers to suffer. The power and authority of those families or dynasties, as well as their heirs, remain stable.

As I said before, the victors of WW2 are the first families in the history of mankind who became mindful about the dignity and worth of the human person. If peace and security diminish, it is highly likely that those families/dynasties may choose to adopt absolutism strategies to maintain their strength and stability. Most importantly, we have no way of knowing that if peace and security diminish and/or if those families/dynasties are resized and new families/dynasties start to administer the international order, they would be in favor of allowing

people to practice freedom of speech or the idea of determination as compared to making all people become dominated. This is very serious and worrisome. The UN Charter's ideas are philosophies that mankind has sought since the American Revolutionary War. If mankind loses this milestone, it would mean discarding the cultivated behaviors that our predecessors invested in through individual and group efforts over thousands of years. If mankind loses the idea of freedom that the United States has been acting as its custodian of since 1776, and/or if the United States reverts to a simpler form, the loss means that mankind would be returning to cooperate in a manner that is not any different from the way our predecessors were cooperating before the American Revolutionary War. An example of what the social order could look like if the United States reverted to a simpler form is to compare the current social order in the United States with the chaotic politics in Lebanon, Iraq, or Afghanistan after 1945, as well as the authoritarian regimes in Egypt, Saudi Arabia, Russia, or China. I must mention that the political system that exists in Great Britain or in the United States post-1945 is already in the process of being shifted to look like the authoritative regime that exists in Egypt, China, and other countries. Any nation that monitors the conversation of its citizens or videotapes their movement is an authoritative regime and not a nation that embodies freedom ideologies.

Hence, the only regime that mankind could build upon its achievement to stabilize peace and security is the one that the political leaders who ruled Great Britain, China, Russia, or the United States up to 1945 coordinated their relations on its premise (i.e., the UN Charter) and not the work program that came to pass post-1945 pursuant to the United Nations' ambitions preventing the leaders who succeeded those initial ones from orienting the international order in the direction that can secure the goals that are suggested in the United Nations; this begs many questions. For one, can the heirs of the old powers avoid their collapse if they do not go back to practicing the work program that the founding fathers of the UN proposed? In other words, can those powerful families/dynasties involved prevent their collapse regardless of what safeguards they employ?

To answer the aforementioned question, it is essential to first define what the heirs of the old powers specifically need to avoid. After

defining what those powerful families and dynasties must avoid, it is equally important to show how they cannot escape the consequences of this distress, regardless of their efforts.

The heirs of the old powers and their successors must safeguard against any misfortune to ensure that their strength and stability remain at least as stable as Edwin Chadwick suggested in his 1829 article on the primary concern of a police body. This would occur if those powerful families or dynasties fail to implement effective preventive policing measures that make it difficult for criminals to obtain “the objects of temptation”—i.e., control of the international order. In other words, the heirs of the old powers or their successors fail to realize what is happening in time. The families/dynasties involved can't tell good from evil because the people misleading them seem polite, smart, and logical in their arguments.

John Dalton (1766–1844) was an English chemist, physicist, and meteorologist. He is best known for introducing the atomic theory into chemistry and for his research into colour blindness, sometimes referred to as "Daltonism" in his honour.¹²¹

Color blindness is the decreased ability to see color or differences in color.¹²² Whereas, in sociology, a color-blind society is one where racial classification does not limit a person's opportunities.¹²³

In my view, Charles I, the king of England, was capable of judging individuals based on the color of their skin, but at a certain juncture in his reign, he lost the ability to judge them based on their character.

The public dissatisfaction with the way Charles I, king of England, was ruling Great Britain made the population perceive that he was not ruling fairly or based on an equal justice system. This led to the population losing trust in his leadership, including withdrawing their readiness to obey and trying him on charges of being a tyrant, traitor,

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

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

¹²³ [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Color_blindness_\(racial_classification\)#:~:text=A%20color%20blind%20society%20has,of%20the%201950s%20and%201960s.](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Color_blindness_(racial_classification)#:~:text=A%20color%20blind%20society%20has,of%20the%201950s%20and%201960s.)

murderer, and public enemy to the good people of the nation and sentencing him to death.

Charles I was not the first British monarch to be deposed or executed. Edward II (1284–1327) and Richard II (1367–1400) saw their reigns end in 1327 and 1399 respectively.^{124,125} Likewise, Henry VI (1421 – 1471) was deposed, and Lady Jane Grey (1537 – 1554) was tried and executed.^{126,127}

However, the background or circumstances leading to Charles I's deposition, trial, and sentencing were completely distinct premises from the motives that the other British rulers had to yield to later, as Charles I's actions, including his conflicts with Parliament and his belief in the divine right of kings, set him apart from his predecessors.

Some historians regard the Bishops' Wars of 1639 and 1640 as generally being viewed as the starting point of the 1639–1652 Wars of the Three Kingdoms (i.e., the English Civil War) that ultimately involved the whole of the British Isles.¹²⁸

The Bishops' Wars were a dispute between the Church of Scotland (known also as the kirk) and the Church of England when Charles I attempted to impose uniform practices on the two churches. The majority of Scots advocated a Presbyterian system, without bishops, while the Church of England followed an episcopal system, or rule by bishops. The father of Charles I, James VI, king of England, had reintroduced episcopacy to the Church of Scotland in 1584 when he became king of England in 1603. Charles I was like his father convinced that when the Church of Scotland and England become unified and governed by bishops, this would serve as a first step to achieve the monarch's vision of a centralized, unionist state.

It is important to note that the Bishops' Wars were not a doctrinal dispute between the Church of Scotland and the Church of England

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

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

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

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

¹²⁸ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bishops%27_Wars

but rather a dispute over how the governance of the Church of Scotland should be assumed (i.e., an episcopal system or a Presbyterian system).

Indeed, it was not the intention of Charles I that his interference in unifying the two churches would lead to the Bishop's Wars. However, the support for the war materialized in such a way that when Charles I attempted to introduce reforms in a system that was nominally Episcopalian but operated with significantly different governance structures and doctrines, the system ultimately collapsed.

No one knows if the challenges that exist in the world post-1945 can be correlated to those that Charles I or the British monarch dealt with in the 17th century.

When Charles I decided to unify the three kingdoms religiously to strengthen the union between the three kingdoms, he began to realize that he had Scottish bishops presiding over a church largely Presbyterian in structure.

There is a big correlation between what Charles I stumbled upon when he tried to unify the three states and what the heirs of the old powers envisioned achieving post-1945. The powerful families and dynasties involved pursued goals similar to those of Charles I and his advisors in the aftermath of World War II. Those powerful families/dynasties have 183 governments presiding over a population of different religious, political, economic, and social beliefs.

We could also say that the heirs of the old powers must be dealing presently with challenges that are more complex than the one Charles I dealt with during his reign. Most likely, the bishops that Charles I assigned in Scotland were faithful to him. Of the 183 governments responsible for transforming conditions and outcomes for the heirs of old powers, many do not demonstrate strong loyalty. Since 1945, we find that a good number of the governments are prioritizing their self-interest more than prioritizing the policies that those powerful families/dynasties deeply care about, which has led to a disconnect between the interests of these families and the actions of the governments they once influenced.

If we consider the challenges that Charles I faced regarding who should hold ultimate authority in clerical affairs across the three monarchies, we can argue that the issues confronting the heirs of old powers after 1945 are similar to those Charles I encountered in determining who holds ultimate authority over the distribution and management of natural and legal rights among UN member states. Likewise, if we incorporate the different nationalist allegiances and religious and political convictions that Charles I must have dealt with when he was trying to transform the conditions and outcomes that he deeply cared about into the ones that the heirs of the old powers presently have, we observe that they are almost identical. For example, each superpower presently has its own traditional royalists in politics and religion in the same way that Charles I was governing in the British Isles.

Indeed, Charles I's inability to judge people by their character cost him dearly. It is highly likely that Charles I and his advisors' unfamiliarity with the fact that outcomes are not entirely within their control, but rather depend on how well they could secure or satisfy the best interests of their dependants, significantly contributed to the resolution of the ensuing tensions. In other words, Charles I and his advisors underestimated the existence of cunning individuals who would conspire against him or the monarch to further their own interests.

I have no way of knowing the precise nature of the religio-socio-economic and political tensions that provoked the parliamentarians and the public in Great Britain to view Charles I as a threat to the point of withdrawing their readiness to obey him, including sentencing him to death.

However, it is logical to suppose that when instability within a monarch or a country emerges, a principal motive for people's unpreparedness to surrender freedom to obtain the benefit of the political order could be due to legislation that is not applied to all social classes or to moral panic.

A moral panic is a feeling of fear spread among many people that some evil threatens the well-being of society.¹²⁹

I have no way of knowing if Charles I was practicing favoritism or if some moral panic aroused social concern that led parliamentarians and the public in Great Britain to view him [Charles I] as a threat, but given the nature of the English Civil War events¹³⁰ that transpired from 1642 to when he was tried and sentenced in 1649.¹³¹ However, we can say that it was a combination of moral panic and favoritism that started the open protest, which grew in the course of time and things into a full-fledged civil war that ended with the replacement of the English monarchy in 1649 with a Commonwealth of England.¹³²

The same combination of moral panic and favoritism charges that confronted Charles I between 1642 and 1649 seems to be confronting the heirs of the old powers from 1945 onward. In fact, the moral indignation of the United States, in particular, is being sensationalized in such a negative way around the world in recent years that many people are beginning to see this country as a threat to societal values and interests. It is not only the United States that is being sensationalized in a negative way in much political discourse post-1945, but so are Russia, China, and, in particular, the rich or the idea of capitalism.

A statesman is a person who is experienced in the art of government or versed in the administration of government affairs.¹³³ About 1000 years ago, our ancestors came up with a great idea to balance between security, which is too often threatened, and human rights, which are too often denied. For example, in Great Britain, the ruling families and dynasties managed to create a balance among themselves by transforming the Divine Right claim, which each family had relied on, from a theory with no limitations to one that included clear checks and balances.

¹²⁹https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Moral_panic#:~:text=A%20moral%20panic%20is%20a,entrepreneurs%20and%20the%20mass%20media%22.

¹³⁰[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/English_Civil_War#:~:text=The%20English%20Civil%20War%20\(1642,Wars%20of%20the%20Three%20Kingdoms](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/English_Civil_War#:~:text=The%20English%20Civil%20War%20(1642,Wars%20of%20the%20Three%20Kingdoms).

¹³¹ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Execution_of_Charles_I

¹³² https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Commonwealth_of_England

¹³³ <https://www.dictionary.com/browse/statesman>

For instance, about a thousand years ago, the families/dynasties who were ruling Great Britain started to convert this monarchy from a dominion that was ruled through absolute authority to one that supposedly became a constitutional monarchy. The powerful families that ruled Great Britain also inspired people who felt hopeless about their lives to believe that a better life was possible. Indeed, the values and beliefs outlined in the Magna Carta, which culminated in the principles established during the American Revolution of 1776 and the ideas included in the UN Charter, support the notion that humanity can build relationships among individuals regardless of race, gender, or creed.

If countries like Great Britain or the United States stopped post-1945 to become capable of exhibiting great wisdom or ability in directing the affairs of their own people (governments) or in dealing with important international issues, this instability could only be due to the families/dynasties who control those two countries having stopped to respect the ideals enshrined in the laws or ideas that they deeply care about, or the pursuit of equal political rights and opportunities for development that they tasked the United Nations to promote has triggered this apparent imbalance.

The heirs of the old powers seem to be dealing with a situation as complex as the one Charles I faced during his reign.

It would be naïve to assume that Charles I did not look from the perspective of his own interests to prevent the revolt or uprising that he was confronting from flaring up and becoming uncontrollable. If, despite having been protected with a strong and well-equipped army and police force, Charles I (and his close advisors) failed to suppress the violence in England, this outcome could have been prompted by two reasons. The first reason could have been because he wagered on deliberately allowing the violence. In other words, he believed that by using violence or difference to his advantage, he could crush his adversaries. The second reason is that he may have believed the tensions were easy to control. In other words, he would be able to maintain his traditional religious and political role in the face of rising opposition.

The hostile attitude towards the considerable political, social, spiritual, and religious power that Charles I leveraged and his failure to maintain his traditional religious and political role in the face of competing religious forces were fatal.

Theocracy is a form of government in which a deity of some type is recognized as the supreme ruling authority, giving divine guidance to human intermediaries that manage the day-to-day affairs of the government.¹³⁴

Historians claim that the term "theocracy" was initially coined by Flavius Josephus (37–100), a Roman-Jewish historian, in the first century A.D. to describe the characteristic government of the Jews. Josephus argued that while mankind had developed many forms of rule, such as monarchy, oligarchy, and democracy, the government of the Jews was unique. Josephus offered the term "theocracy" to describe the Jewish polity, ordained by Moses, in which God is sovereign and his word is law.¹³⁵

All the wars that humans have experienced since they began to recognize God as the supreme ruling authority and his word as law were either aimed at removing the church from all aspects of public and political life, including its involvement in the everyday lives of citizens, or at incorporating it.

As I said before, I have no way of knowing what caused the English Civil Wars. The conflict could have stemmed from the opposition to the influence of the Episcopal Church in social or political matters. The wars could have been due simply to money or an internal power struggle between Charles I and some parliamentary members.

However, if we are to consider that Charles I must have done all that was in his power to assert his political legitimacy but the people or the aristocracy did not accept his authority, we can say that his failure to convince everyone about his legitimacy involved a combination of moral corruption, institutional issues, and disagreements in religious

¹³⁴ <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Theocracy>

¹³⁵ <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Theocracy#Etymology>

interpretations. Most importantly, we can argue that if the masses had been convinced that the monarch could genuinely provide the necessary moral leadership in the fight against social and economic injustice, this belief might have prevented the monarch from descending into a civil war.

This allows us to also say that if Charles I had managed to harmonize between the divine sovereignty of God and humans' responsibilities, he could have spared himself from the fate that awaited him because he would have avoided having the people or the aristocracy witness that he was not playing a pivotal role in the systems of oppression that led to the British Civil Wars.

Indeed, the challenges that Charles I faced reflect the circumstances that the ruling families and dynasties in South Africa encountered when they chose to adopt an authoritarian political system based on racial segregation (white supremacy) between 1948 and 1990.

The ruling families and dynasties in South Africa refused to balance equal political rights and opportunities for development, positioning themselves in a way that would secure the support of the overwhelming majority, specifically the Black population. After many years of social injustice, the ruling families/dynasties in South Africa found themselves in a precarious situation. Their choices were to give every man and woman, no matter what the color of his (her) skin was, the right to vote, which meant losing power to the overwhelming majority, or face the same fate that Charles I awaited him when he picked to resist.

I cannot know why people refuse to surrender freedom for the political order the heirs of the old powers legitimized in 1945, but if the reasons are tied to an inability to balance equal political rights and opportunities for development, those powerful families/dynasties involved might share the fate of Charles I or the families/dynasties who ruled South Africa.

The difference between the fates that awaited Charles I and the families/dynasties ruling South Africa is that Charles I faced death,

while those families/dynasties had to relinquish control of the regime and revert to a simpler form of governance.

At the end of WW2, support for the postwar international order that the victors of WW2 (the old powers) proposed grew rapidly, but this support seems to be dying out. The only supporter for the postwar international order is the United Nations (WB, IMF, NATO, and others).

The Bible portrays God's given right to rule as a concept that is open for every man and woman to come freely to Him. However, since the date when humans began to make God sovereign and his word is law, and in particular, resizing each other on the basis of asserting that they are enforcing the laws that God decreed, we find that God has been adopting a totally different strategy from the one that humans are pursuing to narrow the gap between evil and good. For example, God does seem tolerant and slow in reacting in support of man's struggle for freedom and justice. Despite all the evil that people commit, thus prompting any person to suppose that he would be getting impatient and interfering more often in human affairs, but he seems to keep his interventions minimal based on the small number of prophets he commissioned to narrow human disparities. Actually, the opposite can be said about the individuals (i.e., rich or clergy) who play the role of intermediary between God and the people. Despite all the rules that those powerful people come up with and insist on to make the communication between God's right to rule and any newborn to pass through them, we find that despite their eagerness or moral impatience to make the world become a better place, people's moral conduct does not change.

The differences between the two are due to one of two motives if we compare how the prophets that God sends to strengthen morality make the work for freedom and equality a short and simple path and the one the rich or clergy use, which makes the path long and complicated. The first is that the rich or clergy are teaching ideas contrary to what God has been sending his prophets to show those individuals who want to play the role of intermediary between God and the people what they must do to make the work for freedom and equality as easy as God's prophets appear to make it. The second possibility is that those

individuals who wish to act as intermediaries between God and the people believe they are the ultimate authority on all matters.

Hence, we cannot say that the ideas that exist in Judaism or Hinduism, etc., are improper to make people voluntarily surrender freedom to deepen connectedness; then we can say that the rich or clergy could be teaching ideas that are not compatible with the ideas that God was teaching through his messengers. Most importantly, we could say that all those who decreed their legitimacy to rule to convert the world into becoming a better place for our successors are being faithful to what the Bible in 1 Timothy 2:5 counseled people to adhere to to strengthen social cohesion, but by making one substitution in this verse. The Bible in 1 Timothy 2:5 states, "For there is one God and one mediator between God and mankind, the man Jesus Christ." As of 33 AD, all the people who considered that their role was to maintain order, balance, and justice declared themselves to be the intermediary between God and mankind.

Hence, the heirs of the old powers decided as of 1945 to put a mediator between themselves and mankind, the United Nations (WB, IMF, NATO, and others). This means that those powerful families/dynasties do not mind that their role to deputize for God is delegated to the United Nations.

In the Bible, in the book of Revelation, chapter 22:18-19, it is stated, "And if any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life, and out of the holy city, and from the things which are written in this book."¹³⁶

If verses 18-19 in Chapter 22 of the Book of Revelation are true, we could say that when Charles I allowed the bishops to act as mediators between his earthly authority and the people, God took away his life. This also signifies that if the heirs of the old powers continue to let the United Nations be a mediator between their desires to transform the conditions and outcomes that matter to them and the people, it is

¹³⁶ [https://www.churchofjesuschrist.org/study/new-era/1977/09/q-and-a-questions-and-answers/how-do-we-explain-revelation-22-18-that-says-not-to-add-to-the-scriptures?lang=eng#:~:text=%E2%80%9CAnd%20if%20any%20man%20shall,19%5D%20\(Italics%20added.\)](https://www.churchofjesuschrist.org/study/new-era/1977/09/q-and-a-questions-and-answers/how-do-we-explain-revelation-22-18-that-says-not-to-add-to-the-scriptures?lang=eng#:~:text=%E2%80%9CAnd%20if%20any%20man%20shall,19%5D%20(Italics%20added.))

highly likely that they could face the same fate that Charles I or the families/dynasties who ruled South Africa yielded to.

This is because what prompted the people in England to depose and sentence Charles I was motivated by a moral panic. If from 1945 onward, poverty, corruption, and nepotism have been on the rise, these are all evidence to support that the international post-war order that the victors of WW2 proposed in the aftermath of WW2 was not programmed to improve justice and freedom but to benefit the individual involved, not to mention political and moral corruption.

Before the violence of the English Civil Wars erupted, Charles I had full, supreme, and universal religious and political power over the three kingdoms, a power that he was exercising unhindered. Parliament had no tangible power before the English Civil Wars. Most historians report that the members of the Parliament were a collection of aristocrats who met at the King's pleasure to offer advice and to help him collect taxes.¹³⁷

Governing depends not only on financial power but also on the people's conviction that their ruler possesses the right leadership to establish a political community through a social contract, in which they all gain security in exchange for subjecting themselves to an absolute sovereign, whether that be one man or an assembly of men.

Everyone recognizes that Charles I's aspirations to extend his high Anglican or political policies were intended to strengthen the security of the monarchy, even if he was perhaps misunderstood. However, his limited interest or affection for the religio-political and social policies or attitudes he exhibited, including the growing support for a check on his power, supports that he was up against a counterculture rather than merely confronting a few parliament members or individuals opposing him.

Then again, if the "Roundheads"¹³⁸ or "Parliamentarians" began to regard the religious, military, diplomatic, and economic policies that

¹³⁷ <https://www.historic-uk.com/HistoryUK/HistoryofEngland/Origins-of-the-English-Civil-War/>

¹³⁸ <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Roundhead>

Charles I was approving as a threat instead of an opportunity, this perception had to have been fueled by a growing conviction by a larger segment of the population that the political and social attitudes or languages that Charles I or his loyalists (or cavaliers) were manifesting had little interest in serving the public good.

I have no way of knowing if the language or behavior that Charles I and his loyalists (or cavaliers) were manifesting before prompted a moral panic or a feeling of fear that led many people to believe that some real evil danger would be threatening the well-being of English society. However, if the disorder that was raging in the monarch led the religious group who were known as “Puritans” to be in favor of undermining the authority of Charles I or the political hierarchy in the monarchy and to prefer to deal directly with God on all issues concerning morality or how to increase their own happiness, signifying that Charles and his favorites were not the only power behind the throne but that there were other men or groups of men that informally were also exercising power in the monarchy.

Generally, people (nations) characterize other people (nations) as either a friend (ally) or an enemy (foe). When two people (two nations) dislike each other, they can express their enmity toward one another in two ways. The first method is through either party expressing open anger, hatred, frustration, envy, jealousy, fear, distrust, etc. The second method is through one party playing a role contrary to their real character. The Bible in Matthew 7:15 characterizes this second type very clearly: Beware of false prophets, which come to you in sheep's clothing, but inwardly they are ravening wolves.¹³⁹ In Matthew 7:16, after Jesus warned about this type of people who are wolves in sheep's clothing, he then says that the only way to know the true nature of those people, who will be revealed by their actions, is, "Ye shall know them by their fruits. Do men gather grapes of thorns or figs of thistles?"

Throughout history, people have used the concept of foe or ally as a tool to focus the fear and anxiety within a society toward a particular target.

¹³⁹ <https://www.biblegateway.com/passage/?search=Matthew%20%3A15&version=KJV>

I have no way of knowing why the “Puritans,” parliamentarians, and others became dissatisfied with the political and economic policies that Charles and his followers were implementing to the point of interpreting his actions as a threat, preferring to become bound by their personal power and conscience to undermine his authority instead of observing the political hierarchy in the monarch, except if everyone was construing that the events that they were all living were going to be misleading them from their proper belief or practice. In other words, the events they were living through agitated them and raised their fear to the point that they all began to think that something wicked or evil would happen to them if they did not act.

To capture the sense of this relationship from a secular perspective, let us take the events that transpired before the fall of the Soviet Union. During the Cold War, the United States' political policy toward the Soviet Union was based on making the people who live in the Soviet Union perceive that communism was a threat to the public good. After many years of prototypical propaganda morphing to show that communism was an ideology that does not allow a person to prioritize his self-interest, the people who were all allied for an equal purpose became at odds with one another in pursuit of other purposes.

If people can recognize that the actions of others pose a threat when those actions do not serve their best interests, it follows that frustration can grow when a government is weak and unable to meet the needs of its citizens.

Frustration is defined as “the feeling of being upset or annoyed, especially because of an inability to change or achieve something.”¹⁴⁰ In psychology, frustration arises from the perceived resistance to the fulfillment of an individual's will or goal and is likely to increase when a will or goal is denied or blocked.¹⁴¹

There are two types of frustration: internal and external. Internal frustration could be categorized as challenges that arise from the inability to fulfill personal goals, desires, or needs. External causes of

¹⁴⁰ <http://english.oxforddictionaries.com/frustration>

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

frustration involve conditions outside of an individual's control, such as a roadblock (a man-made motive) or rainfall (a natural motive).

Humans cope with frustrations in multiple ways, but generally speaking, the majority express their anger in the following three ways: provocation and violence, passive-aggressive behavior, or tolerance with no action.

All that humans do from birth to death is envy. The majority of people struggle to obtain the things they deeply care about, which frustrates many of them. Then again, when humans obtain the things that they perceive as the main reason for their unhappiness, this makes them stop being interested or stimulated. In other words, they become uninterested or unstimulated by the thing that they were lacking.

In the field of psychology, cognitive dissonance occurs when a person holds two or more contradictory beliefs, ideas, or values; or participates in an action that goes against one of these three and experiences psychological stress because of that.¹⁴²

For example, we can say that pre-1945, the families/dynasties who were ruling the world (i.e., the old powers) subjugated people to domination because they were inhumane. This is one belief, idea, or value. But we can also say that pre-1945, the families/dynasties who ruled the world denied the common people what they envied to keep them disinterested and unstimulated.

The inconsistency between the two previously mentioned beliefs prompts people to continually strive to change them until they align. Before 1945, people's efforts to resolve this cognitive dissonance kept the world dynamic.

After 1945, the heirs of the old powers decided to ignore the advice of the UN founding fathers regarding the governance of the international order, aiming to prevent cognitive dissonance from confusing people by allowing them to possess what they envied, thereby keeping them uninterested. As of 1945, this strategy produced the same outcome as was the case before WW2. The world is still dynamic.

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

Evidently, people's beliefs clash with a new level of awareness or perceived information, triggering the frustration that emerged post-1945. As we all witness, our political leaders are actively trying to find ways to resolve the contradictions that people are exhibiting in order to reduce frustration.

For example, before 1945, the type of frustration people experienced was related to improving transportation, communication, governance, and similar issues. The frustration of people post-1945 is no longer about how to improve transportation and communication. Post-1945, the frustration of people is to share wealth and power on equal rights. I did not include people's frustration at having access to water and food because the mere fact that a person is alive means that he has access to water and food.

Conflicts arise when two competing goals interfere with one another. From 1945, the United Nations' efforts to prevent frustration and boredom failed. In fact, the more the United Nations strives to enhance people's conviction to be dedicated to sharing wealth and power on equal rights, the more the cohesiveness of people to see that, indeed, such a transformation is occurring grows. In other words, people are increasingly unprepared to accept that their leaders, who are the custodians of the goals everyone is pursuing, have nothing to do with what could be preventing the achievement of those goals.

If the Puritans managed to produce a counterculture of all population groups to the point of subverting the power of the king and of the Church of England in the British Isles, this means that it is highly likely that if people around the world continue to perceive that the heirs of the old powers are monopolizing the political and economic system to serve their best interests and not the best interests of mankind at large, then all the people in all the nations may rebel against them in the same way the Puritans, Parliamentarians, and others did during the English Civil Wars.

In other words, the people (or nations) of the world could withdraw their obligation to cooperate based on the principles that are stipulated in the postwar international order, as happened in the 1990s when the

people who were living under the Soviet Union perceived that their political leaders were monopolizing the political system to secure their best interests and not the goals that the communist ideology proclaimed and collapsed the power of the families/dynasties who were controlling this ideology.

Moreover, since the heirs of the old powers have no way of knowing if people (or nations) are plotting to denigrate them, since this is a one-sided concept, this means that those powerful families/dynasties could be letting the UN conduce them to hit a dead end through their non-objection to this organization preaching to people to stop being ready to be satisfied with the hand that they were dealt in order to be devoted to securing that outcomes are shared on equal rights.

Indeed, the heirs of the old powers face two choices if they want their descendants to continue transforming the conditions and outcomes they currently have the ability to influence. The first is to stop the UN from teaching goals that frustrate people and to go back to implementing the work program that the founding fathers of the UN proposed. The second choice is to change people's perception about their appeal to share on equal rights outcomes. Evidently, there is also the option of increasing deaths through wars, famine, or biological warfare.

I have no way of knowing which specific choice from the aforementioned ones the heirs of the old powers would pick to maintain their strength and stability. What I do know is that if those powerful families or dynasties decide to allow the United Nations to maintain the perception that the idea of coming together after World War II was to cooperate in the economic field and to eliminate poverty and injustice in all its forms, they must ensure that this global council is not an artificial entity embodying the same spirit as Oliver Cromwell.

Oliver Cromwell (1599 – 1658) was an English general and statesman who led the Parliament of England's armies against King Charles I during the English Civil War and ruled the British Isles as Lord Protector from 1653 until his death in 1658.¹⁴³

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

Cromwell is regarded as one of the most powerful commoner in British history. Cromwell got there by very un-British means. Cromwell believed he was led by the will of god. His passionate conviction to build a life of peace led to the killing of Charles I, king of England.

The United Nations (WB, IMF, NATO and others) employees are very powerful commoner who got their privileges through very un-traditional means post 1945. The passionate conviction of the UN employee is to build a safe life of peace. The UN employees believe that the UN charter which the families/dynasties who won world war 2 proclaimed as standards to maintain international security gives them right to use their awareness to end poverty and injustice in all its forms. If human nature has not changed post 1945, we can say that the teaching of the UN has to have impacted negatively on many nations post 1945 in the same way Cromwell's perception impeded on the British Monarchy in antiquity. In other words, the UN teaching should have converted many nations into becoming stateless, including prompting governments to form bias courts to try and arbitrate cases that were not any different to the one that Cromwell presided over to justify the killing of a king.

Cromwell believed that he was living a life of tribulation, because he was a sinner and he was not behaving in accordance with what the Biblical scriptures stipulated. This was to dedicate his life to deepen good.

The UN employee are working to make mankind rise above all the evil that exists in the world so all people can be drawn in a personal relationship with good. The UN employee are working to build a social order whereby all people would share outcomes on equal rights, or where no one would live in a world which would know any form of sin. The UN employees believe that when they eradicate poverty in all its forms or injustice tribulations would end and everyone would live a life of peace and prosperity.

This perception that Cromwell developed about the importance of soldiering so mankind can be saved from being tormented by evil grew

as he became more and more drawn to Puritans ideas. In fact, most books on the English Civil war leads readers to believe that Cromwell emerged from this spiritual awakening convinced that his troubles are a test to raise him above his indignation or economic sufferance. This is exactly what the UN employee believe that their interferences or travails to eradicate poverty or injustice in all its forms is doing in the world. The UN employee believe that all the trouble that they are knowing and/or the one ones that the people who they are helping conscript in their plight to eradicate poverty or injustice in all its forms, would eventually lead mankind to share outcomes on equal rights, this putting an end to all this historical dynamic that mankind has been knowing.

Most books on the English Civil Wars lead readers to believe that Cromwell personal relationship with God is what saved and changed him completely. This relationship convinced himself that he was not worthless and that he has a mission to increase good. Historians claim that this inwardly “purification” exercise that Cromwell felt is what made him feel happy and blissful. His conviction that all what he was going through and doing is deepening good is what healed him from his depression and made him feel worthwhile.

The United Nations (WB, IMF, NATO and others) employees are not doing anything different than what Cromwell was doing before he decided to change the world to make people become free from fear and want. The UN are imagining that horror would be great on earth if tribulations continue to rise, and/or if people withdraw from being ready to cooperate based on the equality of outcome. In other words, the UN believes that man would return to his state of nature if its efforts to make people pursue on equal rights outcomes are slowed down.

The monarch was persecuting Puritans humiliating them, and insulting them including burning their books and imprisoning their clergymen. Some UN member states started cracking down on any people who express fundamentalist religious views especially Muslim ideas in recent years.

The policies that Cromwell and his supporters adopted failed to provide the best means of achieving equality in the British Isles. Cromwell swept away almost 1000 years of monarchy. He gave Britain its only experience of republican rule. The UN has been giving mankind its only experience of democracy since 1945. This organization failed to prevent wars between nations since 1945.

The powerful elites in Great Britain recognized after the death of Cromwell that the aspirations that he was pursuing was unattainable, and managed to reorient the population to go back to accepting that the Monarchy be reestablished.

Could the insecurity that the world started knowing post 1945 be events that are identical to what the British Monarch was experiencing during the English Civil war? Could this “divine rebirth” or regeneration that the UN is leading to make people renounce evil and advocate equality be what is brewing all this insecurity that mankind started knowing post 1945?

As of 1945, the number of people who are perceiving that their governments are humiliating and insulting them has been growing. This perception has increased the unpreparedness of people to surrendering freedom to obtain the benefit of the political order, preferring to deal directly with the UN Security Council in as far their natural and legal rights instead of letting their governments secure their best interests.

Could the heirs of the old powers preserve their power and avoid that people undermine them or the power that governments possess shrink after they granted the United Nations officials the same privilege and rights to realize the full development of their personality they enjoy?

I have no way of knowing if the heirs of the old powers would be able to preserve their power and prevent that the teaching that the United Nations along with state and non-state actors are prompting not revert them to a simpler form.

It looks as if only time would tell if the social and economic policies that the United Nations along with state and non-state actors are

legitimizing on behalf of the heirs of the old powers would achieve a healthy and vibrant economy, which can ensure full employment to people and the development of social justice, thus permitting them to preserve their power so they could transfer it to their successors or stumble on the same challenges that the British monarch confronted in antiquity when the puritans concluded that the fiscal policies that the Monarch was legitimizing was not going to bring happiness in the dominion in a meaningful way to merit that they exhibit tolerance, and resorted to disregard and violence to rectify the imbalance that exist in the Monarch.

I recommend continuing to study the impact of the heirs of the old powers letting fear and want, instead of the work program suggested in the UN Charter or the UDHR, navigate the maintenance of their strength and stability.