

March to Perdition

The UN's Threat to the Anglosphere

Wicked As They Come

Salim Maloof, Ph.D.

Copyright 2022 by Salim Maloof

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

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

Suggested Citation:

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

This is a work of non-fiction.

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

For more information on reproducing section of this book or sales of this book,
go to:

Center for Modernity Planning and Assessment
www.centermpa.com

To Mark, Nicholas and Matthew Maloof

TABLE OF CONTENTS

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

PREFACE

Part ONE: Wicked As They Come

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

Part TWO: Passport To Shame

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

Part Three: Know Your Enemy

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

Motive that propelled the author to prepare this work

In 2013, a US national was working for UNOPS (a subsidiary organization of the general international intergovernmental organization named the United Nations) in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC). He expressed reservations against UNOPS approving a project in the DRC, which UNOPS negotiated directly with the prime minister.

The government of the Democratic Republic of the Congo was going to finance the general organization named the United Nations (UNOPS) to implement on its behalf a project worth \$25 million. After the government of the Democratic Republic of the Congo deposits the money into the UN bank account, the United Nations will withdraw its administrative fee, and then it will use its procurement rules to justify waiving open competition and recruit a line ministry within the DRC government to implement the project, redepositing the remaining funds back into the DRC government's bank account minus the UN fee. The DRC government does not have to justify in its own financial books how this money was spent because it was converted into a non-audit item. Afterwards, the government line ministry that received the payment becomes accountable to the United Nations. And since each UN agency runs its own legal and auditing house, it is easy to fix the paperwork to make everything legally clean. The project involved opening 2000 km of roads with bridges and culverts in 2 years in the eastern Congo (a war zone area).

When the US national reported the irregularities in this project to his supervisors, they informed him that the organization would review the situation and take appropriate action. Then his supervisors gave him two choices: wait until his contract expires to go home or accept to temporarily relocate to Sudan. He was also told by his supervisor(s) that if he succeeds in growing the Sudan office in Sudan, the organization will help him achieve his career goal of becoming a UN Resident Coordinator. UNOPS signed the project with the government of the DRC, which was negotiated after his departure for Sudan.

However, a few months later, the project was cancelled, and the United Nations returned the money back to the government.

In Sudan, the US national committed the same mistake he did in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. This mistake was prioritizing the work program of the founding fathers of the UN over his self-interests. He objected to the decision of the Department for International Development (Dfid) [now called the Foreign Commonwealth & Development Office] of the British government to finance a project in Darfur worth 10 million euros, in which Dfid (the British government) wanted to bluntly violate the UN financial rules and regulations.

To avoid the financial loss that the United Nations (UNOPS) was going to incur in terms of administrative fees after DFID (the British) made it clear that it was not going to finance this project unless the conditions it was asking for were met, the supervisors of this US national placed him on administrative leave in 2015 to investigate a claim that they said was launched against him by one of his staff.

While on administrative leave and before UNOPS told this US national what charges were leveled against him or by whom, his supervisors informed him that the organization was restructuring and that it was not going to be using his services when his contract expires. However, in the same contract termination letter, the United Nations (UNOPS) invited this US national to apply to fill the position he was temporarily filling in Sudan, which was downgraded. Next, the United Nations Office for Project Services (UNOPS) administrators (i.e., his supervisors) sent the US national a letter informing him that the organization had cancelled the investigation. The United Nations did not tell the US national what charges were leveled against him, who filed a claim, interview him, or follow any of the UN rules and regulations in cases of misconduct while he was on administrative leave.

When the US national lost all hope of persuading his supervisors to reconsider, he filed an application in the United Nations courts seeking damages for libel, rather than for his termination. At the start of the legal proceeding, the UN judge asked the United Nations (UNOPS) to resolve this case with this US national outside the UN court. The

United Nations (UNOPS) made an offer to the US national, which also included regulating outstanding issues related to his pensions and health insurance, including offering him a new two-year retainer contract.

The US national refused the offer of the United Nations (UNOPS) because it did not include assisting him to pursue his career goal of becoming a UN Resident Coordinator, as was initially agreed. The court hearing proceeded. Surprisingly, the United Nations court system, after hearing all the details of the case, dismissed the filed application in 2017. The reason for the dismissal was justified on the basis of a rule that requires any staff member who rejects any decision made by the United Nations to submit his objection within 60 days.

To put it differently, the United Nations court dismissed the application of the US national and denied him the right to any claim because he did not question within 60 days the decision of the organization named "United Nations" placing him on administrative leave and waited until his supervisors informed him that they had cancelled the investigation to put into question his rights. Said differently, the mistake this US national made was his decision to practice tolerance as the preamble of the UN Charter counsels and not use his legal right to put into question why the organization named United Nations was placing him on administrative leave; it cost him his right to any claim! That is to say, had this US national exercised his legal rights (practiced intolerance), his chances to secure them would have been higher! In other words, the United Nations requires individuals to abandon tolerance in order to have any rights and instead encourages them to be intolerant!

The victors of WW2 granted the United Nations privileges and immunities. UN staff and individuals victimized by the United Nations cannot have their cases heard in civilian courts. All cases are heard in UN courts. This US national can go nowhere to claim his right as long as the victors of WW2 do not amend the UN Charter!

In 2022, a corruption ring involving UN managers who exploited the UN as a facade for their malicious activities was exposed and dismantled; these managers had targeted this same UN staff member who refused to prioritize his self-interests over the values outlined in

the UN Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights before. UN member states chose not to request the imprisonment of those UN managers alongside the UN judges who protected them; instead, they accepted the UN's decision to end the contract of those managers while allowing them to keep all their wealth, health insurance, and UN pensions. Likewise, instead of UN member states requesting that the United Nations Secretary General reopen the case of this UN staff member to ensure he is compensated for the suffering caused by his refusal to participate in their unethical schemes, they believe that allowing this intergovernmental organization to ignore the case will help preserve their own power, wealth, and status.

Throughout history, people with considerable power have been denying the weak right, and so the way the intergovernmental organization named the United Nations, and in particular, the judges of the UN courts handled this case, is not new. What is new, however, is that this case once again confirms the elusiveness of seeking shared values by assigning a formal intergovernmental organization, like the United Nations, the role of custodian of morality and human rights while its administrators simultaneously pursue their own personal development. Throughout history, kings or kingdoms were reverted to a simpler form when they allowed false teachers to manipulate institutions or whenever those false teachers disliked the outcome.

If everything is relative, the victors of WW2 should be aligned to face the same end that the US national had to yield to at the hands of the United Nations (organization) in the course of time and things. In other words, if the decision of the US national to prioritize the philosophical ideas that the victors of WW2 laid out at the end of this global war over his self-interests led to his reversal to a simpler form by the United Nations (organization), the outcome then signifies that this organization should be reverting the United States and the victors of WW2 to face the same end in the course of time and things.

The purpose of this work is to establish if the families/dynasties that control the United States (the custodians of the idea of freedom) and the families/dynasties that won WW2 (the custodians of the Anglosphere) could continue to transform the conditions and outcomes that matter to them while the administrators of the United Nations (the

organization) have converted this global council into a market to buy and sell that is not any different than the one Jesus found was taking place when he visited a temple. Alternatively, if those aforementioned powerful families/dynasties should amend the UN Charter, thus granting any person whom the general organization named the United Nations victimized the right to have his case heard in civil courts, in this way, it would be avoided that the United Nations (organization) continue to disintegrate their power until a new authority absorbs them and starts to build on top of their civilizing mission.

Special Note to All UN Member States

This work is a treatise. It is an inquiry into the potential causes that triggered the apparent failure of UN member states to prevent conflicts and to make future wars impossible after World War II.

This work was not prepared to criticize the social order that ensued in the aftermath of WW2 or any government that came to power in the aftermath of this global war. This work is also not intended to provide any UN member states with ideas on what their leaders, thinkers, or populace should be doing or not be doing to prevent conflicts or strengthen peace. Likewise, the purpose of this work is not to share a view on how to social engineer the world to give the best results, nor was it prepared to suggest what leaders or nations should do or not do to maintain their strength and stability.

The victors of WW2 (the families/dynasties that control the international order or the money supply of the world) granted rights to the international intergovernmental organization named the United Nations (UN) to be an economic operator and to provide economic, political, social, and cultural solutions in UN member states, while UN employees are enjoying immunities and privileges.

This work was prepared for the sole purpose of understanding whether or not the international intergovernmental organization named the United Nations could revert to a simpler form, the victors of WW2, in the same way the Catholic Church managed to revert the rulers of the Roman Empire to one. The main aim is to understand whether or not the victors of WW2 would be able to continue to solidify their power while the staff of the organization named United Nations are plundering, abusing their authority, denying people rights, and most importantly, violating the fundamental principles that this organization was created to help protect.

I am, therefore, trying to form an opinion on whether or not the families/dynasties who won WW2 could continue to maintain their strength and stability while UN systems are feeding part of their decision-making process or if the strategies that the UN systems are

determining and implementing on their behalf in UN member states could result in their resizing. Specifically, I want to know if the heirs of the families/dynasties who won WW2 could consolidate their wealth, power, and status while the international intergovernmental organization named the United Nations (along with international aid organizations, NGOs, charities, and all those who believe that they should dedicate themselves to the service of their neighbor) is using their awareness to put into question how natural and legal rights should be distributed instead of doing what the founding fathers of the UN suggested, which was to let governments provide parameters for everyday behavior only. The implications of letting the intergovernmental organization named United Nations promote that it was going to end poverty and injustice in all their forms by 2030 (or at any later date in the future), and most importantly, letting this authority be in charge of such a dossier on the maintenance of the security and power of the families/dynasties that won WW2 are also studied.

As the above shows, this work was prepared for the sole benefit of the victors of WW2 (the families/dynasties who control the international order or the money supply of the world) and their heirs, and its content should not be interpreted to mean that it was prepared for the attention of any person, society, government, monarch, or nation, or for the intention of criticizing anyone.

Furthermore, one should, while reading this book, bear in mind that the intentions of the author are not to discredit, appraise, or criticize any UN member state. Nor are the intentions of the author to criticize the performance of any UN member state, regime, government, or ideology, including who governments decide should live or die or whether mankind should go back to adopting pre-1945 political dogmas or continue to strengthen democracy.

In addition, it is very important that readers keep in mind while reading this book that the reason why certain regimes or certain countries are mentioned and others are not has nothing to do with the intention of the author to criticize the referenced or analyzed countries. The world is composed of 193 UN member states. This means there are today 193 different political (and economic) systems whose architectures do not resemble each other. In principle, all the UN

member states are supposed to be strengthening democracy and the rule of law using liberal interventionism or the self-determination philosophy that was prescribed in the international rule-based postwar world order that was laid out at the end of WW2, but no nation is doing it, including the United States (the principal custodian of those two philosophies). The only reason why certain countries (regimes) are mentioned and others are not is due to the author perceiving that the way the political, economic, social, and cultural culture of those mentioned countries captures better the issues and ideas that he (the author) wants to build his arguments upon. It is very important that readers who originate from countries mentioned in this work, such as Lebanon and others, know that it is not the intention of the author to discredit your countries, the people of those two countries, the past or present leaders, or the past or present politics adopted.

The author's goal is to show, as I said above, a view that could have a bearing on the reason for the failure of the victors of WW2 (the families/dynasties that control the international order or the money supply of the world) to prevent wars between nations, including the failure to make people surrender their freedom to cooperate based on the work program that was specified in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. The main aim is to provide to those powerful families/dynasties (and not the nations who won WW2 or UN member states) constructive criticism that, in the opinion of the author, they should not ignore if they do not want the fate that happened to the rulers of the Roman Empire to happen to them (i.e., their heirs).

The views expressed here are those of the author only and should not be interpreted as those of any organization that the author was affiliated with before or today.

Special Note to All Staff Members of the United Nations

An idea does not consist of physical matter. Ideas are visualizations. However, an organization is a legal entity (an artificial person) that real humans operate.

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

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

While reading this book, one should bear in mind that the author recognizes that many UN staff are wholeheartedly working at the United Nations (herein, the organization) to attain the goals specified in the UN Charter and that their efforts have made lots of constructive contributions to deepening peace and security in the world. The progress the United Nations (hereinafter the organization) has made to contribute to human development is impressive. The purpose of the author is not to discredit the efforts or achievements of the UN staff and, henceforth, the results they achieved to secure the goals stipulated in the preamble of the UN Charter.

On the other hand, it is important that UN staff also know that after the victors of WW2 (the families/dynasties that control the international order or the money supply of the world) approved that the United Nations (the organization) become an economic operator, its administrators are taking advantage of the idea of good to plunder, steal, launder money, accuse people erroneously, deny people rights, and most importantly, use the UN courts to destroy people's livelihoods, just as Ferdinand II, King of Aragon, and his wife Queen Isabella I of Castile were doing in the late 15th century/early 16th century in western Europe. Those bad apples at the UN (supervisors) are not able to balance their interests against the interests of the common good because they are not working in their roles to satisfy the best interests of society only but to deepen their own. The disregard and contempt that UN supervisors and UN judges are prompting could compel people to lose faith in this institution, thus deepening fear and want and justifying why we need to go back to cooperating based on pre-1945 political doctrines.

The purpose of this work is to understand if the victors of WW2 (the families/dynasties that control the international order or the money supply of the world) could prevent their collapse after they allowed the United Nations (hereinafter, the organization) to be operated in the same way people on the outside of the UN fence do.

Special Note to All People of Faith

This work is a treatise. It is an inquiry into the continuous denial of man of the ideas that are included in the biblical scriptures (which are different than the question of whether God created the universe or not) and man's ongoing search to explore new methods to improve connectedness, when in theory all the ideas that newborns are coming up with are nothing but a different way of saying what is already mentioned in religious scriptures.

The present work is exploring the impact of man's ongoing conviction that it is possible to rely on the ideas prescribed in the religious scriptures and, at the same time, let human imagination convince human ingenuity that it could escape from the danger that the scriptures say would happen to the person who thinks that he or she is exempt from the appeal that such scriptures tax. Said differently, the work is exploring the impact of man formulating continuous work programs that prioritize the idea of good and then thinking that the idea of good could be used to solidify one's own power without the person who is relying on such an idea having to enforce them on him (her) first.

Specifically, the work is examining the impact of man's decision (i.e., human imagination) to diminish the role of religiosity as a tool for controlling behavior in the aftermath of World War II, allowing technology (machinery) to take on the majority of the responsibility. In this regard, and if we are to consider that in theory there is no difference between having a machine deny a person a right and having a real person do it (i.e., enforce the law), the author is trying to understand if the moral degradation that the world would be knowing consequent to man stopping to use human reason as a principal interlocutor to improve well-being would help the families/dynasties that control the international order or the money supply of the world (i.e., the victors of World War 2) to maintain their strength and stability, or if it would revert them to a simpler form. In other words, the author is trying to understand if the decision of the victors of World War II to undermine the values that are included in the religious

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

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

In publications in which the Prophet Muhammad (upon him be peace and blessings) is mentioned, Muslim writers follow his name by the phrase 'upon him be peace and blessings.' Whenever I mention the name of the Prophet Muhammad (upon him be peace and blessings), I do not include this phrase in this work. Readers who adhere to Muslim faith should understand that it is assumed and that no disrespect is intended.

Definitions

The victors of WW2 (or powerful families, or most powerful families, or families/dynasties who won WW2, or families/dynasties who control the international order and the money supply of the world, or elite families/dynasties): This word shall refer to the group of men who stand to lose the most if their wealth, power, or status is taken away from them and placed in the hands of another group. This group of men exercises their power by presiding over the money supply of the world and the international order. In other words, this group of men owns and controls the system that determines the value of money, ensuring that no transactions occur on any operating platforms except for the one controlled by its members. To perceive how this group exercises its control over the world, one must regard its members as being nothing other than the people who own and administer the wire that feeds electricity into homes from the street. People would be living in darkness if they did not connect to this wire to have light. In theory, the members of this club can only be the families/dynasties that preside over the different religions; hence, no authority can outlive the authority of the group of people who rely on the idea of good (i.e., the idea of God) as a tool to solidify their power. The elites (the families/dynasties that control the international order or the money supply of the world) preserve their power through the rich countries, or the five permanent nations of the UN Security Council.

Five permanent nations of the UN Security Council: This word shall refer to the countries that provide legal functionality for the architecture that the elite families/dynasties that won WW2 want every member of the human family to respect. In other words, those five nations are the countries that legitimize the social contract (natural and legal rights) that the victors of WW2 want all people to respect. In principle, those five countries are a group of rich and poor nations that the families/dynasties that won WW2 want other societies to consider their opinions before taking action of their own. The families/dynasties that control the five permanent nations of the UN Security Council are not necessarily the families/dynasties that control the international order and the money supply of the world.

Rich nations (rich countries): This word shall refer to the countries that provide financial functionality for the architecture that the elite families/dynasties that won WW2 want every member of the human family to respect. In other words, they are the countries that own the companies through which most of the world's trading is handled as well. Until the end of WW2, those countries were based in Western Europe, and the families/dynasties that won WW2 used to make those countries their home bases. The principal job of the government in those rich nations is to induce the atmosphere that will determine which market is to fall and which one is to grow, which nation is to be engulfed in a civil war, and which country is to stay in peace. In other words, they pull the strings and levers that determine which nation has power or wealth and which one is engulfed in instability.

Nations that won WW2: This word shall refer to the western European monarchs and republics. It was the Old Powers (the western European monarchs and republics) who fought during WW1 and WW2, and they were the ones who won those two global wars. In real life, no society, kingdom, or nation that waged a war and won gave its spoils to another society or kingdom. In addition, the Western European monarchs and kingdoms started working to build wealth, power, and status at the start of the 2nd millennium and did not start to build military before WW1 or WW2 erupted. This work regards the role of the United States as the global policeman of the world, a functional role delegated to it by the families and dynasties that control the monarchs and republics in Western Europe. In other words, the United States is fronting on behalf of the families/dynasties that control the western European monarchies and republics, just as law enforcement agents front for the families/dynasties that control governments in any country.

Banks, large financial institutions, or corporations: This word shall refer to the legal organizations that the rich nations depend on to ensure that people are routing the money that created things through such service providers. Governments regulate the power of banks, large institutions, or corporations, and vice versa. All the wealth that banks, large institutions, or corporations gain comes from investment in research financed by governments.

Governments: This word shall refer to the structure (legal entity) that determines and enforces the natural and legal rights that people legitimize. Banks, large institutions, or corporations regulate the power of governments, and vice versa. All the wealth that any nation acquires gets determined by the families/dynasties that won WW2 through the rich nations. In other words, the families/dynasties that won WW2 decide which country to inject money into to increase its productivity, might, etc., and which country to build within it or next to it (i.e., in a neighboring country) competitors to weaken its government and impoverish its people. The families/dynasties make this decision based on how the balance of power is shifting within a nation and between nations as a function of progress.

Global policemen of the world: This word shall refer to the United States. In this work, the United States is not regarded as a member of the club of rich nations or the powerful families/dynasties that won WW2. The United States is viewed as a satellite state that the rich countries and the powerful families/dynasties control. In the aftermath of WW2, the families/dynasties that won this global war took on the global policeman responsibility that Great Britain was playing until 1945 and delegated its functionality to the United States. The job of the United States, acting as the global policeman, is to ensure that the social model desired by the families and dynasties that won WW2 is adopted in various UN member states in the aftermath of the war. This social model was summarized in the work program stipulated in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

Leading by example: The phrase “leading by example” shall refer to two relations: political and economic. The political meaning shall refer to cooperation based on the principles set forth in the UN Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. The economic meaning shall not refer herein to the readiness of the industrialized nations (the Italians, the Norwegians, the Germans, the British, the Americans, the Chinese, the French, the Russians, etc.) to follow the legal procurement rules during the implementation of projects. Rather, the economic meaning of the word “leading by example” shall refer to the preparedness of the rich and industrialized nations to ensure that no newborn stays idle. This can only happen when the industrialized nations and the rich nations recognize that all that people do on earth is

create material things to improve basic social services (water, health, and food), transportation, and communication, and that there is a vast empty space on earth that, if exploited and inhabited, would make fewer people live in fear and want. This shall mean that industrialized nations give the nations whose people are idle the blueprint (technology) that can show them how to build tunnel boring machines, pile driving machines, etc., to enable them to interconnect mountains or explore the sea (build submarines, roads on the surface of the sea to interconnect the world through such a network, build tall buildings in the middle of the sea, build large boats, etc.), thus preoccupying them with building instead of being devoted to stripping them of their power.

United States: All references to the word “United States” in this book could mean (i) the United States, as a philosophical idea as penned in the US Constitution about how “all men having been created equal” by the founding fathers of this country, which they named the United States; and (ii) the territory located in North America, which is known as the United States, and whose inhabitants depend on the idea “of all men having been created equal” to get their ways despite the resistance of others. This idea that the founders of the United States penned about “all men having been created equal” is the final axiom in man’s ongoing search to enhance morality. Its power to help mankind strengthen the idea of good was incomparable from 1776 to 1945. This idea enabled the American people to develop an understanding of themselves unprecedented in the history of the world. If American culture were endangered, later generations could not prosper. Any criticism or compliment expressed shall not mean the need to have this country promote nationalistic ideas intended to deepen the hegemony of this country over the international order, but rather to maintain the understanding that the American people have gained of themselves as compared to other societies around the world. This is because it is this understanding (awareness) that led them to be in favor of the idea that the WW2 war aims be to secure that all people live free from fear and want, instead of being in favor of extending domination.

PREFACE

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

1

The Impact of Awareness on Global Order

Many scholars have expressed different opinions about what could have helped the patriots develop resistance or gain the support needed to split from the British Crown to create the United States. I consider that the declaration the patriots penned at the start of the American Revolutionary period about all men having been “created equal” made the difference.

If from as far back as the progressive era there are “furtive conspiratorial cabals of internationalists, greedy bankers, and corrupt politicians” who are part of a master conspiracy to create “a one-world socialist government” that the UN would act as its common political authority, then those powerful elites have to be programming to assure the continuity of their interests by orienting the psychological or philosophical perception of people (or nations) toward an idea that would be as powerful as the declaration the patriots penned at the start of the American Revolutionary period.

For example, from 1887 to 1937, the British Empire was holding a series of conferences aimed at creating closer ties between the colonies and the United Kingdom.¹ The purpose of those meetings was to emphasize imperial unity, but experts claim that as time went on, the conferences became “a key forum for dominion governments to assert the desire for removing the remaining vestiges of their colonial status.”²

1 https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Imperial_Conference

2 https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Imperial_Conference#Notable_meetings

All the deliberation that humans contemplate contains tangible and intangible aims, explicit and implicit aims, or positive and negative aims. It would be naïve to assume that the British Empire did not study possible ways to assure the continuity of the overall power or authority of the dominion. Empires grow in power to a certain extent, expand, and then gradually disintegrate and collapse. Empires have typically concluded in two ways: either by merging with another expanding empire or through collapse and a return to a simpler form. Toward the end of the 19th century / start of the 20th century, the British Empire was not suffering from either prognosis. Therefore, it would be truly naïve to assume that the British Empire did not study possible ways to delay the fate or collapse of its authority.

If, at the end of the 19th century / start of the 20th century, the decision makers in the United Kingdom were hiding implicit interests to assure the continuity of their colonialist mindset, they would have had to choose between two alternatives: The first had to be to continue to rely on employing the same pre-colonial methods that were in use to assure the continuity of their interests. The second should have been to employ a mental construct that would allow the empire to continue to have a monopoly without the idea or belief that the rest of the people or nations would be united around this kingdom, making them perceive that they are being dominated.

If decision makers in Great Britain were hiding implicit interests to assure the continuity of their colonialist mindset, I cannot imagine how those individuals could have recommended relying on continuing to use pre-colonial methods to assure the continuity of their authority. In 1905, Otto Hahn (1879 – 1968), a German chemist, discovered a new substance he called radiothorium, which at that time was believed to be a new radioactive element.³ This work that Hahn produced paved the way for scientists to know that an atom could be split, and thus, until 1938, when Hahn managed to split the atom, which is a process that is needed to produce a nuclear bomb, most scientists were racing to find out who would be the first to reach this scientific breakthrough.

Therefore, since it was only a matter of time before the nations who were racing to figure out who would be the first at producing a nuclear

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

bomb, thus making it very difficult for a given nation to impose itself on others, it makes more sense to assure the continuity of Great Britain's colonialist interests through using a mental construct. If the mental construct is tied to a milestone that most people cannot deny its importance to creating world peace, then it would be very impossible for a nation that imposes itself to rely on the balance of power to get its own way. In other words, the people's engulfment around the idea would make it very difficult for any country to gain enough military power to dominate all others. Moreover, the futurists who lived during the imperial conferences also considered how the post-industrialization era might look, knowing that disruptive technologies would eliminate many jobs. Therefore, the fear of Great Britain and the other old powers of finding themselves possessing powers or knowledge that they could not employ to administer the poor nations was worrying them. In other words, Great Britain and the rest of the Western European powers could not produce light bulbs or sewing machines and limit their use in Great Britain, Denmark, or the Netherlands only. If the people or nations that Great Britain was dominating at the start of the 20th century are brought on board to cooperate to pursue a noble idea, there isn't a more effective way to assure the continuity of the interests of the families who are in positions of power in Great Britain indefinitely.

I cannot imagine that there exists a better psychological or philosophical idea that the decision makers in Great Britain could have come up with to assure the continuity of their interests than to apply a logic that would be intended to observe perpetual commitment to deepen fraternity or social connectedness. This is exactly how the people who justify that our disasters and calamities are due to our unwillingness to cooperate based on the philosophies that they claim God counseled have been maintaining their powers and authority since they began to diffuse such ideas.

A person cannot be in two places at all the time. If all the British Crown can aspire to gain from the territories that this empire was dominating or administering is that its authority does not decline and fall, including counting on the cooperation of the people who are living in those territories to assure loyalty or remain faithful in the event the British Crown is attacked, there isn't a better strategy that

this kingdom could pursue to secure that its central representative authority remain indeterminately active than to recognize the evolution of the dominions of the empire into separate, self-governing countries within a commonwealth of nations and to engage the people in all those independent realms to dedicate themselves to pursuing policies related to transparency, civil liberties, economic freedom, education, etc.

If, according to Welch, powerful interests are conspiring to weaken the US in order to create a “one world government” with the UN serving as its political authority, then these powerful individuals must also control the Western European nations. This scenario suggests that world elites were likely considering how to ensure the continuity of their power at the end of the 19th century and the beginning of the 20th century, similar to the strategies Great Britain was probably employing to prevent their interests from declining.

If, at the end of the 19th century / start of the 20th century, those powerful elites were conducting exercises similar to the ones that the British Empire was holding from 1887 to 1937 to study possible ways to assure the continuity of their power, then I cannot imagine that there was a better alternative from among all the ones that they were studying, and they had to pick one from them than to endorse life-changing values to maintain their central authority.

"Top-down" and "bottom-up" are two strategies of information processing and knowledge ordering used in a variety of fields, including software and humanistic and scientific theories.⁴ The top-down approach “starts with the big picture. It breaks down from there into smaller segments.” A bottom-up approach “is the piecing together of systems to give rise to more complex systems, thus making the original systems sub-systems of the emergent system.”

If decision makers in Great Britain were hiding implicit interests to assure the continuity of their colonialist mindset, we can say that the breaking down of the British Empire into separate, self-governing countries within a commonwealth of nations and engaging the people

4 https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Top-down_and_bottom-up_design

in all those independent realms to dedicate themselves to pursuing life-changing values was a top-down strategy.

On the other hand, if Welch's claim is accurate that powerful interests are conspiring to weaken the US in order to create a “one-world government” with the UN serving as its common political authority, then these powerful individuals are actively piecing together systems to form more complex structures. In other words, they are pursuing the opposite of what the British Empire is pursuing to assure the continuity of its interests, and this is a bottom-up approach.

From a cognitive psychological or philosophical perspective, the most successful bottom-up ordering approach that “makes the original systems a sub-system of the emergent system” is religion. Religion is a type of information processing system based on incoming data from the environment to form a perception. For example, all the religions integrate responsibilities that deal with encouraging compassion and justice for the neighbor. This idea of showing love for the neighbor is one of the foundational criteria that, on its basis, the people who dedicate themselves to the service of God depend on to make people surrender freedom to obtain power afterward.

If, as per what Welch claimed, there are powerful interests who are conspiring to weaken the US to create a “one-world government” that the UN would act as its common political authority, then this group has to be emulating a methodology that is not any different than the one the people who dedicate themselves to the service of God depend on to make people surrender freedom. I cannot think of any life-changing value that this powerful group could be advocating, which has the power to “make the original systems sub-systems of the emergent system,” other than emphasizing the importance of the need to reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights.

The declaration that is penned in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights about “All human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights” emphasizes a milestone that is not any different in complexity than the teaching that Jesus Christ was commanding when he was

asking people to love one's enemies.⁵ The human rights doctrine proclaimed by the nations that won World War II could have served as a lure or orientation for this powerful group to entice all existing nations to relinquish their freedom in order to achieve the goals outlined in the preamble of the UN Charter.

For two thousand years now, different newborns have been trying to "love their enemy" as Jesus Christ commanded, and the majority have failed. In the meantime, people managed to see the Roman Empire collapse and the Catholic Church rise. Those powerful people that Welch claimed are plotting to create a "one world government" that the UN acts as its common political authority may very well be programmed to have this association of nations play the same role that the early church's missionaries served to convert pagans, gentiles, and Jews to abandon their beliefs and adopt the Christian faith. Ultimately, when the industrialized nations are weakened, it will become much easier to incorporate all the UN member states into the expanding power of the UN. This scenario could also explain why there was a big emphasis in the UN charter to control armament production while allowing knowledge to be freely disseminated and not withheld as was done pre-1945.

Indeed, there is no better way to get to what one wants than to achieve this objective through employing psychological or philosophical controls, such as manipulating public perception or promoting specific ideologies that align with their goals. If we consider how many people throughout history have used ideas to gain significant influence, it becomes clear that the group Welch claimed is working to create a "one-world government" could eventually achieve their goal if they are determined enough. I think the question that needs to be answered, if this group exists, is whether their successors would be able to consolidate power and maintain a line of succession similar to that of monarchs.

In other words, numerous religions emerged after the founding of Christianity or the death of Jesus in 33 AD. The early church missionaries managed to transform this new Christian faith into one of

5 <https://www.biblegateway.com/passage/?search=Matthew+5%3A43-48&version=NIV>

the world's dominant religions. During the past 2000 years, many religions were born, and then they declined and were abolished, often influenced by sociopolitical factors, cultural shifts, and the rise of competing belief systems. The question I believe needs to be answered is not whether the group that Welch claimed was working to create a "one-world government" would eventually achieve their goal, but rather if their successors would be able to fulfill this goal and control the UN, allowing it to evolve through history in the same way that the early church missionaries transformed the Christian faith into one of the world's dominant religions. In parallel, if this group were to be able to maintain power in the same way the British monarchy, for example, is capable of tracing its origin from a petty kingdom in the 10th century to a vast empire in 1921, or 1000 years later.

For example, one of the resolutions that was passed during the 1907 Imperial Conference included ceasing to refer to self-governing British colonies such as Canada or Australia as colonies and conferring upon them dominion status.⁶ The British Crown (or the Westminster system) continues to include the nations that received dominion status during this Imperial conference. The British government prevents Commonwealth nations from developing militarily to ensure people in its remaining territories do not challenge the kingdom's central authority. The question that I believe needs to be answered is whether the British Crown can continue to maintain the political association that this country has upheld for 1000 years, while also promoting the idea that everyone should foster human rights to create an egalitarian world.

In the book *The Prince*⁷, Machiavelli claims that the degree of difficulty and danger in trying to liberate people who are satisfied with their slavery is the same as when trying to enslave free people. Machiavelli cautions about mixing principles. He claims that the people who change their state or condition "find afterwards by experience that they have gone from bad to worse." Machiavelli claimed that those people who change their condition find that they are "deceiving themselves."

6 https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/1907_Imperial_Conference

7 <https://www.victoria.ac.nz/lals/about/staff/publications/paul-nation/Prince-Adapted2.pdf>

I have no way of knowing how long people in different nations can continue to support the two psychological and philosophical ideas that they have been caught between since 1945 and that they need to cope with. On one hand, the UN advocates for the importance of fostering human rights to create an egalitarian world, while on the other hand, standing governments emphasize the necessity of surrendering freedom to maintain peace and security. What I do know is that until the outbreak of WW2 in 1939, nations dominated each other by denying each other knowledge. The technologically and militarily superior nations used to control the survival needs and earthly desires of less advanced nations by withholding technical and financial assistance to gain advantage. Post 1945, the nations who are technologically and militarily superior are relying on the same power differential criteria to gain advantage. Post-1945, those powerful nations are using the same methods they used pre-1945 to control the less prepared nations' military. The only difference is that after 1945, the disadvantaged or poor nations are no longer referred to as having a colonial status; instead, they are now described as having an independent or decolonized status. We also have UN member states inject money to have the UN and development aid agencies teach people why they need to stop with being tolerant to create an egalitarian world, as this process is seen as a necessary step to empower these nations and reduce the influence of powerful nations over them.

Machiavelli claims that when a country "submits to a new prince, the new dependent people have to support his army and suffer infinite other hardships, which the prince must put upon his new acquisition." He then claims that "the political leaders in that conquered country would not only have enemies in all those whom they have injured to get to their authority, but they also would not be able to keep those friends who put them there because they cannot satisfy them in the way they expected." Most importantly, Machiavelli claims, "Although one may be very strong in armed forces, yet in entering a state, one always needs the cooperation of the local people."

I do not know how the UN member states expect to control the local people after they inserted the UN to strengthen their awareness about

the need for why they need to stop putting up with the cruel treatment of the rich and the agents that the rich place in government or in positions of power. Machiavelli claims that this task is much easier when the displacement is happening between two cultures that maintain the same values or language. However, when the case involves differences in language, customs, or laws, there are difficulties, and good fortune and great energy are needed to bridge these gaps and foster mutual understanding among the local people and the UN representatives.

It was not established yet that when a nation fosters human rights, including allowing such programming to be handled by an agent who would reside with local people, it creates conditions of stability and well-being. So far, the nations where the UN encouraged people to abandon their customs or laws in favor of modernized behavior have become more insecure.

The purpose of granting poor nations independence post-1945 was to allow mankind to rely on human reason to find peaceful solutions, not to make them insecure or extend the pre-1945 political order beyond this cutoff date. The United States did not propose ceasing to refer to the poor nations as “colonized nations” and conferring upon them “decolonized” status while continuing to dominate them as was the case pre-1945. If nations continue to depend on their military superiority to obtain their way, including continuing to impose sanctions or blockades as they have been doing to control the people who are threatening their interests, such behavior could plunge humanity into uncertainty worse than the one Orwell depicted would come to pass in 1949 in the novel he titled 1984. The large number of individuals who have died since 1945 while supporting a cause demanded by an external party serves as evidence of this issue. In 1945, only one nation possessed weapons of mass destruction (WMD), but now we supposedly have 3,750 active nuclear warheads; many nations are aiming at each other, and that does not include the inventory of other types of WMD.

The uncertain times plus the defiance that people in certain nations are expressing even after their leaders are forced to step down is scary. People's growing knowledge does not lead to individuals with a

complete understanding of themselves, who would be ready to surrender freedom for the protection of their remaining rights; instead, it emphasizes the importance of instituting relationships that prioritize equal rights. This conduct is very serious and worrisome because when people are prioritizing equal rights, it is not possible to organize societies or countries in an international order. The insecurity and confusion that emerged in all nations after 1945 make it much easier for internationalists, greedy bankers, and politicians—whom Welch accused of betraying the United States—to establish the socialistic global government Welch warned about, which undermines national sovereignty and individual freedoms.

A nation's withdrawal from international affairs or its sanctioning and prevention from international trade makes no difference. In either case, such actions could trigger mass immigration, economic decline, and moral degradation. Such events would then provoke political crises if the wealthier people in the country stopped supporting the standing government. Such a scenario would lead to social unrest, national division, and up to even a civil war. The more UN member states become stateless, the more the UN's role in the country that experienced a civil war would grow. As the UN's role in any country grows, the power elites that Welch claimed are working to create a one-world government, with the UN serving as its common political authority, will move closer to realizing their objective.

No one knows if the collapse of the Soviet Union, the civil wars that emerged post-WW2, and all the growing dissatisfaction that emerged post-1945 are precursors to creating this step-by-step common political authority that Welch was adamantly against. However, it appears that the world elites, whom Welch accused of conspiring to establish a global socialistic government, must first manage the rising trend of ethical egoism in various countries before they can advance toward their objective. The nations with middle or small powers do not want to consider the opinions of the nations with great powers before taking actions on their own. Newer families seem to be competing to exercise control of the money supply of the world instead of the traditional ones that existed in the aftermath of WW2. Even children are disregarding the potential role their parents could play in their upbringing, as they

begin to believe that the virtual reality they experience while using computers is equivalent to real-life experiences.

“Not everything is what it seems” is a quote that means that it is so easy to think that we know everything about a situation and we have everything under control, but the outcome could later prove to be only temporary. Two scenarios could have prompted the dissatisfaction that emerged in the world post 1945. The first could be due to the world elites that Welch claimed are plotting to mount a socialistic global government underestimating the impact of having the UN teach people to foster human rights on the number of people whom this teaching would awaken so they would all, at the same time, be concerned with expressing or pursuing ethical egoism to create an egalitarian world. In other words, those power elites were expecting that the UN teaching would increase production and consumerism, and it would not awaken a large number of people who would be dedicated to pursuing ethical egoism. The second scenario could be due to those same world elites underestimating the fragility of the human will and its ineptitude to surrender freedom to abide by a given social order when we live in a world that, so far, the only permanent thing in it has been change.

“Change” occurs in nature. Mankind was not granted the right to control how living and nonliving things change. If human nature has not changed from pre- and post-1945, it looks as if the decision of the UN and the political leaders who succeeded the architect of the postwar international order to change the work program that the initial architects proposed from one that aims to establish relations intended to maintain international peace to one that focuses on interfering in the political and economic preparedness of each other and fostering human rights, delivering humanitarian aid, promoting sustainable development, etc. could be what created this growing dissatisfaction that emerged in the social realm post-1945.

It looks as if the power elites that Welch claimed are working on mounting a socialistic global government have two conflicting challenges that would always produce a zero net gain after the UN and the political leaders who succeeded the founding fathers of the UN changed the principal mission of this association of nations from one that was intended to maintain international peace to one that is

identical to what the Salvation Army⁸ started serving in 1865. First they need to figure out how to stop people in rich and poor nations from pursuing ethical egoism to achieve the same type of living standards. Second, they need to ensure that both rich and poor nations remain insecure in order for the UN to expand within its member states, making it possible to transition to a single state that exercises authority over the entire world.

Actually, the challenge that is confronting mankind after the UN and the political leaders who succeeded the initial architects of the UN changed the purpose of the democratic institutions that the founding leaders managed to create and counseled on how they should be used to maintain international peace and security to ones that are intended to foster human rights to pursue equality is that this change makes the purpose of those social structures start serving a different goal than the one they were initially created to serve. In other words, the democratic institutions created by the architect of the postwar international order were intended to teach people tolerance, rather than to teach people to exhibit behavioral patterns aimed at ensuring all members of the human family achieve the same living standards. This change that the UN and the political leaders who succeeded the initial architects of the UN made amounts to making something become something else, which is very serious and worrisome.

This development makes Welsh's concern about the existence of a secretive group who are working to betray the US sovereignty secondary as compared to the new one that the UN and the political 'leaders' who succeeded the founding fathers of the UN created in the world when they began to teach people to exhibit behavioral patterns intended to lift every member of the human family to achieve the same living standards. This conclusion is because the patterns that humans need to exhibit to achieve the same living standards are not the same types that humans exhibit when they practice tolerance.

The patterns that humans need to exhibit to achieve the same living standards require that a person become dynamic. This requirement means that a person needs to be accelerating the rate at which he is changing matter. The increased number of cases of delinquencies that

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

emerged post-1945 could be a result of the accelerated rate at which people started to change matters. The situation is again very serious and worrisome.

If the rate at which people enter the social order (through matter change or newborns) differs from the rate at which people leave (through death), we will accumulate harmful patterns, as humans can freeze social space and accumulate material wealth. We can't tell if the patterns we create help or harm society, so we might be doomed.

The blueprint that the founding fathers of the UN counseled we follow post-1945 to attain the ends set forth in the UN Charter necessitates that every member of the human family practice tolerance. If UN member states continue to support the idea that the UN and development aid agencies should elevate every individual to the same living standards, this work program will increasingly discourage people from being resilient and committed to pursuing social justice. The more people become devoted to pursuing social justice, the more drastic measures governments will be obliged to take to maintain peace and security under control. The more drastic measures governments take to maintain peace and security, the more likely it is that the democratic institutions, which our former political leaders claimed were established after World War II to ensure that every member of the human family could live free from fear and want, will be exploited by those who operate these social structures to dominate and subjugate the populace. If the continued intolerance that people are exhibiting post-1945 leads governments to be tyrannical to control peace and security, most people would be required to accept the obligation imposed on them because they would have no freedom.

Perhaps Welch saw an absolute need to stall the UN and the development aid agencies from continuing to push people to a state of anarchy, which would make it much easier for the power elites that he said are working to mount a socialistic global government to reach their goal. Evidently, when people live under a tyrannical government, their struggle to regain civil and political rights begins.

We cannot know if the power elites that Welch claimed are working to mount a socialistic global government exist or whether they are

running scenarios and simulations on the challenges and obstacles they would have to resolve if they are, indeed, working toward erecting a global government that exercises authority over the entire world. Louis Dearborn L'Amour (1908–1988) was an American novelist and short-story writer who said, "A ship does not sail with yesterday's wind."⁹ If those power elites truly exist, they should be aware that there is no longer a remedy to achieve their goal if ethical egoism is permitted to continue to grow. This statement also signifies that the more ethical egoism is permitted to spread or grow in the social order, the greater the chances that the new postwar international system that the UN member states and the UN are both cooperating to attain may end up becoming a totally different social order from the one the exiting nations expressed readiness to cooperate to pursue during WW2. Because change is the only permanent truth in our world, the only remedy to control the international order is either to return to the work program established by the UN's founding fathers—since tolerance is not a threat but impatience is—or to let world events dictate the actions that only unwise men would take.

Human behavior did not change pre- and post-1945. The western European nations that colonized the poor nations until 1939, or when WW2 is regarded as having started, are the same ones that control international affairs post this global war. It would be anti-logic to assume that those nations accepted to break up their monopoly or control, so nations started to cooperate on the aftermath of WW2 to create equal living standards whereby we would have, as the case is now, 7.6 billion people who are all working to realize the full development of their personalities when competition is natural. If their goal was to create this scenario or social order, why then do they not stand up against the United States to stop this country from being an obstacle ahead of the nations that want to possess a nuclear weapon?

It appears that UN member states have two options regarding work programs that outline how to organize the international order. The first work program's agenda focuses on demonstrating behavioral patterns that align with the proposals made by the architect of the postwar international order to achieve the goals outlined in the UN Charter.

9 <https://www.goodreads.com/quotes/977436-a-ship-does-not-sail-with-yesterday-s-wind>

This first work program stipulates that existing nations must come together to practice tolerance, which will ultimately enable governments to prioritize a plan ensuring that all people have access to water supplies, food, and mates. Once the needs of most people for water supplies, food, and mates are met, they can rely on their understanding to determine how to allocate wealth, power, prestige, and fame proportionally among the global population. This work program to succeed requires that people collaborate with one another based on the principles of equal rights at all times. The second work program involves ensuring that people continue to exhibit behavioral patterns that align with the ambitions of the UN and the political leaders who succeeded the architect of the postwar international order, which include promoting global cooperation and sustainable development initiatives. The second work program aims to elevate the living standards of every member of the human family to equality. In other words, the goal is to ensure that the entire world population has access to necessary resources such as water, food, and partners, as well as the means to accumulate wealth, power, prestige, and fame.

Hence, it would be illogical to assume that Great Britain, the US, or the other nations from WWII proposed creating a new international organization to achieve, on their behalf, what they perceive as their interests (if they wanted to avoid weakening their strength and stability); we could say that we have two work programs to choose from to stabilize the international order. The founding fathers of the UN proposed a work program, and the UN and its member states are currently united in pursuing a new program, believing it could ultimately be achieved by 2030.

A maze is a path or collection of paths, typically from an entrance to a goal.¹⁰ The pathways and walls in a maze are “typically fixed, but puzzles in which the walls and paths can change also exist.” The natural and built environments are constantly changing. Human behavior is a property that is like matter, is continually changing. I have no way of knowing if the new work program, which the UN and its member states have united around to achieve equal living standards for all by 2030 or beyond, is an action that would subject mankind to navigate challenges in a manner similar to personal travel through a

10 <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Maze>

maze. In Greek mythology, it is reported that the legendary Daedalus built a labyrinth (a maze) for King Minos of Crete at Knossos to hold the monster Minotaur.¹¹ According to the legend, Daedalus built the Labyrinth so that the Minotaur could barely escape it.

I have no way of knowing if the UN and the political leaders making decisions at the UN are legitimizing ambitions similar to those in the UN SDG or understand the path that would lead us to achieve those goals. However, the convoluted patterns that emerged suggest many UN member states are rethinking the postwar international order, especially after the Sept. 2001 attacks. Accordingly, several nations seem to prefer adopting political positions that prioritize isolationism. This situation is once again serious and worrisome because as more nations support an isolationist stance, this philosophy increasingly serves the world powers that Welch claimed are conspiring to weaken the US in order to create a “one world government,” with the UN acting as its common political authority. A nation that isolates itself inevitably experiences internal disintegration. This approach facilitates a smooth collapse and eliminates the need for nations to go to war to assert dominance over one another.

However, not every impossible scenario will occur, and vice versa, the future organization of nations could include unthinkable scenarios. The existing nations may choose to establish a new postwar international system that could be completely different from both the current world governance system and the one that Welch claimed some global elites are attempting to create.

The Walking Drum is a novel that Louis L’Amour published in 1984. This book is about a young man who flees his birthplace to seek his lost father. This young man travels from place to place in search of his disappeared father. Throughout his entire journey, he finds himself in the roles of slave, pirate, scholar, physician, merchant, alchemist, and other jobs, which are all helping him to seek knowledge and fortune, including learning about dazzling wonders. Most importantly, the various roles that this young man adopted immersed him in treachery, passion, violence, danger, excitement, adventure, and revenge.

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

People need to cope and work around challenges to increase their happiness, just as the main character in Louis L'Amour's novel *The Walking Drum* did while searching for his missing father. If the political leaders who succeeded the founding fathers of the UN want all 7.6 billion people to stop being content with what they have and to be devoted to exhibiting behavioral patterns that foster human rights in order to create an egalitarian world by 2030, this scenario indicates that worrying about the fate of US sovereignty is secondary to focusing on the bigger picture, as I mentioned earlier. We need to focus on predicting how the international order might change as more people live longer or become fully committed to achieving the same living standards. Would our successors be able to organize under an international order if more people express distrust in standing governments than they do now? How will our world change when more people think they should help shape their governments? If peace and security continue to deteriorate, would our successors choose to create the fictional world that Orwell and other authors depicted in order to avoid a global war and implement necessary changes?

No one knows how people will be organized in the future. However, if the distrust that people are expressing with their governments continues to grow, there is a good chance that governments could start to control or monitor people's behavior beyond the standard surveillance methods, such as the cameras that are mounted on streetlights in most cities¹² or the information that is collected from the internet and electronic communications¹³ that people make. Governments could begin to neutralize the human body and behavior of individuals who argue or act against the social order by controlling essential tools such as credit cards, vehicles, and bank accounts that people rely on to sustain their livelihoods. In so doing, the government would be granting authorization to people to sustain their livelihood in the same way.

The guards who manage the penitentiary detention system do this. In the field of physical security, access control is authorized, allowing

12 <https://qz.com/1458475/the-dea-and-ice-are-hiding-surveillance-cameras-in-streetlights/>

13 <https://computer.howstuffworks.com/government-see-website.htm>

only designated individuals to enter secure areas and ensuring the safety of both personnel and assets.

Imprisonment is a form of punishment that is used to reform offenders, but it often raises questions about its effectiveness and the conditions within the prison system that can impact rehabilitation. The use of prisons “can be traced back to the rise of the state as a form of social organization.”¹⁴ In prisons, prisoners' mobility is controlled at all times. According to the US National Institute of Justice, about 68 percent of 405,000 prisoners released in 30 states in 2005 were arrested for a new crime within three years of their release, and 77 percent faced arrest within five years.¹⁵ Likewise, if history is any guide, the countries that controlled the actions of their citizens, banned individuality, or discouraged free thinking should have managed to increase their stability, but their efforts did not help to formulate new social behavior. This evidence signifies that the likelihood of governments managing to control behaviors using physical security is highly unlikely.

If the implementation of physical and information security measures has a limited effect on formulating new social behaviors, then the more governments rely on these measures to regulate behaviors, the more likely it is that the practical knowledge gained by abusers or enforcers could counteract the desired change due to the influence of these measures on actions.

People's actions are generally aimed at rejecting old methods in favor of new ones, and they believe that the practical concepts they are constantly pursuing are simultaneously increasing their happiness. This mental construct makes people continually become unprepared to be tolerant. This is because only when a person is intolerant or dynamic would he be able to upgrade his awareness. This concept also means that the more governments enhance the consciousness of their dependent people, the more governments would be, in so doing, educating or giving their citizens a reason why they should not remain tolerant.

14 <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Prison>

15 <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Recidivism>

If the more a person knows, the more his upgraded awareness provokes him to be intolerant or prompts a person to believe that when an individual rejects his old ways of doing things in favor of new methods, such a change increases his happiness. This theory signifies that if the UN and the political leaders who succeeded the founding fathers of the UN are fostering human rights to create an egalitarian world by 2030, then people's pursuit of happiness would be unyielding in the future.

Therefore, technology encourages people to assign roles that the human body could have naturally fulfilled, while the UN and its successor political leaders are teaching that pleasure is the ultimate good. This phenomenon means that as more people dedicate themselves to pursuing the full realization of their personality, the more attuned people are going to become toward reading and listening to the things that reinforce their own views. As technology increasingly liberates human bodies and behaviors, natural inequality and competition will lead people to rely more on sources that reinforce their own views, thereby amplifying their biases and sense of happiness.

This scenario means that the challenge to domesticate people would be getting more complex than what is the case like in recent years if governments start to depend on physical and information security measures to formulate new social behaviors. This scenario signifies that the more governments rely on the power of technology to help them to neutralize the human body (and concurrently the human behavior) of the people who argue or act against the social order, the more people's distrust of the government would grow. When the distrust in any government grows, such behavior leads to internal political disagreements. Such behavior ultimately leads to a civil war.

Since the appearance of man on earth, only religion and science managed to transform interaction to formulate new social behaviors. If the international families of financiers and bankers that Welch claimed are working to establish a socialistic government actually exist, then this elite group may be relying on scientific knowledge to foster societal discord and on religion to advance their plan for a world government. As I mentioned earlier, religion is a culture in which

adherents willingly surrender their freedom to individuals who dedicate themselves to preaching the behaviors and practices articulated by that doctrine, even if the rituals they participate in end up controlling them. If the international families of financiers, bankers, etc. are indeed working on erecting a socialistic government so they can control it themselves, they could be depending on religion to provide them with specifications to achieve their goal, or they could be depending on a theoretical one. When people develop concepts, most people choose how to take a real working system and enhance it rather than to experiment with a theoretical idea. If this international group exists and has ambitions to create a world government, its members would be taking a big risk if they choose a concept to make people reject their actual contentment in favor of a new method that would be any different than the one the people who dedicate their lives to preaching the word of God use to dominate others. In other words, this select group has to be counting on a work program that displays a relentless commitment to advocating law and order or ending poverty and injustice to achieve their goal in the same way the people who dedicate their lives to the service of God and their neighbor do to gain advantage. This select group understands that they can only achieve a permanent work plan by aligning their aspirations with the work program that those who dedicate themselves to serving God and their neighbors rely on. This select group knows mankind will keep advocating that all the big unanswered questions science cannot answer were programmed by a divine force. All this select group needs to do to ensure its continuity is to formulate social behaviors that complement what religious doctrines or convictions advocate.

If Welch's alleged group is trying to create a world government, its members may be clashing with those who serve God and their neighbors to see who would win. The insecurity that people and nations began to experience after 1945 may also be influenced by those who dedicate themselves to serving God and their neighbors, as they seek to maintain their controlling power in the future.

A coin has two sides that are made from the same material. Ethics and money could be two mediums that are controlled and operated by the same people. If ethics and money are controlled by the same people, it is likely that the insecurity experienced by individuals and nations

since 1945 results from an ongoing conflict between those who dedicate themselves to serving God and their neighbors and those who seek to seize this power.

In other words, as people and nations continue to move away from cooperating to achieve the work program that the founding fathers of the UN advised, focusing on equalizing living standards, both peace and security are likely to diminish. When people are compelled to pursue the creation of an egalitarian world, they lose the courage to accept second-best options when the first best is not attainable or the ideal is unattainable. When people (or nations) stop being ready to be tolerant, it becomes very difficult to control the political order through religion or a governing system run solely by people (i.e., human behavior). At this point, it would be necessary that the people who are in positions of power delegate or depend on technology to control people's expectations or the prevailing distrust in government.

When people (or nations) start applying scientific knowledge to control behavior, such an approach would allow a select group with specialized capacity to start to control others without dominating them. This signifies that as technology or modernization starts to dictate the course of action, the role that religion and other associative relationships played to derive policies, organize people, and control behavior would become irrelevant. This scenario also means that when people (or nations) begin to depend on technology to control each other, the small group who possess specialized capacity would hold excessive power while the majority would all possess equal strengths. This small group would become capable of controlling the strategic economic and social choke points that people (or nations) depend on to sustain their survival needs and earthly desires, such as the electric grid, internet, or the money supply. This scenario also means that the people who control or administer the work of this small group, who possess specialized capacity, would be able to remain bound by their personal power and conscience while all the others must surrender freedom and be equal.

On the other hand, project requirements refer to the conditions or tasks necessary for the project's success or completion.¹⁶ All projects have functional and non-functional requirements. Two people cannot fill the same void space. When two people work together, they must divide the functional roles needed to complete the project. People engage in conflicts and wars over the acquisition, management, and distribution of resources.

If it is impossible to interact with the resources that people go to war to decide over, who should be doing the governing while one person accepts tolerance as the other makes decisions to improve both their life chances? Then both must decide who would improve his life chances first, based on whether the weaker one can surrender freedom or prevent the other from using his natural and manmade power to gain an advantage.

If humans are involuntarily required to surrender freedom in all matters related to their relationships or interactions with each other and the natural world so one can play the role of banker, coach, captain, cook, nurse, etc., then this behavioral conduct shows that humans are willing to go along with the idea that a small group takes advantage of their capabilities to reach a common goal.

Any branch of knowledge dealing with engineering or applied sciences requires specialized capacities. Humans believed that machinery and equipment developed from the application of scientific knowledge increases happiness, and as a result, mankind expanded the emotional content that science leverages in their relationships.

If the growing complexities of societies necessitate the employment of scientific methods or technology to ensure successful completion of projects, and if we cannot manage to operate the necessary machinery and equipment involved without a small group with specialized capacities gaining advantage, then this signifies that humans are ready to support the idea that the people who control or own the organizations that run those technological companies wield considerable power.

16 <https://study.com/academy/lesson/project-requirements-definition-types-process.html>

If the main goal of teaching people to develop a deeper understanding of themselves is to instill a sense of responsibility that encourages everyone to surrender their freedom for the sake of equal treatment in social, economic, and commercial matters, then we can conclude that the application of scientific knowledge for practical purposes aligns perfectly with humanity's ambition to achieve equality among all people, even if a small group holds considerable power. In other words, we must consider that there are two methods humans could use to develop a deeper understanding of themselves, which would further international peace and security. Humans can rely on their programmed human ingenuity to create this sense of responsibility, or they can rely on machinery and equipment developed from the application of scientific knowledge to create this condition. But if, from the date when humans began to find solutions to their differences until now, most people refuse to express behavioral conduct that confirms their readiness to surrender freedom regarding matters with which they are respectively concerned, then having machinery along with a small group wielding considerable power to maintain peace and security instead of continuing to rely on the programmed human ingenuity to achieve this goal is not totally a threat but an opportunity if the UN and the UN member states want all the humans to become equal. In fact, all people, companies, and nations use dashboards to control their performance and to adhere to obligations incumbent on the operations of such tools. If we let machinery instead of programmed human ingenuity control behaviors to maintain peace and security, in the same way companies employ dashboards to run the performance of their businesses. Such a system should aid mankind in regulating its behavior to ultimately achieve its goal of creating an egalitarian world much easier.

If some people postulate that "money is the root of all evil," then it is highly likely that humankind may not be ready to live in a regulated world due to the extent to which such a condition would control freedom.

In other words, if our goal is to teach people to develop a deeper understanding of themselves so that any individual would be prepared to wait until the traffic light turns green before driving, whether they

encounter a police officer directing traffic or a functioning traffic light, we can achieve this goal in two ways. We can continue to rely on human ingenuity to abide by rules, or we can delegate this function to machinery and equipment to take control. We can achieve this goal using both human ingenuity and technology at the same time as well. To achieve this last option, governments could enact a law that awards a person who takes a picture and reports a driver going through a red light a financial reward.

If technology can help mankind neutralize the human body so that even if a person wants to go through a red light, they cannot, then this evolution fits perfectly into mankind's ambition to make all humans equal, as I said before. This is because if the person who is behind the wheel of the car is rich or poor, it would not make a difference. The rich or the poor cannot use their power differential to gain advantage. The rich or poor can't override the car's machinery and equipment to run a red light. In fact, when people stop to administer their relationships through their naturally programmed human ingenuity and begin to rely on computers, the internet, or machinery to solve problems or do new things, then this development or shift would start to make those who rely on their personal power and conscience to obtain their way start to accept the second best if the first best is not attainable. Such a shift would eliminate problems of inequality, discrimination, corruption, and many other social challenges. Most importantly, this development would resolve how resources could be managed and distributed. This is because the people who control the computers that make things work would then interfere and control those who seek their own advantage without regard for others' welfare, preventing them from using their power to achieve their goals despite resistance.

If humans believe that the wars, poverty, discrimination, inequality, inefficiency, hunger, etc. that exist in the world are due to the resources not being managed or distributed equally and there are people who are earning as much as possible with no regard for anyone else's well-being, this signifies that interlinking the actions of all the people in all the nations to an architecture or a platform that provides equal functionality can ensure equal treatment in social, economic, and commercial matters much better than if this process were being done

on a nation-per-nation basis. In other words, if humanity's goal is to eliminate reliance on personal power and conscience for achieving their objectives, a single, unified architecture distributed across all nations would ensure that all people are treated equally.

For example, when people or nations become integrated into an economy that is regulated through technology, there would not be so many people or nations, as is the case now, taking advantage of their financial and military strength to get their way despite the resistance of others. The machines and equipment that controls the money supply of the world would not allow any person (or nation) to violate the principles of equal rights.

If people have only images and illusions behind which they hide their true motives, then only when we destroy the image can we create the changes that we are after.¹⁷ This also means that if the idea of having people cooperate to develop the right understanding of themselves has the objective of making newborns learn to interrelate with each other in the economic and social fields based on the principles of equal rights, then it is important to destroy this sovereign nation concept that people amalgamate their power or ideas under to get their way despite the resistance of others so that all people become equal afterwards and not some feel privileged and others do not. In this way newborns have fewer ideas to depend on to deepen their biases.

If it is not possible to ensure the proper functionality of an overall governance architecture that depends on technology to guarantee that all people would become equal afterwards, and if this exercise does not integrate readiness to abandon this sovereignty idea or others that people depend on to exercise power, this scenario signifies that for as long as UN member states refuse to voluntarily relinquish power so that a single authority could administer all the people, peace and security may remain dynamic. Experts suggest that such an overall architecture or common political authority could come into existence either through a compulsory domination or through a voluntary power relinquishing process.

17 <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=hhvBTy28VJM>

Welch was apprehensive about the US joining the UN or taking part in a collective governance system in which the set of rules, norms, and standards that are generally accepted by one nation is used as normative guidelines and a framework for other states to follow across a broad range of domains. The concerns that Welch expresses are anti-logic but, at the same time, very serious and worrisome. I will explain the concern that Welch expressed through an example.

The internet is defined as “a global computer network providing various information and communication facilities, consisting of interconnected networks using standardized communication protocols.”¹⁸ The vast range of standardized communication protocols that the internet carries, such as the interlinked documents and applications of the World Wide Web (WWW), provides to an immense number of people a chance to be able to share information and services that would otherwise have been stored in different computers, but through the HyperText Markup Language (HTML), it becomes possible to access them without the need to log on to different computers to get at them.

The World Wide Web is developed in such a way that a person does not need permission from a central authority to post anything on the web. People could post on the web information from no matter where they live or what cultural and political beliefs they have. However, in recent years, most governments have expanded their surveillance capabilities by monitoring all the information that people post, including arresting those who post anti-government materials.¹⁹

No one knows how effective all the social media monitoring programs or the algorithms that power them that governments are operating have been in achieving their stated goals, but so far the standardization of people's capability to publish anything on the web has not changed people's discrimination attitude. This means that if we erect a collective governance system whereby the set of rules, norms, and standards that people need to follow are universal, there is a good chance that such an attempt will result in people formulating new

18 Google definition – What is the internet?

19 <https://www.brennancenter.org/blog/government-expanding-its-social-media-surveillance-capabilities>

social behavior that is similar to what people are presently exhibiting after the World Wide Web was standardized.

If after the World Wide Web made access to information on a vast range of issues and subjects universal, and if the facilitation of such a system did not help in formulating new social behaviors and in establishing normative attitudes that would make newborns be ready to surrender freedom to pursue a common conceptual framework, then there is a big chance that erecting a common political authority to provide a means for states to practice more stable, consistent, and organized international relations may be a failure in creating a behavioral change in the same way the idea of the World Wide Web has been so far.

Moreover, as I mentioned earlier, there are two methods that humans can use to develop a better understanding of themselves in order to promote international peace and security. Humans can rely on their programmed ingenuity to foster a sense of responsibility, or they can depend on machinery and equipment developed through the application of scientific knowledge to achieve this goal.

If there is a good chance that the application of scientific knowledge to neutralize the human body (/behavior) of people may not aid governments to make people change their behavior to maintain peace and security, and if from 1945 to now, when our governments emphasized the importance of human reason (human ingenuity) over the unimportance of technology to create this difference using a collective approach to maintain peace and security in the world (i.e., the UN Security Council), we failed to create this change so far, then Welch's preoccupation about granting international legal personality to an intergovernmental organization to carry out mutual interests with unified aims could be a preoccupation that should not be taken lightly. This preoccupation suggests that if the five permanent nations of the UN Security Council are replaced by new countries, whether that number is one or one hundred, it will not lead to any change in maintaining peace and security. This scenario also means that whether one nation or one hundred nations are tasked with maintaining peace and security, any reliance on scientific tools to control human behavior would be ineffective.

Actually, Welch's threat regarding the US joining the UN is best understood through the idea of government practice as punishment for a crime.

Incarceration is a process that forcibly restrains the liberty of the confined. The confinement neutralizes the human body and makes it impossible for human ingenuity to overrule its condition. Most prisons in industrialized nations control prisoners' movements through automation. Most reports published about life inside a prison indicate that the environment is dangerous, and the threat level remains high whether prisoners are escorted by a prison guard from one place to another or if this is done through automation.

If prisoners are controlled by prison guards or through automation, and neither method teaches them to coexist, then Welch's concerns about relying on collectivism to ensure peace and security could pose a significant threat to a nation. In the United States, the inmates and the guards are from all nations, faiths, and creeds. Of all the different treatments that prisoners receive in prison, it is the prison guards who decide who receives what, and no one can be sure up to what extent race, language, sex, or political orientation plays a role. The same issue of bias also exists at the highest levels of the judicial system. When the judicial system of a country starts to abide by international laws and its actors hail from all nations, faiths, and creeds, it is not possible to know if the judge is being biased when he punishes different people with different prison terms for a given crime, because all judges are themselves from distinct races, languages, sexes, and political orientations. This scenario means that the strength and stability of any nation could be greatly affected when it is determining and enforcing its own rules as compared to when the same process is being run based on international laws or relations.

If coming up with an organized conceptual framework to formulate new social behaviors would make no difference in deepening peace and security, hence people's conduct in prison serves as an example, then this scenario means that if people or nations do not cooperate based on the principles of equal rights, it would make no difference if the international order remains as the case is like presently or if a

single political authority or multiple ones assume this role in the future. This scenario also includes the possibility of nations reverting to pre-1945 political policies or engaging in a global war to decrease the world population and lower expectations.

Welch must have had concerns about the US joining the UN that went beyond the decline of the UN's sovereignty and the notion of nations uniting to create a one-world government with global authority. One of two fixations could summarize Welch's apprehension against the US getting involved in international affairs. The first possibility is that Welch wanted to prevent humanity from experimenting with changes in perception because he believed that American values represent the correct principles for guiding international relations. The second is if Welch's advanced thinking was intended to serve hidden motives.

According to what is reported about Robert Welch's early life in the literature, Robert was considered a "gifted" child. He was admitted to the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill at the age of 12.²⁰ In the literature, it is even reported that during his early political activism, Welch "was a strong believer in various conspiracies that promoted that a wide range of individuals and organizations were part of an international communist plot"²¹ to weaken the US.

Mental Health America (MHA) was founded in 1909, and it is a nonprofit organization dedicated to addressing the needs of those living with mental illness.²² The MHA has reported that 3.5% of the population in the US experiences psychosis.²³ MHA also asserts that 1% of the population receives a statistical diagnosis of schizophrenia at some point in their lives.

Schizophrenia is a psychotic condition. This mental health disorder is a medical illness that results in strange or bizarre thinking; perceptions (sight and sound); behaviors; and emotions.²⁴ MHA also states that environmental factors, such as drug use and stress, can either improve

20 https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Robert_W._Welch_Jr.#Early_life

21 https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Robert_W._Welch_Jr.#Early_political_activism

22 <http://www.mentalhealthamerica.net/who-we-are>

23 <http://www.mentalhealthamerica.net/conditions/psychosis>

24 <http://www.mentalhealthamerica.net/conditions/psychosis-schizophrenia-children-and-youth>

or worsen schizophrenia and other psychotic disorders, which are brain-based conditions.

It is not reported in the literature that Robert Welch suffered from any psychotic disorder or that he used drugs or was stressed. Robert Welch was a rich man, and so were all the co-founders who joined with him to found The John Birch Society in 1958—they were all wealthy.²⁵ After his death, those he influenced continued to promote his ideas through the organization he founded, including expressing their concerns about the US being betrayed to create a one-world socialist government.

If the odds of the hidden motives that could have pushed Welch to express apprehension against the US becoming involved in international affairs do not seem to be related to him being diagnosed with any form of psychotic disorder, then his advanced thinking could have been directed to gain advantage. I will examine for clues in the philosophical ideas that he was promoting.

The John Birch Society describes itself as a conservative advocacy group that supports anti-communism and limited government. The organization says that it opposes collectivism, totalitarianism, anarchism, wealth redistribution, and economic interventionism. Many commentators have described the John Birch Society as ultraconservative, far-right, radical-right, and extremist, and some even list the society as an organization that advocates extreme antigovernment doctrines.²⁶ However, for those who emphasize policies that "advocate extreme antigovernment doctrines," their motives may stem from either rejecting traditional methods in favor of new approaches or vice versa. In either case, this behavior may stem from a concern about needing to gain something when rejecting beliefs or fearing the loss of something if those beliefs are changed. In other words, people exploit anti-government views for political gains.

Classical liberalism is a political ideology that advocates civil liberties with an emphasis on economic freedom. The second paragraph of the first article in the US Declaration of Independence reads, "We hold the

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

26 <https://www.jbs.org/about-jbs/myths-vs-facts>

truths... that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." The idea of classical liberalism is a hands-off attitude toward the economy,²⁷ which aligns with its advocacy for minimal government intervention in economic affairs to promote individual freedom and prosperity. American conservatism is a broad system of political beliefs that is characterized principally by respect for free markets and free trade, including individualism, among other values.²⁸ Likewise, Wilsonianism is a form of liberal internationalism. The main pillars of the Wilsonian ideology are collective emphasis on self-determination; democracy; capitalism; and opposition to isolationism and non-interventionism. Opposition to isolationism and non-interventionism means favoring interventionism or intervention.

A question begs an answer. If one of the principal points in the Atlantic Charter was to lower trade barriers following the end of WW2, why were Robert Welch and all his wealthy co-founders opposing economic interventionism if the central tenet of the liberal ideology is the opposition to isolationism and non-interventionism?

This apprehension that Robert Welch and all his wealthy co-founders were advocating to oppose economic interventionism is a paradox. A tenet of capitalism is liberalism. If Welch was opposing economic interventionism, his stance means that he was theoretically opposing capitalism—not American capitalism but collective capitalism. Welch’s concern that collective capitalism weakens US sovereignty but its threat becomes low when practiced independently is nonsensical. If interventionism creates wealth, how is it possible that US interventionism contributes to its downfall when practiced collectively, but not when practiced independently? I shall remind readers that in 1945, instead of the Wilsonian philosophy continuing to be practiced solely in the US and in limited international settings, it began to be theoretically applied in all existing nations after World War II. Actually, there is another question that begs an answer. Why, when the US was practicing American capitalism and Western European countries were practicing “mercantilism/colonialism” before WW2, was such “collective capitalism” cooperation considered safe, avoiding any threat to the US's decline and fall, but when the same

27 https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Classical_liberalism#United_States

28 https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Conservatism_in_the_United_States

nations began to practice collective capitalism post this global war date, did such a policy become a risk? Most of the nations that gained independence after 1945 were under the administration of Western European nations.

If Robert Welch and his wealthy co-founders were mentally stable and not experiencing psychotic disorders (such as hearing voices or seeing things that aren't there), their concern about political and economic globalization threatening the US's sovereignty remains puzzling.

Before 1945, existing nations coordinated in the economic field based on distinctions. If, after 1945, the UN member states agreed to coordinate in the economic field without any distinctions, this philosophy should have provided an opportunity for powerful nations to increase their wealth rather than pose a risk, as Welch attempted to highlight.

If there is a relationship between political and economic globalization and the fall of nations, mankind could be confronting a challenge that is more complicated than the one Welch expressed about the US sovereignty declining and reverting to a simpler form. The UN member states, along with the UN, chose not to implement the work program proposed by the United States in 1941 and instead adopted a new work program that included creating the conditions outlined by the UN's founding fathers in the UN charter, as well as new goals aimed at establishing an egalitarian world. The creation of an egalitarian world requires that UN member states foster human rights. This signifies that there could be a relationship between fostering human rights and the fall of nations.

The aforementioned idea presents a new challenge. Welch believed that internationalists, greedy bankers, and corrupt politicians are driving the transformation of political and economic globalization in order to revert the US to a simpler form and create a new collectivist world order.

Earlier I said that the unwillingness of people to be tolerant makes it impossible to know how to organize our societies and our countries in the international order. This abnormal conduct that emerged after

World War II could be caused by a group working secretly to control world affairs, orchestrate events, and infiltrate governments and corporations to gain political power and ultimately influence the establishment of a one-world government, as Welch claimed. But Welch's idea about a small group working underground to control world affairs is nothing but a mere perception he put forth. This abnormal rise in intolerance could also be attributed to a scenario where no group is controlling the international order, allowing world affairs to operate independently (running unmanned). If the world's events are running without supervision (unmanned), then this scenario is serious and very worrisome.

We don't know which scenario or relationship is causing people's defiance from the aforesaid two; this situation is very serious and worrisome. In other words, if no small group works underground to eventually control world affairs, and if the defiance people exhibit does not result from this group losing control of the international order after its members chose to have the UN and the UN member states foster human rights to create an egalitarian world, mankind's exposure could be far worse than if a group plotted events.

The history of the world has been nothing but a theater of operations for intellectual and philosophical movements dominated mainly by illuminati and political leaders who wanted to change the world but ended up failing afterwards. This scenario means that the world events could be running unmanned and not as people most think.

If there is a relationship between political and economic globalization and the fall of a nation, and if this relationship is self-driving, contrary to Welch's claim that "the trend is not accidental"²⁹ (implying an underground group controls world affairs), such a scenario would be a grave and alarming conjecture. As of 1945, all the UN member states have been fostering human rights to create an egalitarian world and are not cooperating to teach people to practice tolerance as per what the founding fathers of the UN counseled. If added knowledge yields individuals who emphasize equal rights relationships, rather than those ready to surrender freedom to majority authority in exchange for protection, then this post-1945 venture to enhance self-understanding

29 https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/John_Birch_Society#Values

could seriously threaten the effective preservation of human progress. This scenario also indicates that it is only a matter of time before the violence that emerged in poor nations after 1945 spreads to nations that have remained resilient until now, such as the US and other industrialized countries.

If there were a master conspiracy, as Welch believed the Communist movement was "a tool of the total conspiracy"³⁰, then the operators would have been better off building the "one-world socialist government" on the Communist movement, as he thought, rather than on liberal ideology. I shall explain what I mean:

There are two ways to create this "one-world socialist government." The first option is to base it on communism, and the second is to base it on liberalism.

In the 1960s, Welch promoted that the Communist ideology was not the top level of this perceived conspiracy to create this "one-world socialist government." The communist ideology collapsed in 1991.³¹ This theory means that the "step by step" transformation toward establishing this one socialistic global government that Welch warned about is being built on top of the liberal ideology if it happens to exist or is using this liberal ideology as the vehicle.

No one knows what caused the Soviet Union to collapse and what direct impact the efforts that the US exhausted to warn about the danger of communism had. The literature that the John Birch Society distributed in the US also falls under the same category. No one can prove that the anti-communism policies caused the Soviet Union's collapse. I doubt that a secretive group intent on establishing a world government prompted the Soviet Union's collapse. Some philosophers claim that ideologies collapse when a new idea displaces an existing one, but they could collapse accidentally too.

I believe the collapse of the Soviet Union was inevitable. This is because all "things" outside the human frame are made of "matter,"

30 https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Robert_W._Welch_Jr.#John_Birch_Society

31 <https://www.history.com/topics/cold-war/fall-of-soviet-union>

which is always changing.³² [Maloof 2005] The continuous changes in the natural and built environments render human desires incapable of achieving what is right [Maloof 2005]. The idea that both the rich and the poor collaborate to promote human rights is a concept upon which the underprivileged rely to enhance their access to material resources, while the wealthy use it to justify their control. The rich and the poor understand that the division of labor leads to natural inequality and results in a leisured upper class, making it impossible to share equal rights. The willingness of the rich and the poor to promote human rights stems from the inability of human desires to overcome the weakness of will.

If ideologies collapse when a new idea displaces an existing one, and if what causes an idea to be displaced so a new one takes over is "reason," which prompts people to create a change, then the collapse of the US, China, Norway, the Netherlands, etc. could be forthcoming, because the changes that the natural and built environment are continuously undergoing make it impossible that a person manage to prevail over the weakness of the will [Maloof 2005]. In other words, the culture that the United States proposed in 1941 to achieve the goals outlined in the UN Charter required people to practice tolerance. The decision of the political leaders who succeeded the founding fathers of the UN and the UN to change this work program and to make it about how to foster human rights to build an egalitarian world means that the new culture that existing people are now pursuing is far better off than the one that the US and Great Britain proposed in 1941. Hence, knowledge enables people to reason and distinguish more effectively between what is right and what is wrong. The more the natural and built environment continues to change, the more the knowledge that people are acquiring would make them thrust to withdraw their support to maintain any type of political order that is short of sharing wealth or power on equal rights to build an egalitarian world. Moreover, hence, there is no ideology that mankind can practice to foster peace and security besides whenever a person exhibits tolerance and readiness to collaborate based on the principles of equal rights, but the UN is teaching the opposite; this situation signifies that peace and security will remain dynamic for as long as UN member states are granting rights to the UN to interfere in the social order to foster human rights.

32 Book – Social Improvement and Human Security: Collateral Damage, 2005

If a secretive group exists and its members are indeed working to put all the countries under the control of a world government, this means that this elite group is counting on states adopting either economic interventionism to reach their goal or a non-interventionism philosophy. In other words, if a furtive conspiratorial cabal of internationalists, greedy bankers, and corrupt politicians are conspiring to mount a “One World Government” that the United Nations would act as its common political authority, the only principles that could be made a variable from the main five pillars of the Wilsonian ideology so those power elites could use to build on their principles the totalitarian world that those members envisage are isolationism/non-isolationism and interventionism/non-interventionism. The other three principles or pillars, i.e., self-determination, democracy, or capitalism, cannot be made a variable, because if the members of this secretive group or those international families of financiers play with them, then they would return mankind to colonialism, socialism, etc.

If international families of financiers are either opposing economic interventionism or favoring such a policy as a means to transition from liberal ideology toward establishing this “one world government,” then the lowering of trade barriers after WWII, along with the shift that most industrialized nations are making toward non-interventionist policies, could be part of their plan. In other words, it is not possible to render poor nations stateless by pursuing non-interventionism policies, because the liberal ideology is what makes a nation collapse. In the case of the collapse of the Soviet Union, the liberal ideology was used as a catalyst to collapse the communist philosophy. Likewise, it is not possible to collapse rich nations when they are pursuing economic interventionism policies, because all the liberal ideology does is shift wealth between nations. For example, the ongoing trade war that exists between the US and China is a result of the two countries practicing economic interventionism policies. The two countries are now taking measures to pursue non-interventionism policies to spare them both from going to war so the victor could resize the economy that is displacing the other. If this trade war that the two countries are testing does not result in each country stabilizing and maintaining its own economic strength and stability, then only a war or a concession from one toward the other would resolve such a gridlock. The US and China

shouldn't go to war to resize each other's economies, as both have nuclear weapons. If international families are indeed working to create a one-world government with the UN serving as its common political authority, then the best way to ensure the collapse of rich nations is to pursue isolationism, allowing the breakdown to occur from within.

The decision of Great Britain to withdraw from the EU or the threat that the US made in 2017 to withdraw from international affairs supports that if some power elites are really working to create a one-world government, then the members of this group count on setting up those two countries to succumb to the same fate that the Soviet Union underwent by relying on the non-interventionism principle to create disintegration. This scenario also means that the members of this secretive group are counting on the awareness that the nationals of those two countries are always gaining to thrust them to focus on how to establish an egalitarian world; thus, the intolerance that would emerge would instigate the decline and fall of those two countries. For example, if the select group that Welch claimed exists and is working to see the US eventually collapse, then the short-term aim of the members of this elite group would be to make the US withdraw from international affairs first. Then, they should wait until the ongoing internal reforms aimed at reducing corruption lead to a situation where people can no longer tolerate one another. When Americans can no longer tolerate each other, they will divide the country into many weak, independent states, like the Soviet Union. One state, as the case became like in the former Soviet Union, would grab control of all the weapons of mass destruction. Afterwards, the members of this group would start to rely on automation to replace the roles that human bodies were originally designed to perform in the natural world, leading to more human ingenuity becoming idle. Evidently, the more human ingenuities (i.e., human bodies) become idle, the more the human imagination of those idled people will be driving their human ingenuity to be dedicated to deepening social justice to improve the life chances of the human body. The more people dedicate themselves to deepening social justice, the faster the decline and fall of the US state that controls weapons of mass destruction will occur.

This aforesaid scenario about how the US could collapse took into consideration the existence of a select group who are plotting to create

this outcome so a new world government, of which the UN would be serving as its political authority, would rise. This scenario isn't the only one that could cause the US to collapse, as I said before. In addition to a global war or a natural disaster leading to such a scenario, it is possible that world events could drive this outcome to occur independently or without direct intervention (unmanned). In other words, the common problems that experts claim lead to dissolution, such as maintaining large armies, supporting central bureaucracies, and engaging in wars, may not be the primary causes of dissolution; instead, the speed at which a nation, empire, or civilization trades its values and traditions for modernization is what actually hastens the decline.

What if the collapse of communism was primarily prompted by automation replacing the work that people were doing, rather than by philosophical propaganda or material goods entering the country? The Soviet government was filtering what got in and what did not throughout the life of this regime, which included restricting access to foreign ideas and technologies that could challenge its authority or promote alternative ideologies. This scenario indicates that the government had the ability to control and suppress any idea that could potentially undermine its power. The breakdown happened from within. What causes people to withdraw their obligation to obey is knowledge. Knowledge enables people to assess whether the system or philosophical idea they support contributes to their happiness. Human ingenuity is constantly striving to enhance the human condition or patronize the human body, often through advancements in technology and social systems that aim to improve quality of life. What if automation made it nearly impossible for political leaders or the government to continue enforcing the idea that people should remain submissive to communist ideology, causing this ideology to collapse in a manner similar to how engineers demolish buildings with explosives? In other words, if the knowledge or progress of the people in the Soviet Union had not accelerated to the level it reached by 1991, the societies that were part of the Soviet Union would not be dealing with the challenges that have now emerged post-collapse, whereby all the people in all those new countries are competing to be happy at the same time. The decision of the people who formed part of the Soviet Union to stop wanting to surrender voluntarily freedom as they were

doing post-1991 led them to create, pursuant to the collapse, the same bureaucracy that The John Birch Society had spent the past 50 years in the US advocating for people to do without in this country. This is how to achieve more with “less government.” In other words, the net gain from the collapse of the Soviet Union has been zero until now.

Indeed, no one knows if the increased knowledge of people will make it possible for our societies to be organized under an international order, especially since our cooperation has shifted away from practicing tolerance to achieve the goals set in the preamble of the UN Charter.

I suppose the international families of financiers that Welch claimed are plotting to betray US sovereignty face a much bigger problem to resolve than just ensuring their goal of establishing a collective new world order is achieved. The decision by UN member states and the UN to deviate from the work program recommended by the founding fathers, which aimed to help people achieve the same standards, seems to have created a significant challenge for our successors in their efforts to build on our ongoing work towards world peace. Robert Welch's opposition to collectivism seems partially valid. All his concerns indicate that the sovereignty of the United States is likely to decline if people continue to prioritize social justice in order to achieve the same standards. So far in this work, it appears that the only option for the US to slow its decline is for the current political leaders to act on Welch's recommendations from 1958 and/or for the country to insist that UN member states return to establishing relationships based on the principles advised by the founding fathers of the UN regarding the international system. I should mention that only the international order that the founding fathers of the UN designed could prevent mankind from being compelled to have recourse to disregard, which leads to violence and oppression.

Then again, as I said before, I disagree with Welch about the existence of a master conspiracy by a group of people who are working to create a “one-world socialist government” that has links to the Bavarian Illuminati³³ or any similar secret societies. I believe that human relations and science are driving this transformation, albeit in an

33 <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Illuminati>

unplanned (or unmanned) manner, as they influence societal changes and the distribution of resources in ways that are often unpredictable and not orchestrated by any single entity. The economic system that humans use spins winners and losers at all the time. Rich families maintain their wealth despite the economic system's weaknesses because their authority may be entwined with the power of religious institutions. We all know that in the event of any type of catastrophe on earth, mankind would not stop depending on the people who dedicate their lives to the service of God to answer big questions that are still unanswered to this day. It is important for readers to understand that the upcoming material in this study does not aim to highlight the adjustments needed by the select group that Welch claimed is plotting to create a new common political authority for all humanity; instead, it focuses on how Welch's skepticism about such a collectivist global government, with the United Nations as its principal authority, could lead to the decline and collapse of American values. Likewise, I am interested in verifying whether the United States' sovereignty could decline and fall, not to ensure the disintegration of US influence, but to ensure the protection of the norms and values that this country defends. I strongly believe that the normative guidelines that the United States achieved represent the pinnacle of mankind's search for a conceptual framework to make progress on all matters of human rights and freedom. It is also important to mention that if my findings lead me to conclude that the United States should surrender its sovereignty to the United Nations in order to better protect American values, I will express that view. I also plan to continue to verify if the views that were expressed about Welch and the members of his organization being ultraconservative, far-right, radical-right, or extremist are right or wrong. As I said before, Welch could have been advocating extreme antigovernment doctrines because he was suffering from schizophrenia or other psychotic disorders.

However, as I mentioned earlier, all the connections I have made so far suggest that Welch's fear of potential consequences if American political leaders were not cautious appears to be related to this issue. In April 1966, a New York Times article characterized the John Birch Society as "by far the most successful and 'respectable' radical right organization in the country."³⁴ It looks as if this appraisal that Welch

34 https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/John_Birch_Society#1960s

and his co-founders earned in 1966 remains valid until now. If there is indeed a relationship between the U.S. reverting to a simpler form and political and economic globalization, it may also indicate a connection between the breakdown of the international social order and political and economic globalization. The decision by UN member states and the UN to abandon the teaching of tolerance, as advised by the UN's founding fathers, in favor of promoting the abandonment of traditional values to enhance competition may be contributing to this disintegration. This teaching could be detrimental to internationalists, if such individuals exist, as it undermines the principles of cooperation and mutual respect that are essential for effective global governance.

4

Man's narcissistic personality disorder dilemma

Newborns provide perspective toward reality based on forming constructs that reflect what existing humans interpret as real or existent, as opposed to what is only imaginary. Many of the concepts that newborns establish toward what is real or existent, rather than that which is only imaginary, are normally defined culturally and socially. If we placed a newborn on an uninhabited island, the baby would not know whether the things around him were created by a supernatural force or resulted from some form of chaotic creativity. In fact, all the laws that scientists claim are true and verifiable are merely patterns that remain untested to prove their inaccuracy. In other words, the validity of those laws is factual for as long as specific natural factors are unchanged.

People are unsupervised and believe that their unique faculties, which enable them to create patterns that natural systems and other microorganisms cannot generate, give them the privilege to perceive their purpose as different from that of other organisms, which seem to spend their lives serving the natural environment.

No one knows why animals appear to have managed to harmonize their actions in such a way that makes them appear to be organized, and humans until now, by large, remain far from reaching such ultimate wisdom. Since the date people started to keep records, there does not seem to be a big difference between what humans spend their lifetime doing and what all the other species in the animal kingdom appear to be doing. Both species appear committed to meeting their

survival needs. The BBC (a British news service) published an article in 2015 about seven animals with astonishing hunting techniques that are at least as important as how humans hunt.³⁵ Some of those animals can engineer traps, like spiders, and some entice prey using their bodies so they could act as bait, like frogfish. This shows that humans are not the only species programmed with ingenuity.

Moreover, if we set aside mental and cultural constructs about reality and focus solely on what is observable, it seems that what is real or existent is merely a property of objects, which people classify into solid, liquid, and gas. All living things spend their entire lifetime exploring those three elements that exist in nature (i.e., reality) to improve survival needs and earthly desires. All the inventions and innovations that humans come up with are to improve transportation and communications. For example, birds (or fish) do not invent tools to facilitate their movement from one location to another. We cannot say that humans are programmed with aptitudes that are any better than the rest of the living things with whom our species competes. Humans are, until now, far from learning how to fly or to hold their breath under water for more than one to two minutes.

If, in theory, the programmed aptitude of humans does not appear to be any different from or superior to the one that the rest of the species with whom humankind cohabits possess, one would assume that mankind would have recognized its own limitations or potential in a manner that is much more virtuous than what the case is like until now. Unfortunately, despite the long history of humanity, the various cohorts that continue to emerge and disappear refuse to confront one reality. This truth is about finally admitting that mankind's special aptitudes may not have been programmed to serve any other purpose that is different from what all the other organisms appear to spend their lifetime doing—serving the natural environment. Alternatively, we could slow down to fix the broken social system that is passed down from one generation to the next, with the hope that each generation will address and resolve its own issues.

35 <http://www.bbc.com/earth/story/20151201-seven-animals-with-astonishing-hunting-techniques>

For example, animal scientists divide animals into categories: sight hounds and scent hounds. Sighthounds are a species that hunt by sight and speed, and scent hounds by scent and endurance. Humans are a species that was programmed not any differently but with the four aptitudes combined. Instead of utilizing their sight and scent abilities to teach newborns how to be content and maximize their potential within their environment, many believe that humanity is on a mission to benefit society, resulting in a dynamic social order. Since 1945, most people assert their readiness to create conditions of stability and well-being, free from interference by race, sex, language, or religion in their relationships with one another; however, everyone insists on the best option being attainable, and no one is ready to accept the second best. Most people are worried about how to obtain, manage, and distribute resources outside the human body, while only a few realize that keeping the body active—not idling it—extends longevity. The proof is the fitness of all the animals.

Maybe the reason why animals appear to have managed to harmonize actions to a degree that makes them look as if they are content is because animals do not appear to be interested in addressing fundamental questions about their place in the universe in the same way we are busy doing. Their withdrawal from exploring the unknown and discovering new worlds may have helped them focus on understanding their place and getting things right, unlike the human species, which seems dispersed everywhere, wanting to know and do everything.

Most importantly, the decision of animals to not commercialize their ingenuity and to use it as a potential to gain advantage may have been the principal reason why animals appear to be organized, and when it comes to us, it appears that we are still far away. When a bird builds a nest, he does not sell it to other birds, transfer it to his offspring, or freeze it forever as humans do. Similarly, a bird does not approach other birds or animals to raise awareness about the necessity of creating stable and healthy conditions for everyone, regardless of race, sex, language, or religion, in exchange for being appointed as their leader.

Many investigators, throughout history, attempted to investigate what causes people to distort their sense of self. From antiquity until now, people have believed that all individuals have a free will to act on their own accord for as long as they adhere to a certain code of conduct. Punishment is only reserved for people who commit crimes based on manmade laws, which raises questions about the moral implications of free will and the consequences of one's actions in relation to societal norms. There are no laws that regulate or place a ceiling on what a person can accomplish from among his grand dreams. People believe that curiosity is vital for the human spirit. This strong desire to know has been providing benefits to our societies for centuries. At the same time, when we compare how different forms and manifestations of life interact with each other, we find that even though the conditions and laws under which these phenomena occur and the causes through which they have been effected are similar to how we have been carrying on doing, they all appear to have reached a state of equilibrium with nature and with each other. When it comes to us, it appears that we are still far away. For example, lions and hippopotamuses or lions and deer do not divide the savannah geographically and demographically into mutually exclusive territories and then establish political structures, institutions, coalitions, agreements, and contracts to trade prey or determine what one species can or cannot do. Every species stays with its kind, and every species “knows its strength” and its limitations, even though most species appear to know that when they bandwagon or chain-gang, they can prevent a strong animal from tormenting weak ones.

There are many things that differentiate human beings from other species, and perhaps the one thing that probably differentiates mankind the most from any other living organism is this unifying notion that people believe in and pursue to attain their grand dreams. For various reasons, every newborn is compelled to push the boundaries of scientific and technical limits in order to explore and ultimately provide benefits to society. The challenge with this unifying notion is that it has been leading mankind astray from one century to another and is thus incapable of making tangible progress that still leaves people feeling unfree from fear and want. Governance is about the art of acquiring, managing, and distributing resources. To pursue grand dreams, people need to become organized and to work collectively.

Regrettably, humans are not collective learners in the same way our closest relatives in the animal kingdom appear to be, which hinders our ability to effectively collaborate and learn from one another in pursuit of collective goals. Even though society sanctions killing, deceiving, abusing, or committing wicked acts, people still commit them and even enjoy doing them.

Throughout history, many philosophers have developed ideas aimed at creating new patterns of thinking and behavior to improve human relations and foster collective change. Until now man's peculiar propensity to kill and even enjoy killing, deceiving, abusing, and committing wicked acts on a mass basis when society sanctions such crimes has not changed.

The issue is that newborns have no say in the decision made by existing people about the purpose of human life being to achieve practical results for the greater good of society, even though they will have to fix the social order that is handed back to them.

Deriving policies to address the natural inequality each newborn faces, ensuring the right to life, liberty, and happiness for all, is admirable. However, if we each live only one life, and mankind shows no evidence of nearing the achievement of "the end of the historical dynamic with the perfection of a civil society," then bequeathing grand dreams to future generations without disciplined action on those ambitions is irresponsible.

This situation begs lots of questions. For one, is it fair to continue allowing future generations to be collectively devoted to discovering new worlds, or should we focus on providing solutions to end poverty, injustice, and inequality, especially when many social responsibility attitudes expressed by people involve domesticating "our neighbor" and surrendering resources that we believe are necessary for our happiness? If all the "talk therapy" and wars that we have relied on from one generation to the next have not helped humanity develop new social behaviors that enhance social connectedness, wouldn't it be wiser for the wealthy to take a step back and reassess whether it is better to reduce production on assembly lines or new ideas, rather than insisting that newborns follow laws that the human body seems unable

to conform to when society is not ready to support programs aimed at controlling birth rates?

A landing is a component of a stair. It is the area of a floor near the top or bottom step of a stair.³⁶ This landing area or platform is used to allow stairs to change directions or give the user a rest. Humans don't want their inventions to follow the same principle they used to move between floors or locations. For instance, instead of spending the next two to three hundred years organizing and meeting the needs of future cohorts with existing technology, and then pursuing new ideas, their interests in heaven rather than on the ground could be confounding people even more. The ongoing rush to be the first to produce driverless cars, human flying machines, and robots will help people reach their destinations faster or complete their tasks more quickly, but it will come at a cost.

All the new ideas that people pursue would destabilize the lives of those living in areas where the necessary resources are located. The people who need those resources to achieve their goals would be using their power differential to keep the society dynamic, often at the expense of marginalized communities who may suffer from the consequences of resource extraction and technological advancement. If we factor in the deadlines that the UN and UN member states are spearheading to foster human rights to create an egalitarian world, there is a good chance that the dynamics that such a work program is creating are accelerating people's intolerance indefinitely or until a new global war becomes imminent to control the international order.

Evidently, if the UN and UN member states continue to want to foster human rights to create an egalitarian world, the damage that their actions could be prompting would not be limited to preventing people from understanding themselves, which is a prerequisite to yielding rational and tolerant personalities or pursuing any new ideas, but could lead to more serious ones.

If existing people are determining on behalf of newborns the legitimacy of their rights, the legality of how to be organized, and the end that they must be dedicated to pursuing; and if no newborn can

36 <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Stairs>

have a say whatsoever in what existing people are deciding or determining “in absentia” on their behalf; and if this idea that newborns find that existing people hold on to about pleasure being the highest good is a notion that suits every newborn because it stratifies naturally any new human being; and if this idea that newborns find about existing people having stratified geographically and societally social space; and if a newborn has no choice but to uphold the values that he finds existing people are protecting because those norms are the different starting points from which each newborn takes off to pursue his grand dreams; and if none of the grand dreams that a person can pursue could not be complete without thrusting others to surrender rights, then it would be pathetic to say that all the forward measures that the UN and the UN member states are exerting to bring the living standards of people to the same standards could provide the certainty, stability and new opportunities that gets proclaimed.

For example, recently, most governments appear to be sponsoring immigration bills that end free movement and others that tighten free trade to address international security issues. These protectionist measures could frustrate people because they shift the economic plans that nations depend on for growth to an inward-focused approach. This means that governments would have no choice but to pursue fiscal strategies that are always looking into recycling the internal economy to maintain the sustainability of the public finances. Such a scenario means that governments would have to take steps to make work fairer and to address issues of nationalization and renationalization. This also means that the steps that governments would be taking to protect the integrity of democracy would be necessitating that public sector bodies be scrutinized to ensure transparency and accountability in their operations. Such a scenario means that governments and societies could start to be pitted against each other. The stricter governments become, the more people will perceive that their public officials are tyrants and anti-democratic. As more individuals refuse to give up their freedom in exchange for the benefits of the political order, the opportunities for exploitation will increase. This scenario means that two choices could await all the governments who would be sponsoring an immigration bill that ends free movement and/or tightens free trade for them. The first is to continue to change leadership and avoid slipping into violence. The second option is to champion free trade and

immigration in order to maintain the attention of their own citizens, rather than solely focusing inward and scrutinizing their performance.

When Adam Smith (1723 – 1790) suggested more than two hundred years ago that the rich can control the poor by focusing on controlling the stations (physical or financial) that the poor depend on to trade, he definitely did not take into account that after Great Britain restored self-governance to the United States, the people who would be living in this new country would be able to split atoms to create an atomic bomb, thus forcing Great Britain to dismantle its empire. Likewise, when the United States proposed to Great Britain and the rest of the western European nations in 1941 to restore self-government to all the nations that those empires were depriving them of, the Americans were not counting on the people who would be integrating their local and national economies to expand their wealth and challenge their own sovereignty. If all the new ideas that people are taking confirm what Heraclitus (BC 535 – BC 475), an ancient Greek philosopher, once said about "man not stepping into the same river twice,"³⁷ it would be naïve to assume that all the policies that are being adopted to solve the most global pressing challenges would not hold unanticipated events in future years. Such behavior also means that humans' devotion to continuously injecting new ideas in the social order does not seem to be improving humans' ability to distinguish between good or evil or to formulate new social behavior. To the contrary, we can expect that for as long as humans are commercializing human ingenuity to seek grand dreams, all the new ideas that people come up with produce nothing but making newborns reject old ways of doing things in favor of new methods to achieve one end. The result is to reap deeper insecurity when human knowledge or awareness grows instead of the opposite. This situation is very serious and worrisome. If more people become aware, their intolerance may also increase; this suggests that the measures being promoted by UN member states to create an egalitarian world might not help humanity end this historical dynamic. Instead, if UN member states continue to permit the UN and international development aid agencies to encourage people to abandon traditional methods in favor of new ones, they could be condemning humanity to face a total social breakdown in the future.

37 <https://www.goodreads.com/quotes/117526-no-man-ever-steps-in-the-same-river-twice-for>

Many philosophers have claimed that humans' inability to cooperate with one another humanely could be due to mankind having evolved from the animal kingdom and not being programmed by a supernatural force as some people argue. If humans evolved from the animal kingdom, then their recourse to violence becomes a priori. However, because the unpredictable behavior that humans exhibit occurs only when a person becomes able to change matter on his own and when he develops awareness, we can say that there must be a rule that is prompting this defiance that humans exhibit.

Protagoras [490 - 420 BC] was a pre-Socratic philosopher who claimed that "man is the measure of all things."³⁸ It is possible that when the awareness of a human being becomes capable of making the human body change matter on its own and produce specific patterns that the natural system and the rest of the other living organisms that co-habit with mankind are not able to produce, this superiority drives a form of grandeur delusion in the imagination of humans.

Megalomania, paranoia, and even delusion are three perceptions that the American Psychiatric Association considers to be brain disorders.³⁹ The Merriam-Webster Dictionary defines "paranoia" to be a mental illness characterized by systematized delusions of persecution or grandeur, usually without hallucinations.⁴⁰ Delusion is "a persistent false psychotic belief regarding the self or persons or objects outside the self that is maintained despite indisputable evidence to the contrary."⁴¹ And megalomania or narcissistic personality disorder is defined as "a delusional mental illness that is marked by feelings of personal omnipotence and grandeur."⁴²

Most humans spend a lot of time thinking about reaching success, gaining power, and how to take advantage of the people around them whenever they become capable of changing matters on their own and when a human being develops awareness. Could the dramatic, overly

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

39 <http://www.mentalhealthamerica.net/conditions/paranoia-and-delusional-disorders>

40 <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/paranoia>

41 <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/delusion>

42 <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/megalomania>

emotional, unpredictable thinking or behavior and manipulative or exploitative interactions that humans exhibit to be successful or to take advantage of others, whenever the body becomes able to produce patterns that only humans can produce, be grandeur delusion symptoms that strike each individual naturally during this interval in life? If these symptoms are not programmed naturally, there must be a rule that activates them.

Hence, not all the people contemplate reaching success, gaining power, and/or taking advantage of the people around them. Whenever humans become capable of changing matters on their own, we cannot conclude that they have been programmed with grandiose delusions. If so, there must be a rule that activates this urge.

Humans change matter to sustain their survival needs and to satiate their earthly desires. All the interactions that people prompt are divided into natural and legal rights. Only during or after a natural disaster, or a war, or when a mass epidemic strikes do people become ready to surrender freedom so as to let relationships stop continuing to be dependent on laws or customs. When a person (or a nation) is not experiencing any calamity, people are generally indifferent toward each other and ensure that their relationship stays divided into either natural rights or legal rights. What if there is a relationship between man's peculiar propensity to be successful, gain power, and take advantage and man's propensity to show conscious thought, compassion, or feeling?

Since 1945, the UN and the UN member states want us to believe that the rates of growth of population, technology, religious radicalism, and environmental degradation are what accelerated this intolerance that emerged. The UN and UN member states do not connect man's propensity for conscious thought, compassion, or feeling with the killing, deception, abuse, or wicked acts that people prompt. Taking a step back, we can see that the UN and its member states attribute insecurity to population growth, technology, religious radicalism, and environmental degradation, but this insecurity arose because people began to show conscious thought, compassion, or feeling post-1945.

If, when people did not show conscious thought, compassion, or feeling toward each other (i.e., before 1945), this comportment did not aid mankind to start to relate to each other better; and if, when people started to show conscious thought, compassion, or feeling toward each other (i.e., after 1945), the same struggle remained, then man's peculiar propensity to kill and even enjoy killing, deceiving, abusing, and committing wicked acts on a mass basis when society sanctioned such crimes cannot be due to other than man's propensity to show conscious thought, compassion, or feeling. If humans don't show conscious thought, compassion, or feeling, they have no reason to interact.

Could this conscious thought or compassion tendency that humans exhibit be what is prompting this constant historical dynamic or struggle to make people start to relate to each other better? This tendency is what makes people want to be successful, gain power, and take advantage of others. This same tendency drives successful individuals who enjoy power to encourage others to abandon their old methods in favor of new approaches. This belief means that humans inherit a tendency to be more successful and more powerful, which could very well be due to this commonly held view by society that people are impelled to foster peaceful connections with one another. Accordingly, this conviction is what makes people yield to the labor division problem, the principal driver that leads people to compete and to be unwilling to surrender freedom to deepen social cohesion. Concurrently, because people have no other choice but to express goodness if they do not want to be dominated, this requirement leads to people having to take advantage of each other. What if man's peculiar propensity to kill, deceive, abuse, or commit wicked acts is related to man's propensity to show conscious thought, compassion, or feeling? How can we be certain that the UN and its member states' commitment to fostering human rights and creating an egalitarian world is not exacerbating the situation??

Most animals exhibit patterns that suggest they are programmed with feelings, including the willingness to sacrifice themselves to save their young. Yet in the animal kingdom, when a specific animal is under threat, the animals who are near, according to their kind, do not show compassion; leave what they are doing and run to aid the one that is in

danger. They all run away. Similarly, when an animal is attacked or killed by a stronger animal, the other animals that rush to the location of the corpse do not approach to check if the attacked animal is still alive, needs help, or can recover; instead, they come solely to secure a meal.

Humans exhibit behaviors that are contrary to those shown by animals. When a person (or a nation) is under threat, most people exhibit compassionate patterns and come to the aid. They do not rush to where the disaster struck to secure a meal but to aid in the recovery. Could the reversed patterns that humans and animals exhibit be why animals seem to be more organized and at peace with each other, and the irregular behavior that humans are showing be because they are exhibiting different patterns?

For example, Haiti is a sovereign nation that was ranked among the nations with the lowest Human Development Index in the Americas before 2010. On 12 January 2010, a magnitude-7.0 earthquake struck Haiti. In the aftermath of the earthquake, many national governments and private and governmental aid groups from around the world mobilized in the country to aid in the relief efforts. Haiti suddenly transformed into a hub for humanitarian response. Some countries began to send relief and rescue workers. Charitable organizations began to coordinate the humanitarian aid. Private companies were sending supplies, while others sought to organize fundraising initiatives to provide monetary support, which was crucial in addressing the immediate needs of the affected population and supporting the recovery efforts in the aftermath of the earthquake. Appeals for international aid in response to the earthquake were so breathtaking to a degree that they prompted the Haitian government in April 2010 to cease food distribution in some camps in order to allow the normal economy to resume.⁴³

Haiti remains to this day ranked among the nations with the lowest Human Development Index in the Americas. However, as the aforementioned example shows, if the unfortunate earthquake had not struck and caused all the destruction in this nation, no national

43 St. Pierre, Mary (April 23 – May 6, 2010). "Rebuilding Haiti one small step at a time". Florida Catholic. Orlando, Florida. pp. A1.

governments or private and governmental aid groups from around the world would have mobilized in the country to aid in the relief efforts.

Two sources could have contributed to the international community's awareness of the need to help the Haitian people in the aftermath of the earthquake. The first source of this awareness could have been a conscientious thought, which supports the idea that human awareness has the potential to inspire brotherly behavior. When the earthquake struck Haiti, people were able to influence behaviors and emotions that were practical and sensible in order to assist the victims, such as organizing relief efforts, donating supplies, and providing emotional support to those affected. The second motive for the assistance that was poured could not have been intended to genuinely help the earthquake victim but rather to gain from the misfortune that struck this country. In other words, the conscious thought, compassion, or feeling of those individuals who rushed to aid the victim in Haiti was poured out to take advantage of the misfortune that the Haitian people faced, rather than to genuinely help the Haitian people recover so they could continue to be successful and gain power, consequently.

There is a well-known proverb that says, "When a cow falls down, the knives multiply."⁴⁴ In the animal kingdom, not all the animals are qualified hunters. When an animal falls down, all the animals prey on the collapsed corpse. The most fit or the strongest animals eat first, and all the ones who are not regarded as qualified hunters wait to eat the leftovers or until another animal is attacked so they can gain again. What if in the human kingdom, when a natural disaster, a war, a mass epidemic, etc. strikes, the consciousness or compassion that people show is not specifically tailored to aid the people who are going through a hardship to recover, but rather because they have something to gain? Once again, Haiti is a good example; before the earthquake struck, the international community was not dispassionate about helping the Haitian people have better lives. After the earthquake struck, the entire international community converged on this country to help with rescue and recovery⁴⁵ and not restoration.⁴⁶ The actions

44 <http://english.ahram.org.eg/NewsContent/32/98/130198/Folk/Folk-Arts/Proverb-of-the-day--When-the-cow-falls-down,-the-k.aspx>

45 <https://www.ucidiver.com/rescue-vs-recovery>

46 https://link.springer.com/referenceworkentry/10.1007%2F978-1-4020-4399-4_285

being taken to restore Haiti to the physical and economic status it enjoyed before the earthquake are carried out by the people of Haiti in partnership with various development aid agencies involved in this process.

The founding fathers of the post-international system counselled that the unpreparedness of a nation in the political, economic, and social fields should not be a pretext for another nation to interfere in the evolution of an unprepared country as long as its people are observing faithfully and strictly the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations.

The degree of preparedness of any nation in the political, economic, and social fields is at the mercy of the natural environment and the capabilities of its members to push their scientific and technical limits to develop power to deny others rights. It would be irrational to assume that the founding fathers of the post-international system interpreted that when a nation is struck with a disaster, all the nations that would come to its aid should also interfere in its rebuilding, because if this were the case, they would not have agreed that a nation begin to freely dispose of its natural wealth and resources without prejudice to any obligations arising out of international economic cooperation.

If the founding fathers of the post-international system were fine with a nation beginning to freely dispose of its natural wealth and resources without prejudice to any obligations post-1945, this conclusion means that those architects did not program that any nation interfere in the preparedness of another sovereign nation, whether this meddling or involvement is to address tragic events or joyous ones. This conclusion is because it would be irrational to assume that the founding fathers of the post-international system could have been in favor of UN member states interfering in accelerating the awareness or preparedness of people at the same time, especially when nations depend on denying each other the right to capability to prevent any one state from gaining enough military power to dominate all others. If nations impede the social, cultural, and economic development of each other to prevent a balance of power scenario, could the founding fathers of the post-international system have programmed that the UN member states

grant rights to the UN and to international development aid agencies to pit them against each other to keep the international order dynamic?

Moreover, in the animal kingdom, wildlife oust each other through brute force and through weaklings forming an alliance to gang up on the animal who are tormenting the majority. This practice results in ousting or killing the animal that is behaving irrationally, allowing a new member to assume the role of protector. In the human kingdom, the person who is being bound by his personal power and conscience prefers that his retaliation against his foes or adversaries involve subjecting them to subjugation, domination, and exploitation instead of ousting them or taking their lives. Humans' contradictory conduct regarding how animals cooperate or behave goes beyond subjecting them to abuse or domination; it involves actions that are much worse. In the human kingdom, humans want that the people whom they subject to subjugation, domination, and exploitation remain indeterminately with their wings clipped and the power of subjugating them to such a fate be transferred hereditarily.

If the founding fathers of the post-international system proposed that people collaborate on the principle of equal rights post-WW2, it would be absurd to assume that they would have been fine with allowing the UN or international development aid agencies to interfere in the rebuilding of nations with agents who are carrying out their functions while pursuing the full realization of their personality, especially when humans depend on denying each other access to capability to impede each other from developing power and becoming a threat. In other words, it would be irrational to assume that on the one hand the nations with great powers would be pursuing policies that deny critical knowledge or capability to non-industrialized or poor nations, and on the other, they would be fine with having non-governmental organizations (NGOs) such as the UN and the different international aid agencies interfere in the political, social, and economic preparedness of the nations that they would like them to be weak, because this strategy defeats the purpose. This is because there is no difference between the people of the poor nations posing a threat to the people of the nations with great powers and the employees who are working at the different NGOs prompting such an outcome—they are

also human beings, and they are also pursuing the realization of the full development of their human personality.

If the founding fathers of the post-international system had created any other organizations besides the ones that they approved (i.e., the WB, IMF, ILO, and UNESCO), then either those initial architects were naïve or they were setting their countries up on a course toward an eventual disintegration. If those who leave mainstream society to serve God and their neighbor cannot purge their prejudice, can a UN employee do so while pursuing their own development? In other words, if the people who supposedly do not pursue the realization of the full development of their human personality (i.e., priests, clerics, preachers, etc.) have not stopped gaining power to increase their pleasure, then how could we be sure that the interference of the different NGOs in the preparedness of people would not gradually develop into forming a number of warring states so a new authority would rise that would associate all of them in a manner similar to what happened when the Catholic Church rose? Is the postwar international system a detour designed by powerful nations to replicate the same events experienced by our predecessors, causing them to regress instead of progress?

Only two scenarios could have prompted the UN member states to approve that the UN create subsidiary organizations and to unleash them in the social order to create the disorder that has emerged in the international order so far. The first scenario would have been due to those political leaders approving those measures misunderstanding what mankind united in 1945 to erect. The second scenario would have been due to those who were making such decisions post-1945 suffering from symptoms of delusion.

The decisive rejection and reversal of the post-war consensus, which emphasized free markets and free movement, could be interpreted to mean that the policies adopted by the political leaders who approved the UN's creation of subsidiary organizations were based on a misunderstanding of what mankind united to achieve in 1945. However, the consensus among UN members to foster human rights, create an egalitarian world, and set dates for achieving this goal alludes to two conclusions. Either the political leaders insisting on this

work program are delusional, or the organizations spearheading it have become significantly more powerful than the UN member states themselves. In other words, there are those who are driving this consensus.

Even if powerful special interests are betting on the UN to promote human rights in order to increase their wealth or to help establish a global government in which they would hold authority, they may be experiencing delusions if they believe their successors will benefit from the plans being developed while the UN continues to gain power. This is because we can never have complete and absolute certainty about the result of an event until it occurs.

The American Psychiatric Association defines delusion as a brain disorder whose symptoms create “an odd belief that a person firmly insists is true despite evidence that it is not, and that this disorder is part of a chronic brain disorder that is called schizophrenia.” This association also defines “delusion disorder” to be “an irrational or intense belief or suspicion that a person believes to be true.”

It is not possible to control what people think or how they act. Likewise, humans' ability to conceal their feelings makes it impossible to determine when a person is in danger; for instance, it is unclear whether those who come to their aid are showing compassion because they genuinely care or because they seek to gain an advantage. This situation also means that it is not possible to know if the decision of the political leaders who succeeded the initial architects of the post-war international order for deviating away from what the founding fathers counseled governments should become organized to secure in favor of letting UN and development aid agencies interfere in the social order was motivated to achieve a specific premeditated schizophrenic goal or not. The dysfunctional international order that has emerged so far is evidence to support what happens when natural rights clashes with legal rights. Everyone agrees that every person has the right to pursue what they believe is their natural right. The global human security problem is not just about acknowledging that every person has the right to pursue their beliefs; it also involves determining which rights a society should prioritize when human ingenuity primarily generates ideas, and individuals use their creativity to

influence those who are less economically prepared to consider their opinions before making their own decisions.

Curve fitting is defined as “the process of constructing a curve, or mathematical function, that has the best fit to a series of data points, possibly subject to constraints.”⁴⁷ The legal rights that humans interrelate on its premise took thousands of years to construct.

As I said before, it is great to allow every philosopher, artist, actor, scientist, migrant, sex worker, child, woman, man, etc. to realize their role and the best of their abilities, because they deserve everything that they get for equal rights, freedom of expression, or freedom to be, but it is very difficult to separate or to dissect the necessity of being what one believes is his natural right from what mankind spent thousands of years interpolating and smoothing to construct the international political order that includes the rule of conduct that has been recognized in respect to the broad class of human actions. This decision that the political leaders who succeeded the initial architects of the post-war international order took to make us feel natural so we stop continuing to hide away our feelings can help us to understand ourselves better, but this work program does not stabilize the social order, which is the reason why we cooperate with one another in the economic field to begin with. Allowing people to feel natural in a world that is full of economic contradictions makes nations produce differently. The problem that exists in the world now is that despite the goods and services that nations sell and buy being disproportional, the UN and the UN member states continue to preach to people about fostering human rights to achieve the same standards of living instead of teaching tolerance and respect. To give an example, let us take Lebanon due to its small geographical size. The powerful nations prevent the Lebanese government from cutting trees to issue banknotes, which are then spent to keep citizens occupied with making and baking bricks to build a tower reaching the heavens, all to reduce dissatisfaction with the government's performance; they also allow Apple and Samsung to advertise on Lebanese soil, promoting the idea that every Lebanese should change their phone annually. To exacerbate the situation, the nations with great powers are urging the UN to

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

educate the Lebanese people on the importance of fostering human rights in order to meet the same standards.

Whether powerful special interests or wealthy international families who control powerful nations are indifferent to the disorganization of the Lebanese people and others—strategizing based on the “divide and rule”⁴⁸ technique attributed to Philip II of Macedonia, or suffering from schizophrenia—does not matter. In either case, their decision to allow the social order in Lebanon and other countries to disintegrate has spread beyond its borders, and its effects appear to be undermining the structural integrity of the international order and altering its dynamics or harmonics. It looks as if the decision that those powerful special interests or wealthy international families made to deviate away from what the founding fathers counselled, that nations cooperate like post-1945, and to exchange that for how to integrate local and national economies into a global unregulated market economy has overwhelmed the structural integrity of the social order to a point of no return, perhaps. The drives and forces that led those powerful special interests or wealthy international families to decide on what’s right from what’s wrong and to ignore what the United States counselled on how nations should consciously cooperate with one another post-1945 could have been compelled from a grandiose view that those individuals could have developed about themselves, their purpose, and the world.

Then again, because it is righteousness and not selfish or sentimental persuasion that binds the conscience of an individual, the ambition of the powerful special interests and the wealthy international family to effectively check wrongdoing and to stand up for the rights of others so the contradictions of our economies do not continue to promote inequity aided favorably the people who were submitting to wrong. This situation has now caused the structural integrity of the social order to become brittle. The penalty for attempting to avoid controlling production to limit the number of enlightened people that this process was concurrently breeding aided those who were subjugated to espouse the cause that the powerful special interests and the wealthy international family are depending on to gain advantage. In other words, the current gridlock benefits the poor by keeping despotism and

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

domination in place, as the more powerless people become, the more they strive for justice, which hinders the powerful special interests and wealthy international families from stabilizing the social order. This scenario means that if the UN and all the different international aid agencies are not stopped from continuing to persuade people to defend rights so people do not continue to espouse the cause of human rights to keep the international order dynamic, there is a good chance that this strategy that the powerful special interests and the wealthy international family are pursuing to gain advantage will crumble people's trust in the idea of the state as a tool to gain security.

The challenge with mankind becoming organized in stateless or non-hierarchical societies is not with how to make people establish relations with one another when there is little concentration of authority within the jurisdiction of a structured authority, but rather with how to guarantee that those who gain advantage from the idea of the state continue to wield power.

Hence, the last thing that the powerful special interests and the wealthy international families who control the nations with great power want to see occur is that the anarchist-type doctrine emerge, because it would split the concentration of authority, preferring instead that people reside within the jurisdiction of a sovereign state. The challenge with integrating people into the state-based idea is that it requires resolving disputes through predefined rules. This philosophy requires that people accept hierarchy. The problem associated with operating hierarchical philosophies is that they require that the people who depend on such cooperation or association maintain huge armies and support a central bureaucracy.

Evidently, the idea of advocating a global political tenet in which societies become organized under a consistent economic and cultural practice and letting a council made up of nations with great power run its authority so the powerful special interests and/or the wealthy international families who control this political ideology could reap its benefits in the same way the natural system programmed trees that bear fruit to operate unsupervised on their own is not something that can be done when it's humans who are running this machinery.

The idea of allowing people to determine their own political status after 1945 aimed to enable highly variable stateless societies to thrive and, through diverse economic and cultural practices, ensure that smaller social groups could resolve their issues using their own established rules. In fact, the Atlantic Charter proclaimed the requirement to ensure that “territorial adjustments must be in accord with the wishes of the peoples concerned,” which could have been proposed for this purpose.⁴⁹ Hence, the powerful special interests and the wealthy international families who control the nations with great power chose to ignore the implications of integrating local and national economies into a global market economy on the people who are understandably also working to achieve the same kind of standards of living as they have; the economic contradictions that are evolving could be corroding the democratic institutions that those powerful people need to be continually promoting and defending to gain advantage.

Rust is iron oxide, which is a brownish substance that forms a film on the surface of iron. Water or water vapor and oxygen force iron to rust. This substance is more brittle than iron. It is less resistant to environmental degradation and permeability by water and air. If the iron is used as a load-bearing item, it can be extremely dangerous. The metal would lose its structural integrity and convert into flakes and scales. Most importantly, the rusty form that iron takes is inevitable (not a process that iron can prevent from happening). The rusty form is “the thermodynamic favored state for those three elements. This state signifies that these three elements prefer to be that way all the time, rather than stay in their pure elemental form. Humans alter the natural state of these elements to meet our metallic needs.”⁵⁰

If humans are like iron, they were programmed to remain in their natural state all the time; and if the laws that people create to legitimize the authority of the state over the individual prevent humans from staying in their state of nature, allowing the UN and international development organizations to force humans into becoming something for which this species was not programmed could corrode the international order beyond repair. The situation is very serious and

49 https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Atlantic_Charter

50 https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=B_em0quwuSw

worrisome. The concern is because if the UN and the international development organizations push more people into becoming organized under political tenets that are not humans' preferred state to be like, they would be increasing the rate at which humans are being corrupted. Humans lack the natural ability to assess the severity of the damage that rusted iron can cause. In other words, a rusted structural element could maintain its shape, but then when a person tries to move it, he will find that it is brittle and is made of flakes and scales. If this process that iron undergoes is also ongoing in the international order, the powerful special interests and the wealthy international families who control the nations with great powers could be inflicting on themselves and on humanity damages that are unquantifiable. In other words, if the powerful special interests and the wealthy international families who control the nations with great powers do not stop the UN and the international development organization from being a party to attain the ends set forth in the UN Charter and do not go back to being organized as per the original contract that the United States proposed, they could be the principal perpetrators of their own self-destruction.

In biology, a pathogen is a bacterium, virus, or other microorganisms that can cause disease.⁵¹ However, the word "pathogen" is derived from the Greek language, and it is composed of two words (πάθος pathos, "suffering" or "passion," and -γενής -genēs, "producer of").⁵²

Laws and political order are not natural but human creations. What if this "specialized" passion, which humans invented to encourage each other to abandon their old ways in favor of new methods that serve a specific purpose, is actually causing the suffering that is eroding the social order? This suffering is forcing human development paradigms that prioritize functional capabilities, such as substantive freedom, which contradicts what people actually need to do to improve social welfare. In other words, it was difficult to vividly detect if this development mission that people devote themselves to pursuing makes the people (or nations) who are less prepared economically, militarily, or technologically surrender freedom before taking actions of their own, as they do now, because the interaction and integration of people were less advanced before advances in transportation and

51 <https://www.lexico.com/en/definition/pathogen>

52 <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Pathogen#References>

communication were made. When the interaction and integration of people were accelerated, it became evident after the UN member states decided to deviate from what the founding fathers of the UN counselled that the international order should be organized like and chose to provide assistance to accelerate the economic and social conditions of each other under all circumstances; this human development or compassion idea does not aid humans in making choices that compel people to emphasize the importance of human reason over the unimportance of the senses. To the contrary, this technique is based on gaining and maintaining power by fusing a larger concentration of people, so the competition for how the resources should be distributed divides them. It is a strategy whose impact is not producing the same effect that its sister and opposite technique, divide and rule, can achieve. Unfortunately, the nations with great power are unable to stabilize the international order, because the degree of awareness of people is different today. This clustering of people is helping individuals cultivate awareness more quickly. The faster the powerful special interests and the wealthy international families who control the nations with great powers are thrusting the UN and the international aid agencies to foster human rights to increase production, the more the cultivated awareness is making people involuntarily emphasize the importance of freedom of choice and the multi-dimensionality of welfare over tolerance and contentedness. Freedom of choice is not a condition that makes a person become ready to surrender freedom to obtain the benefit of the political order but to return the well-being of a person to its favored state (or state of nature). If we factor in how humans want their economic model to be structured, i.e., spinning winners and losers, and also factor in humans' insistence on ensuring that the social space that a person freezes be transferred with the material things that an individual accumulates to designated individuals upon death, this means that for as long as humans are using their human ingenuity to thrust each other to deepen social cohesiveness, the more this notion would be returning them to the state that I said earlier iron, water, and oxygen would like to exist in all the time (or iron oxide) by default. A person's well-being is better when they are bound by their own power and conscience than when they give up some freedom for the protection of their remaining rights.

Moreover, since the wealth that a person accumulates is a function of manmade laws, commandments that humans claim God instructed, the point of entry into becoming among the living, the status of the natural and built environment where the point of entry occurs, and many other factors, we can say that poverty is not due to capability deprivation, ignorance, or lack of financial or technical resources, but rather to the specific social contract that the people in positions of power adopt to determine how resources are obtained, managed, and distributed. However, because the people who have the most say in how resources are to be distributed are also prioritizing how to preoccupy with such resources the human ingenuity of people not in function of the abundance of certain resources but rather in function of what specific advances in technology necessitate, this approach causes another problem. First, it makes the competition for resources continually dynamic, with the level of rivalry varying based on the abundance or scarcity of the required resources. Second, this strategy makes it necessary that people are continually depending on bodies, institutions, unions, coalitions, agreements, and contracts between these units of authority to gain advantage.

Setting up bodies, institutions, unions, coalitions, agreements, etc. continually is one way to preoccupy human ingenuity or imagination, but the drawback of this philosophy is that it does not help strong people (or nations) rely on multilateralism, which discourages those who depend on unilateralism from disregarding commitments to directions that those in power deem necessary to bind beliefs and gain advantage. The rules of conduct that stronger people (or nations) expect weaker people (or nations) to consistently follow in determining right from wrong, such as "do not kill" or "do not steal," are principles that those with soft power would be willing to adhere to only if the powerful people (or nations) are also prepared to fulfill their part of the agreement.

Many people agree that consensus could improve decision accuracy. However, when different participants with divergent points of view, unique perspectives, expertise, positions, etc. are determining what constitutes acceptable behavior, some may agree while others disagree. If we take into account that the laws or the rules of conduct that newborns must adhere to while searching to increase their happiness

are not things that a newborn himself decides upon but are aspects that are imposed, this adds another challenge to obtain a consensus, especially when laws are always introduced and people are living longer. To obtain a general agreement can be challenging in cases where the stakes are high, such as in the case of determining or distinguishing between natural rights and legal rights.

Multilateralism, in the form of membership in international institutions, serves to bind powerful nations, discourage unilateralism, and provide small powers a voice and influence that they could not exercise.⁵³ The aspiration for the UN and international development agencies to teach people about fostering human rights in order to create an egalitarian world is genuine, as it aims to raise awareness on how to achieve a balanced approach to the acquisition, management, and distribution of resources. At the same time, this philosophy could be a very serious threat to world peace and the powerful special interests and the wealthy international families who control the nations with great powers in particular. This concern is because this philosophy shifts the debate of what a person could achieve from the shopping list that one's own imagination constructs of what is right from what is wrong from a discussion that would be decided upon in bodies, institutions, unions, and coalitions to one that would be pondered over in the street with the majority of the people. In other words, any decision to bind those who refuse to surrender freedom to obtain the benefits of the political order will require bargaining and compromise not only with group leaders but also with each member of society.

Many people listen to their biases and rely on their wealth, prestige, or power to deny each other rights. Humans not only use the rules of conduct to deny each other rights, but they also enact those rules to control and regulate expectations. In other words, it is believed that rules of conduct or laws would act as a safety valve. This means that those who behave ethically will always balance out those who behave unethically. This safety valve helps humanity manage situations where more individuals prioritize their biases over principles that the majority deem acceptable. The safety valve theory, enacted in the US

53 <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Multilateralism#Definitions>

in 1862 to address unemployment, serves as a close analogy for understanding the previously mentioned concepts.⁵⁴

Hence, the UN and the international development agencies are teaching people to be devoted to fostering human rights to create an egalitarian world and not to be tolerant and content with what one has amassed or possessed; this argument means that what the aid workers of those bodies, institutions, unions, and coalitions are really teaching is nothing but to have people start to listen to their own biases to increase their happiness. In other words, they are learning to choose the best path to secure their food. This signifies that if the powerful special interests and the wealthy international families who control the nations with great powers do not stop the UN and international development agencies from continuing to make people listen to their own psyche with respect to right or wrong conduct, humanity could be on a straight collision course with a "solitary, poor, nasty, brutish, and short" and nasty human life as per what philosophers such as Thomas Hobbes, John Locke, Jean-Jacques Rousseau, Immanuel Kant, and many others cautioned about. This conclusion is because humans are not a species that appears to be programmed to adhere to rules of conduct but to learn. If the powerful special interests and the wealthy international families who control the nations with great powers continue to allow the UN and the international development agencies to teach people to take the best route to find their food, there is a good chance that a large mass of people who would be depending on their own bias with respect to right or wrong conduct will grow into forming a blob in the social space. In this situation, it becomes impossible for humans to be organized and behave according to any rules of conduct, because the destructive capacity of the blob would far exceed any constructive measures taken to stabilize it.

In the Bible, in the legendary story of the *Passover and the Festival of Unleavened Bread*, it is reported that God asked Moses and Aaron to tell certain people to slaughter a lamb and to place some of its blood on the sides and tops of the doorframes of their houses. The myth says the blood was a sign so that when God judged the city's people, his

54 https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Safety_valve_theory

spirit would pass over the marked houses and no plague would harm them.⁵⁵

Could this parallel that is being made between this story that is reported in the *Passover and the Festival of Unleavened Bread* and the conjecture about what could take place in the international order if the UN and the international development agencies do not stop thrusting people to take the best route to find their food instead of letting only government be responsible for the welfare of societies as per how the United States proposed be what the powerful special interests and the wealthy international families who control the nations with great powers are aligning themselves to face on the hands of the people who the aid workers of those bodies, institutions, unions, and coalitions are awakening? The situation is very serious and worrisome.

If this analogy is true, the implication means that if the powerful special interests and/or the wealthy international families who control the nations with great powers delay going to organize the international order according to the way the founding fathers of the UN proposed, this postponement would be extending their control temporarily, but it would not be stopping the blob or the social order from continuing to deteriorate as more people depend on their own bias with respect to right or wrong conduct. This is because the social order could decay similarly to how viruses spread in the human body, eventually infecting all healthy cells and rendering the human immune system unable to fight them off, which could lead to ultimate death.

Viruses are “microscopic parasites” that lack the capacity to thrive and reproduce outside of a host body.⁵⁶ Viruses are living microorganisms that are tiny. For example, the polio virus, 30 nm across, is about 10,000 times smaller than a grain of salt.⁵⁷ Adolf Eduard Mayer (1843–42) was a German agricultural chemist whose work on tobacco mosaic disease played an important role in the discovery of tobacco mosaic viruses and viruses in general.⁵⁸ In 1886, Mayer published a paper titled *Concerning the Mosaic Disease of Tobacco*, which

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

56 <https://www.livescience.com/53272-what-is-a-virus.html>

57 <https://www.livescience.com/53272-what-is-a-virus.html>

58 https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Adolf_Mayer

surmised that such very small microorganisms exist in nature.⁵⁹ It took scientists until the electron microscope was invented in 1931 to finally visualize viruses.

Mayer found that when “he crushed up infected tobacco leaves with the mosaic virus and injected the noxious juice into the veins of healthy tobacco leaves, it resulted in the yellowish speckling and discoloration characteristic of the disease.” He surmised that whatever was causing tobacco mosaic disease was in the leafy juice.

We do know that what is prompting humans to deviate from the norms of social behavior that are regarded as ethical is a “disease” or a disorder of human origin. We also do know that UN subsidiary organs and international development aids are bodies, institutions, unions, and coalitions that are like a virus; they need a “living” host to house them. In other words, the living hosts are the diverse societies (or people) that the different UN subsidiary organs and international development aids are preaching to them about the need to change traditions and values in order to be modernized to create an egalitarian world.

Geoffrey L. Smith (born 1955) is a British virologist in the area of the Vaccinia virus.⁶⁰ Smith has changed how we think about virus spread. Smith showed that the vaccinia virus travels (surfs) from one healthy cell to another while avoiding (skipping) cells that are already infected.⁶¹ In other words, the virus “bounces past cells that are already infected to reach uninfected cells quicker.”

What if all the various UN subsidiary organs and international development aid created by UN member states to instill passion in the social order after 1945 are actually “disease-causing” agents that contribute to the “speckling and discoloration,” or dynamism, observed in the social order? What if what is preventing our political leaders from isolating and/or from visualizing that all the different UN subsidiary organs and international development aid that they injected in the healthy societies that existed in the world in 1945 could be due to a “disease-causing” agent that behaves like the Vaccinia virus? The

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

60 https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Geoffrey_L._Smith

61 <https://www.livescience.com/8038-viruses-spread-fast-cell-surfing.html>

UN member states are unable to isolate what could be spreading the intolerance that emerged in the social order post-1945 because it is impossible for them to visualize how doing good could produce bad. In the meantime, the more the different UN subsidiary organs and international development aids are teaching people about why everyone needs to stop being tolerant and content to start to listen to his own bias to increase his happiness, the more signs of healthy societies becoming incapable of putting up with one another are growing.

If this analogy that is being suggested about the different UN subsidiary organs and international development aid serving as a pathogen or a “disease-causing” agent that could be perpetrating the spread of the intolerance that emerged in the international order signifies that this large number of non-governmental organizations / people that started interesting themselves in deepening social connectedness could be a result of the large number of people who are not capable of putting up with one another anymore in the different societies. Everyone is pursuing the creation of an egalitarian world to slow the spread of intolerance, but what every person does not know is that the more they interest themselves in creating an egalitarian world instead of adopting the tenets that the United States proposed, the more damage their own interference to make more people value happiness and fair distribution of wealth and opportunities within society will be prompting intolerance. As the number of people who value the importance of true freedom under all circumstances increases, this emphasis will increasingly undermine and damage the structural integrity of our international order to a point beyond repair. This situation is very serious and worrisome.

If, in theory, all living things that exhibit the same characteristics (i.e., use energy, show movement, take in food, change shape, reproduce, etc.) are classified by scientists as “living things,” and if humans, animals, bacteria, viruses, and plants all perform these activities, this implies that all these “things” could have been programmed to exhibit similar types of responsiveness, even though bacteria and donkeys do not play with balls like humans do.

If humans and viruses have features in common, then it is highly likely that those two living things could be possessing consciousness. If humans and viruses can sense things and react to external stimuli, then such behavior signifies that they have the power to be organized. For example, Smith states that new microscopic video shows that after a vaccinia particle infects a healthy cell, “it expresses two viral proteins on the cell surface, which marks the cell as infected.” When further virus particles reach the infected cell, “these proteins cause the host cell to push out snake-like projections called actin tails, which drive the virus particles away toward other cells that they can infect.”⁶²

When humans interrelate and influence each other to behave in a certain manner, they infect each other exactly as per how the vaccinia virus does, with one exception. The only difference is that the vaccinia virus expresses two viral proteins on the infected cell surface, thus marking it as a plagued cell, whereas in the case of humans, newborns are sorted out based on distinction, such as race, color, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth, or other status.

In other words, humans do not push each other away by using snake-like projections called actin tails to influence behavior; instead, they articulate such phenomena by expressing philosophical tenets that are based on incomplete information.

Throughout history, philosophers and researchers have theorized about the origin of people's unwillingness to express tolerance, with nearly all opinions pointing to "pathos" (or passion) as a potential source. For this reason, all existing humans agreed after WW2 to refrain from collaborating based on any form of distinction after this date.

Could the new wave of pathos adopted by UN member states after 1945, which allows various UN subsidiary organs and international development aid organizations to promote "pathos," be responsible for prompting humans to deviate from social behavior norms that were once considered tolerable, leading to this unprecedented unwillingness to be tolerant? This phenomenon happened, principally, because the agents who are spreading the new pathos to foster human rights to

62 <https://www.livescience.com/8038-viruses-spread-fast-cell-surfing.html>

create an egalitarian world are carrying their duties without having been excised first from the factor that has been preventing humans from cooperating in the economic field rightly and/or before launching them among the people to teach them to change their behavior toward this reasonable goal to reduce crises and conflicts. This factor that was not removed from the agents that the UN member states launched among people to teach them to foster human rights to pursue creating an egalitarian world is their right to be themselves, pursuing the realization of the full development of their personalities, while they are teaching people to be tolerant. And so, if the agents who are supposed to be teaching people to be tolerant to foster human rights to create an egalitarian world are themselves prioritizing their happiness over the “pathos” that they are spreading, and if what the different UN subsidiary organs and international development aid organizations are teaching, in theory, is none other than asking people to stop being tolerant to increase their happiness, then could we say that for as long as the UN member states allow agents to spread “pathos,” what this action is doing is none other than what the vaccinia virus, according to new videos, carries out doing? This virus is infecting the societies whose people have not been infected by all this “pathos” (or passion) that the different UN subsidiary organs and international development aid organizations are teaching. The more the UN member states burden the various UN subsidiary organs and international development aid organizations with “pathos,” the more these organizations hinder human development and cause those who come into contact with them, as well as those who are infected, to become dysfunctional and invasive. This also means that since the agents (i.e., individuals who are working for the different UN subsidiary organs and international development aids) and the host (i.e., different societies) are all humans and are all pursuing the realization of the full development of their personality at the same time, the international order could be deteriorating at a rate much faster than humans imagine. If the UN member states do not stop all the machinery that the different UN subsidiary organs and international development aids organizations depend on to infect healthy people, the intolerance that emerged would continue to go on until the social order totally breaks down. In other words, the discontentment created by this phenomenon cannot be contained within a single nation or geographical area; instead, it is a process that leads to intolerance being replicated from one person to

another, leaving only two options to reduce it. The first is a global war and/or going back to pre-1945 programming with the behavior that emerged continuing to go on until a global war becomes inevitable. The second is to close all those machines that are infecting people and go back to implementing the work program that the United States proposed in 1941 to spare mankind from the scourge of a major war.

Most importantly, hence, all the "pathos," or the economic interference that the different UN subsidiary organs and international development aid organizations (NGOs, charities, banks, and companies) are prompting, is being done using agents who are working at increasing their happiness at the same time (i.e., this observance is not being done as per the way the people who dedicate their lives to the pursuit of religious conviction do, whereby in certain religions they even renounce "material things" to be able to dedicate themselves to the service of others). Then this signifies that it is not possible to know if all these emotions or interferences that were evoked post-1945 to elicit feelings of compassion were motivated to attain the goals that the United States proposed or to prompt a rise in intolerance similar to what happened when the disciples of Christ were asking people to reject being tolerant with the rules of conduct that were prevalent during the Roman Empire in order to devote themselves to practicing the tenets that Jesus was teaching.

Moreover, hence, the aforesaid also means that it is not possible to know if the compassion of the different UN subsidiary organs and international development aid organizations is genuine or if they are motivated to gain advantage; this means that it is not equally possible to know if the interventions that all the bodies, institutions, unions, and coalitions are prompting under the pretext that they are programmed to secure the goals prescribed in the UN Charter are indeed driving people to be more tolerant to ultimately end this historical dynamic or if they are deepening people's intolerance to ultimately prompt further insecurity in the social order. For example, if we take the earthquake that struck Haiti in 2010, this means that we have no way of knowing if the convergence that the international community made to aid the people in this country during the rescue/recovery was motivated to genuinely help the sufferers or if all the rush/passion that was

expressed was intended to advance the agendas of the bodies, institutions, unions, and coalitions that rushed to offer compassion.

It is not possible to carry out a sensitivity analysis to measure the proportion of emotions that the international community expressed or evoked after the Haiti earthquake struck to determine if the actions that were manifested were motivated to aid the Haitian people to truly recover and/or if they were carried out to aid the people or bodies, institutions, unions, or coalitions that rushed to their aid. We know that this unfortunate event presents a favorable opportunity for those who support inequality, as it leads to the creation of businesses and profits. Each time people do business or aid each other, such activity creates income inequality. This suggests that the decline in happiness experienced by the people after the earthquake may not have been caused by the earthquake itself, but rather by the compassion shown by the international community.

Many mass protests broke out in Haiti following the 2010 earthquake, making it impossible to determine what proportion of the decline in happiness was caused by the international community's response to the earthquake, as opposed to factors such as inequality, income inequality, corruption, political freedom, climate change, or others.

In statistical measures, binary classification is defined as “the task of classifying the elements of a given set into two groups (predicting which group each one belongs to) on the basis of a classification rule.”⁶³ Accordingly, “contexts requiring a decision as to whether or not an item has some qualitative property, some specified characteristic, or some typical binary classification” are necessary to learn or “to identify to which of a set of categories a new observation belongs.”⁶⁴

Sensitivity has many shades of meaning, and most definitions relate this word to a person's response to his or her environment—either physical or emotional.⁶⁵ The Business Dictionary defines sensitivity as the following:

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

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

65 <https://www.vocabulary.com/dictionary/sensitivity>

1. Degree of awareness and responsiveness to internal and external changes, challenges, or demands;
2. Degree of susceptibility to damage or harm from changes in the environment;
3. Degree of change in a dependent variable in response to a change in an independent variable on which it is dependent.⁶⁶

In theory, we can say that it is impossible to apply any one of the definitions that experts use to express the relationship between one's own response to one's own environment to help us come up with a scale or a measure of change to determine which independent variable contributed to the deteriorated happiness that emerged post-earthquake. This is because we need to consider all the "internal and external changes, challenges, or demands" that the people of Haiti experienced before the earthquake in order to establish a baseline. In other words, if we consider a person who was 33 years old when the earthquake struck Haiti in 2010, we cannot determine the proportion of emotions that contributed to his disenchantment before the earthquake compared to all the events he experienced afterward.

However, since "the degree of awareness and responsiveness to internal and external changes, challenges, or demands" that any person undergoes are "related to a person's own response to one's own environment—either physical or emotional," then we can say that in the case of the people of Haiti, the proportion of the emotions or events that contributed to their deteriorated happiness post-earthquake cannot be due to influences from changes or emotions that their internal psyche was developing or even from external ones that the environment was creating because when the earthquake struck, the entire environment became the same. I will explain:

The biological definition of a host is an organism that harbors another organism inside or near their body in a symbiotic relationship.⁶⁷ Symbiosis is any type of a close and long-term biological interaction between two different organisms.⁶⁸ This allows one to say that Haiti or

66 <http://www.businessdictionary.com/definition/sensitivity.html>

67 [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Host_\(biology\)](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Host_(biology))

68 <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Symbiosis>

the population of Haiti can be referred to as a host. After the earthquake struck in Haiti, all the external physical changes or internal feelings that could have contributed to the disenchantment of the people in the system (i.e., in Haiti) became “zero” because when the earthquake struck, all the emotions, sensitivities, etc. of the entire population became all the same. In other words, all the emotions and sensitivity that the people of Haiti were feeling converged on how to survive.

Experts claim that symbiosis can be obligatory or facultative (optional) when an organism can generally live independently. After the earthquake struck in Haiti, symbiosis became obligatory for survival in this country. In other words, the people of Haiti became entirely dependent on the proportion of emotions that the international community expressed or evoked for their survival.

Sensitivity is the “degree of change in a dependent variable in response to a change in an independent variable on which it is dependent.” This definition allows us to say that the degree of change in the behavior of the people of Haiti should have changed in response to the changes in the emotions and behaviors of the international community on which they were dependent. This situation is very serious and worrisome. This scenario means that if after the international community had a chance right after the earthquake struck to affect the behavior of the people of Haiti in any way they wanted, the people in this country are to this day unhappy with one another and protesting; then one of two scenarios could be true. Humans are primates, or the programming that the international community tried to institute post-earthquake in this country is the motive. This is because there is no difference between when an earthquake strikes or a war erupts. Those two phenomena prompt destruction, death, devastation, and a condition in which the survival of a host becomes dependent on the proportion of emotions of another agent.

If we compare the interjection that the United States made in Europe post-WWII, we find that the European people did not express the same behavior post-war in the same way the people of Haiti have been doing pursuant to the earthquake that struck this country. It is undeniable that the interference that the United States prompted in Europe post-WW2

contained interference that was humane and one that involved explicit and implicit economic gains. The international community's intervention in Haiti following the earthquake does not share the same characteristics. In the case of Haiti, foreign aid injected into the country after the earthquake was primarily motivated by humanitarian concerns rather than greed. This signifies that one of two motives could be contributing to the deteriorated happiness that continues to plague the Haitian people post-earthquake: The United States was pursuing tenets that the international community in Haiti was not pursuing, or vice versa. Europe's current stability is unprecedented in its history.

Therefore, we cannot conclude that the interventions by UN agencies and international development aid restored the Haitian people's pre-earthquake status. On the contrary, we find that despite the large number of specialized and diverse interventions implemented in this relatively small country, the well-being of the Haitian people has not improved significantly. Pervasive poverty, inequality, and many social and economic constraints still plague this country. Thousands of people take to the street regularly to protest about allegations of government corruption, inequality, rising prices, etc. What if the freedom of choice and human rights policies that the UN and the international aid community fostered in the country created a host of dysfunctional and evasive cultures? This teaching stopped the people of Haiti from being able to put up with one another and be ready to accept being tolerant in order to increase their happiness.

Moreover, if despite all the foreign aid that the United States injected into Germany post-WW2, the Germans managed to build social connectedness to lift their country from the ruin of the war to pre-war status; and if despite all the foreign aid Haiti received post-the 2010 earthquake, the country's political stability remains unchanged (i.e., the country remains one of the poorest in the Americas region), we can say that the persisting poverty, corruption, political instability, poor infrastructure, lack of health care, and lack of education that have been plaguing Haiti cannot be due to lack of financial resources post-earthquake. The US funded Germany after WW2 and Haiti after the 2010 quake. The people of Germany did not claim that their government was corrupt or biased during the country's rebuilding

process after World War II. The German people managed to develop understanding of themselves to bring the country to its pre-war status. In the case of the Haitian people, their behavior did not change pre- and post-earthquake. The Haitian people's inability to formulate new behavior is due to factors other than a lack of foreign aid for understanding themselves.

Actually, some commentators speculate and argue that the United States prevents sovereign nations from interfering in the Americas, in accordance with the Monroe Doctrine, which warned European powers against such actions back in 1823.⁶⁹ This policy could be interpreted to mean that the US would like Haiti to remain insecure so the US government can continue to gain advantage. The earthquake did not kill all the people who possessed power in Haiti; so to say, the United States stopped interfering in the politics of this country to protect its interests. The US government might prefer that Haiti remain unstable to prevent the Haitians from developing wealth or power and to invite a global power over who could begin to threaten the US due to the proximity of the two countries to each other. The United States was not the sole country that was aiding the people of Haiti in the recovery; hence, the different UN subsidiary organs and international development aids were fulfilling this principal role. It would be erroneous to say that the US prefers that Haiti remain unstable or any other country, for that matter. Humans can influence each other to be intolerant because inequality and bias are common. If the various UN subsidiary organs and international development aid organizations that were assisting the Haitian people in formulating new behaviors failed to create the necessary behavioral change, then the reasons for the ongoing poverty, corruption, and political instability can only be attributed to two factors. The first issue is whether the foreign aid that was injected was used to teach people to be tolerant while recovery was ongoing. The second is if the different UN subsidiary organs and international development aid providers who rushed to aid the Haitian people were motivated to advance the agendas of the bodies, institutions, unions, and coalitions who rushed to offer compassion. In other words, a significant portion of the foreign aid money that was injected was used to enhance the satisfaction of various UN subsidiary organs and international development aid workers assisting the Haitian

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

people, rather than specifically to improve the well-being of the Haitian people themselves. This scenario also means that the different international bodies, institutions, unions, and coalitions that rushed to aid the Haitian people were not teaching the philosophical policies that the founding fathers of the UN counselled that UN member states cooperate with one another to strengthen. This situation also signifies that the rise in intolerance that the people of Haiti started knowing post-earthquake could have been due to all the corruption, abuse of power, or bias that the bodies, institutions, unions, coalitions of the different UN subsidiary organs, and international development aid organizations who rushed to their help brought along with them. In other words, the allegations of government corruption, inequality, economic inequality, rising prices, etc. that the people of Haiti are demanding an end to are due to all the erroneous teaching that the different UN subsidiary organs and international development aid organizations were pursuing and the corruption, abuse of power, or bias that the agents of those bodies, institutions, unions, and coalitions who rushed to the help of the Haitian people brought along with them.

To illustrate how the philosophical ideas taught by various UN subsidiary organs and international development aid organizations to the Haitian people before and after the 2010 earthquake may have primarily contributed to their inability to develop a necessary understanding of themselves after World War II, let us consider the following analysis.

The last war that the Haitians fought occurred before WW2 (i.e., the Second Caco War, 1918-1920).⁷⁰ It is clearly understood without being said that the United States provides security and economic oversight even after the US ended its occupation of Haiti in 1933.⁷¹ The only philosophical change that the Haitian people were introduced to in modern history was freedom of choice and the human rights policies that the UN member states and the UN started cultivating in 1945. If human nature hasn't changed since WW2, if human evolution is relative, and if the Haitians' economic model is still the same (i.e., producing winners and losers), then the UN and other international

70 https://en.m.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_wars_involving_Haiti

71

https://en.m.wikipedia.org/wiki/United_States_occupation_of_Haiti#Government_and_opposition

development organizations' flawed philosophical ideas could be making them less tolerant and disrupting social order. Accordingly, mankind could stand a chance of surpassing this economic crisis, which is causing intolerance and a reluctance to surrender freedom for the sake of political security, only if UN member states return to adopting the work program proposed by the United States in 1941.

Clearly, if, as I said, freedom of choice is not a condition that makes a person become ready to surrender freedom to obtain the benefit of the political order but a catalyst to prompt a person to return to his "state of nature" to secure his well-being, then the more people start to act on their accord, the more a person's own human imagination will start to thrust one's own human ingenuity to explore the unknown, discover new worlds, or fix grand dreams. This situation means that for as long as UN member states allow the different UN subsidiary organs and international development organizations to teach people to push the boundaries of their philosophical and/or scientific and technical limits so everyone can realize the full development of their personality, the more this phenomenon would unfortunately be prompting people to lose touch with reality and to get them to believe things as being "true despite evidence that they are not."

Evidently, mankind's power to be "the measure of all things," which he derives from his ability to engineer tools beyond nature's and other species' capabilities, could fuel the grand feeling that drives humanity to explore and answer the big questions not granted to our species. This desire to answer big questions could be provoked by human imagination after this aptitude becomes aware of the existence of the only truth that mankind cannot claim that it is formed on the basis of incomplete information—this truth is death. Humans' search to live a full life requires that human imagination be dispersed everywhere. This impulse makes it impossible to fix the social order that every newborn stumbles upon, which existing people want to be split between natural and legal rights. Then again, the challenge with all the false psychotic beliefs or delusions that humans construct before death appears to be more entangled with the work program that rich and poor people alike pursue to make all mental aptitudes come together to pursue the same aspirations or ambitions than with having many people trying to do it their own way at the same time.

Because all humans share the same physical characteristics, the human imagination generates ideas, perceptions, or feelings aimed at organizing people to cooperate or behave in a manner that reflects the same level of coherence observed in the tools created by human ingenuity. The situation is very serious and worrisome, because the reliance of the people who dedicate their lives to pursuing such a goal could be conjecturing erroneously. First, there's no evidence that all humans are equal or can interact under the same rules of conduct because they share the same physical traits. Second, there is nothing in the real world that is equal except the tools that mankind produces. Actually, nearly equal things, like sand or grains, do not establish relationships with each other, unlike how UN member states and the UN determined that all humans are equal and proceeded to create an egalitarian world. All the natural things maintain an independent boundary throughout their entire life until work is performed on them, which means they do not interact or change unless influenced by external forces or human intervention.

The noble gases, such as helium, neon, etc., are a group of inert chemical elements who, under standard conditions, are quite “happy” with their configuration and don’t need to react with other elements to increase their “happiness.” This group of chemical elements are all “odorless, colorless, monatomic gases with very low chemical reactivity.”⁷²

A chemical substance is a form of matter having constant chemical composition and characteristic properties.⁷³ All the chemical species are a chemical substance or ensemble composed of chemically identical molecular entities that can explore the same set of molecular energy levels on a characteristic or delineated time scale.⁷⁴ According to scientists, "Almost 99% of the mass of the human body is made up of six elements: oxygen, carbon, hydrogen, nitrogen, calcium, and phosphorus. Only about 0.85% is composed of another five elements: potassium, sulfur, sodium, chlorine, and magnesium."⁷⁵

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

73 https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Chemical_substance

74 https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Chemical_species

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

If humans are nearly made up of chemical substances, then it is highly possible they were programmed to function in a manner similar to the natural occurrence of the chemical elements from which their mass is composed. What if humans were programmed to form a class of properties that behave like the group of noble gases who are happy maintaining a low chemical reactivity? What if the different work programs that existing humans pursue to bind humans to each other are what could be creating all the entropy that mankind knows?

According to scientists, the thermodynamic behavior of monatomic gases is extremely simple when compared to polyatomic gases because it is free of any rotational or vibrational energy.⁷⁶ What if the efforts that humans make to enhance social connectedness are actually causing the instability and decay observed in the social order at different rates? Scientists have identified one hundred eighteen elements so far. The first ninety-four occur naturally, and the remaining twenty-four are created by human manipulation.⁷⁷ All the synthetic or artificial elements that humans manipulated are unstable and volatile. What if the accelerated instability and volatility that emerged after 1945 are primarily due to the political leaders who succeeded the architect of the post-war international world order, as they pursued ambitions to force artificial relations that humans were not programmed to cooperate with? The widely varying rate of decay that emerged in nearly all the countries pursuant to WW2 could be a result of the forced impetus to create an egalitarian world that the UN member states and the UN are pursuing.

All that the political leaders and the UN have to show for since they began to explore relationships to create an egalitarian world instead of acting on the work program that the founding fathers of the UN counselled that people should be organized to observe is that anyone who comes into contact with the tenets that they are mixing and remixing is finding himself becoming repulsive. Those people who are at the UN detaching themselves from reality and are using their own demeanor to fix goals and even set deadlines to achieve them just because we live in an age of reason and a time of progress are

76 https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Monatomic_gas

77 https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Chemical_element

stripping bare the tapestry that mankind invested thousands of years to be organized around.

Indeed, those who are at the UN deciding on how the international order should be steered and are even telling us that they hold the key to happiness, security, or freedom are not factoring that the tenets that they are mixing are ones that the people who dedicate their lives to the service of God and their neighbor have been testing with since antiquity, and all their attempts so far have failed to domesticate people to adhere to common values despite their own testing with resorting to wars, atrocities, and injustices to reach their goal. Likewise, those who are at the UN deciding on how the international order should be steered seem to be also ignoring that ever since the idea of the state emerged as a social organization alternative, and the people who rely on this concept to determine and enforce policies have been failing to formulate new behaviors as well. The incapacity of the majority of the people who determine or enforce policies to practice what they preach steers the different social organizations and institutions that people form to deepen social cohesion and face the same fate that the individuals who dedicate their lives to the service of God and their neighbors are running into—failure. Yet instead of the international families who control the rich and the poor nations adopting the work program that the founding fathers of the UN counselled to ensure lasting peace in the aftermath of WW2, newborns will discover that the international council that their predecessors claimed would be working to deepen fraternity between people (or nations) and is “the final development of a full and complete structure of a world order under law”⁷⁸ has become another economic operator who is even selling watches, T-shirts, and goods in the social order⁷⁹ to increase the need to have standing armies or to hold peace congresses instead of reducing it.

The implication that mankind is taking by allowing that the international families who control the rich and the poor nations reject conforming to the work program that the founding fathers of the UN proposed allows that the idea of the state remain a platform to protect the laws that people develop to gain advantage instead of being a

78 <https://www.nobelprize.org/prizes/peace/1945/ceremony-speech/>

79 <https://shop.undp.org/>

stepping stone to evolve toward the results that all humans recognize are primordial to be free from fear and want. This means that instead of people using the idea of the state (or the UN) to become a policy forum to find solutions to the next level of challenges that stand in the way of people developing better friendly relations, such as how to let a newborn continue to freeze social space and to hand the material things that one accumulates on a cumulative basis to designated individuals upon death, which sparks grave inequalities, the idea of the state (or the UN) becomes an unending threat and a platform to incite distinction. The permanent shift in the balance of power that the teaching of the UN and the international aid organizations are inducing in the social order to create an egalitarian world transforms into an obstacle and prevents one group from gaining enough power to dominate all others or to create a common ground so the world could be at least, perhaps, more peaceful. Likewise, this teaching prevents people from entering into relations to address the next level of challenges that I just mentioned above and the one that deals with how to protect the moral and material interests resulting from any scientific, literary, or artistic production that each author claims is his sole property.

In other words, the decision of existing people to abide by fixed manmade laws that create inequality right at birth, while humans are transient, makes newborns devote their time to rejecting mythical tales that are widely accepted for their truth to test with new ideas, such as whether controlling birth rate, fighting religious extremism, and pushing man's scientific boundary could formulate new social behaviors to deepen social connectedness. The concepts and work programs that new humans test to formulate new social behaviors have not yet produced a tangible change in mankind's demeanor. All the thinking tools that man defines and uses to regulate newborns' behavior have had varying success, but none have progressed mankind toward emphasizing lasting patterns. If the drawbacks that humans regularly identify as a possible cause for their own failure to surrender freedom to obtain the anticipated benefit do not ferry people to better days despite the solutions that are consequently developed, this signifies that people are misdiagnosing the real shortcoming. For example, instead of the international families who control the rich and the poor nations, opt to stop the UN and the international aid

organizations from pushing people to increase their awareness about their right to a standard of living that is equal because it is not possible to achieve this goal even if an individual agrees to voluntarily surrender freedom to attain it; the families who control the money supply of the world want the rich and poor nations to come up with solutions to stop the advances in transportation or communication from making people develop bias.

Installing cameras on every street corner might help newborns develop social behaviors, but it's unclear if this would happen if man-made laws creating inequality remain. Technological surveying in developed nations still shows no change in behavior, suggesting growing impatience aligns with post-1945 UN practices. The only significant change from pre-1945 to post-1945 is that humanity began to promote equal rights. The above also means that if the international families who control the rich and the poor nations do not stop the UN and the different international aid organizations from continuing to let people's impatience grow, they could be continuing to prescribe remedies to a diagnosis that is not the real cause for the intolerance that emerged. Ultimately, such actions could cost the international families who control the rich and the poor nations their status.

Psychologists claim that impatience motivates us to reduce the costs of reaching our goals or to switch them.⁸⁰ Hernán Cortés de Monroy y Pizarro Altamirano (1485–1547) was a Spanish conquistador who led an expedition under the rule of the King of Castile in the early 16th century that caused the fall of the Aztec Empire.⁸¹ When Cortez arrived in the New World, he burned his ships to take away the option of having to “return to Europe” if things would get difficult with him and his soldiers and they would all grow impatient.⁸²

Obviously, if the international families who control the rich and the poor nations had grown impatient and acted on what the founding fathers of the UN counselled, that people should be organized to cooperate post-1945, it would have been possible to hold accountable

80 <https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/blog/clear-organized-and-motivated/201411/the-7-laws-impatience>

81 https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Hern%C3%A1n_Cort%C3%A9s

82 https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Hern%C3%A1n_Cort%C3%A9s#Destroying_the_ships

the governments that disrespected the obligations arising from international treaties. However, the decision by the international families who control both rich and poor nations to undermine the United States' proposed work program for managing the international order, and to allow the UN or international development aid organizations to interfere in the political, economic, or social preparedness of people, has thwarted all efforts to maintain peace and security. The impatience demonstrated by the international families who control both rich and poor nations has led people in countries with significant and limited power to increase their demand for social justice. Since 1945, the more the political leaders of the nations with great powers and the UN member states empower the UN and development aid agencies to foster human rights to create an egalitarian world, the more this action seems to be growing people's impatience in nearly all the countries. The more people seem to be putting their impatient energy into creating an egalitarian world, the more the impatience that seems to be fomenting appears to confirm that the happiness of the entire population, not just a small group of people with authority in each country, is what the nations with great power must control. In other words, if people in rich and poor nations (or nations with great and soft power) continue to perceive that their preparedness allows each member (or each nation) to take actions of his own without any due regard for the feelings, wishes, rights, or traditions of others to increase their happiness, it would become very difficult to control people's demeanor. This situation is very serious and worrisome. This is because the allegations of government corruption that many people are expressing about their political leaders could continue to grow, potentially shifting the debate from a local issue between the poor and the rich (or between the poor and the ruling government) within a given nation to a global conflict between the poor and the families who control the world's money supply.

Aesop's Fables is a collection of fables credited to Aesop, a slave and storyteller believed to have lived in ancient Greece between 620 and 564 BCE.⁸³ The Lion and the Boar Fable addresses an event in which a lion and a boar were fighting to determine who would defeat the other to gain advantage. Then, they noticed the vultures watching them, eagerly anticipating the fall of the first one. "They quickly made peace,

83 https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Aesop%27s_Fables

saying, 'It's better to be friends than to be food for crows or vultures, as will surely happen if we are disabled.'"⁸⁴ Indeed, the international families controlling the world's money supply and the poor have divided history from 564 BC to the present in a way that mirrors the lion and the boar fable. If the ongoing intolerance continues to grow, the buildup could lead to the families who control the money supply of the world and the poor attempting to size each other up through a global war. This action will help stabilize peace and security, but it could be very costly for either the international families who control the money supply or the wealthy individuals and those who hold significant power in general. This uncertainty is because we can never have a complete and absolute certainty of the result of an event until it occurs. In other words, there is a significant possibility that the changes brought about by wars in the balance of power could lead to the emergence of new families that begin to control the global financial system, alongside the established religions that manage to survive.

This intolerance that emerged worldwide post WWII would not have occurred if the families who control the money supply of the world adopted the work program that the United States proposed that all people (or nations) adhere to its principles to achieve the ends stipulated in the preamble of the UN Charter and did not emphasize the importance of increasing production to increase their wealth. The decision of the families who control the money supply of the world to let the UN and the international development aid organizations become economic operators and to interfere in the political and economic development of the people in rich and poor nations pushed people to abandon their values and traditions to seek how to increase social justice and, consequently, their happiness. The families who control the world's money supply could continue to insist that, because all of humanity appears to possess the same physical characteristics, they could remain passive and allow the rich and poor to resolve their differences until one group surrenders to the other. However, if we look closely at the outcry and frustrations that protesters are making against the international order, it seems that those who are disenchanting are ready to trade their impatience for rhetoric only if the

84 <http://www.taleswithmorals.com/the-lion-and-the-boar.htm>

resources used in commerce and all the creations of the mind, such as inventions and literary and artistic works, are shared on equal rights.

In theory, all the wars that humans have known were motivated by a desire to strike a balance between the interests of innovators and the wider public. Similarly, the inference that the rich and the poor people form, and for obvious reasons, all members of the human family are equal and eligible to natural and legal rights just because all mankind possess the same physical characteristics has been another principal cause for all the wars that people have known. Therefore, because humans are continually making theories about dependencies between their interests for exploration and quantities in nature and society, this behavior makes the individuals/families who become struck by the aura of power program to pass it on hereditarily. Compiling or passing power/wealth from one member of a family (or board) to another member of the same family (or board) necessitates that humans nest.

Nesting behavior refers to an “instinct or urge in pregnant animals to prepare a home for the upcoming newborn(s) to provide protection against predators and competitors that mean to exploit or kill infants.”⁸⁵ This practice is found in a variety of animals as well as humans. Peculiarly, humans have elevated nesting behavior to a level that exceeds the original purpose of animal nests, which is to lay and incubate their offspring until the young are capable of increasing their chances of survival independently. Most animals leave their nests after their young can care for themselves. Humans, on the other hand, have legitimized the right of any person to freeze or ossify the nest (i.e., wealth or power) that he builds through his journey, including allowing that it can be passed down from one member of a family (or board) to another member of the same family (or board). In addition, humans desire for newborns to be continuously domesticated so that they exhibit behavioral patterns where their actions cease to influence others. In other words, common sense dictates that a person who studied political science become eligible to be a king. Humans want that the succession of power to the throne passes from one member of a royal family to another member of the same family irrespective of whether the heir is fit to rule or not.

85 https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Nesting_instinct

In 1941, the United States proposed a social contract that frees humanity from perpetuating socio-economic structures designed to benefit primarily the wealthy and their supporters. The US secured for mankind a milestone of its kind unheard of in the history of human rights. This country ended the practice of the poor engaging in actions that are labeled as increasing the wealth of the rich. The US outlined that post-WWII all the human relations would be converted into a process in which the action that a person takes starts to determine another for the benefit of the person in question.

In other words, until 1945, all the wars that people endured were intended to reshape the pool of wealthy individuals by transferring authority from existing monarchs to a new generation of heirs. This process also meant that the actions that all the people were prompting till 1945 were motivated to resize those who were in positions of power or with status so that the new people who would rise to power would subjugate all the others to subjugation or domination. In 1941, the US proposed that people's actions stop being motivated to achieve self-centered aspirations and become ones whereby the rich and the poor would be cooperating together based on the principles of equal rights. The results that the US hoped to reap when all of the people begin to cooperate based on the principles of equal rights were not any different than the uplifting that occurs in sports.

In sporting events, all the athletes who are not the first to cross the finish line accept their defeat and accept the second-best medal when the first best is not attainable. All the athletes who want to compete refrain from employing force or tricks before or during the race, unlike people who compete in business or for public positions.

All the athletes who compete take time before the race day to train. This chance, which required them all to be fit, including on race day, made them all equal. In other words, this training process affects all athletes. All the athletes who competed but did not win can continue to train to improve their fitness so they can eventually win in future competitions. This philosophy used in sports shifts an athlete's ambition from attempting to forcibly strip a champion of their title through tricks, as seen in business, to focusing on improving their fitness to win. Likewise, this continuous fitness enhancement that

athletes undergo prevents a champion from holding on to his title permanently or passing it down hereditarily. The equal treatment received by all athletes competing in sporting events prevents them from relying on their human imagination or ingenuity to devise tricks. In fact, the public and businesses reciprocate the equal treatment that athletes adhere to. The continuous rise of a new champion makes the public and the businesses switch their attention or sponsorship toward the new competitor who rises or breaks a record.

Peculiarly, instead of the political leaders who succeeded the founding fathers of the UN adopting the philosophy that the United States proposed to nest behaviors whereby newborns put their energy more “in doing” so everyone can be touched and no one feels left behind, they formed UN subsidiary organizations and international aid organizations and thrust them to interfere in the social order to teach newborns to foster human rights to create an egalitarian world. To create an egalitarian world between people, the person who is living in Nigeria must be able to increase his abundance to be at the level of the person who is living in Norway. First the people who live in Norway refuse to allow the people of Nigeria to have free borders in the same way this country is willing to accept that Germany maintains such privilege, which creates significant barriers to economic and social mobility for Nigerians seeking opportunities in Norway. Second, humans cannot increase their scientific, literary, or artistic production before increasing their knowledge or access to resources or material things. Those two parameters (i.e., knowledge or access to resources) are a function of the environment and man-made laws. Norway did not establish free border policies with Nigeria to allow the Nigerian people to increase their resources and compete equally. Norway, Russia, and the US are only prepared to offer technical assistance or financial aid to the people of Nigeria, Iraq, and India, enabling those living in these underdeveloped countries to build their capacity and compete effectively.

This kind of interference that the rich and industrialized countries are prompting in the poor countries to build the capacity of the people who live in those underdeveloped countries to compete can definitely contribute to deterring war, resolving conflict, promoting peace, and supporting civil authorities in response to domestic crises. However, it

could also be a knife between two blades, because the technical assistance or the financial aid that those rich and industrialized countries are injecting is not permitting an avenue so that the people in those poor countries whose awareness was uplifted could be doing some useful work with the knowledge that they gained. Therefore, top employers in Norway, Australia, China, and other countries continue their productive work, while people in Nigeria, Libya, Mexico, and similar nations begin to apply the knowledge they gained from the technical assistance or financial aid provided by Norwegians and others. All this interference in the lives of the Nigerians is creating energy that the Nigerians are unable to transfer to their surroundings as the Norwegians do. In other words, the Nigerians can't improve their work-life balance, personal security, or housing because the Norwegians, Brits, and Brazilians won't share how to make transportation or communication goods or let them be. This is because if the Nigerians start to produce their own goods, the assembly lines in the countries that are flooding their markets would have to slow down.

In thermodynamics, “work performed by a system is energy transferred by the system to its surroundings by a mechanism through which the system can spontaneously exert macroscopic forces on its surroundings, where those forces and their external effects can be measured.”⁸⁶ Scientists claim that “energy is not a material substance, but rather it is the ability of something to do work.”⁸⁷ Scientists also claim that “energy is never really destroyed, but it is just transferred from one form to another.”⁸⁸ What if all the energy, including technical assistance and financial aid, that wealthy and industrialized nations are transferring through UN subsidiary organs and international aid organizations is encouraging people to channel this energy, such as their growing awareness, to maintain a dynamic social order, since they lack the means to transfer it to their immediate surroundings? This situation is very serious and worrisome.

In theory, all the teaching from the UN subsidiary organs and international aid organizations can be seen as a call for people to stop

86 [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Work_\(thermodynamics\)](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Work_(thermodynamics))

87 <https://www.khanacademy.org/science/physics/work-and-energy/work-and-energy-tutorial/a/what-is-work?modal=1>

88 <https://courses.lumenlearning.com/boundless-chemistry/chapter/the-laws-of-thermodynamics/>

accepting their status and work toward improving their contentment. This indirectly indicates that the teachings of the UN subsidiary organs and international aid organizations are primarily responsible for people becoming less tolerant of their own status. Impatience motivates us to reduce the costs of reaching our goal or to switch goals, as I said before. There are only two ways for a person to gain knowledge or resources. One method is through employing force, and the other is through relying on practicing the principles of equal rights. If insecurity has been on the rise since 1945, this trend signifies that people are not cooperating in the economic field based on the principles of equal rights that the US proposed but are favoring crises and conflicts.

Each time people use crises and conflicts to achieve their goals despite others' resistance, those individuals are prioritizing their personal power and conscience over the political order. When people emphasize the importance of their personal power and conscience, such behavior signifies that they are prioritizing their self-interest over the interest of others. Humans cannot prioritize their self-interest without employing their human imagination or human ingenuity to help them make progress. Hence, the knowledge people gain cannot be applied to produce useful work, such as balancing work-life, personal security, housing, health, etc., because rich and industrialized nations are unwilling to let their achievements uplift everyone. In other words, allowing the knowledge transferred by UN subsidiary organs and international aid organizations to empower those being trained will enable them to apply the awareness they gain to productive work. Can we say that all the cyber scams that emerged from Nigeria in the early eighties⁸⁹ and all the revolts that followed, such as the Arab Spring, etc., are all events that are a consequence of this unused energy that the UN subsidiary organs and the international aid organizations raised in nearly all the nations after the UN member states deviated away from the program that the United States proposed, and not necessarily because of increased religious extremism or advances in communications or transportation, as some commentators want us to believe?

89 <https://www.scamwatch.gov.au/types-of-scams/unexpected-money/nigerian-scams>

If the aforementioned conjecture contains any elements of truth, this scenario means that if the UN subsidiary organs and the international aid organizations are not stopped from teaching people why they need to reject their actual way of doing things in favor of new methods and/or the rich and industrialized nations are not stopped from financing this type of interference, more people could start to rely on distinction and/or on tricks to increase their happiness. The situation is very serious and worrisome. If more people continue to be worried about how to be a president, a king, or an astronaut to be wealthy or in a position of power instead of worrying more about becoming a president, an astronaut, or a doctor to faithfully use their role to increase peace and security or touch people's lives, there is a good chance that mankind could be wagering on the milestones that our forefathers, starting from 1776, began to sacrifice their lives for so we can all free ourselves from living under domination. In other words, because all the resources on earth are partitioned up and whatever is left to discover requires special knowledge, if people in rich and poor nations alike do not begin to start to put the knowledge or awareness that people are gaining from advances in transportation and telecommunications to use in useful work, there is a good chance that all the awareness buildup that people are accumulating will blow up if it continues to rise and it is not being used to do useful work. This scenario also means that if insecurity continues to rise and more people continue to undermine the political order, there is a good chance that humanity will either have to sacrifice freedom to keep peace and security under control or reduce this abnormal rise in intolerance that emerged post-1945 through a global war to reduce the calls for social justice.

This grim prognosis that the international order is no more could have been avoided if the UN member states, when they went to work to secure the goals that were fixed in the preamble of the UN Charter, began to transfer knowledge to people only after programming first or in parallel solutions so all those who would have their awareness upgraded would know how they were going to spend all the knowledge that they were gaining afterwards.

It looks as if the focus of the political leaders who succeeded the founding fathers of the UN on advancing the United Nations programs intended to improve the rights of the individual or the natural equality of all men, over how to coordinate the activities that the United States proposed between UN member states on a global scale, did not stabilize the international order but expanded people's disenchantment further. In other words, it looks as if the choice that the political leaders who are determining UN policies took to undermine how the physical doctrine of motion and physical momentum that man seems to obey needs to be used to regulate how humans react to information and change and to let their sensation, knowledge, affections, or passions steer their actions is navigating the governance of the international order toward a dead end.

Actually, the UN member states do not seem to be undermining how physical phenomena are universally explicable when they are allowing UN subsidiary organizations and international aid organizations to interfere in the social order to transform people's awareness into becoming high-grade energy without a way for this built-up knowledge to do work, but they want to challenge with their choices how humans exchange or transfer knowledge between each other as well.

Throughout history, each generation takes turns to resolve why the rationality that man emphasizes does not provide peace and security. A good starting point to understand why the reasonableness that mankind employs does not produce lasting peace could be interlinked to the question of purposefulness that people structure their actions around. People categorize human activities or explorations in ways that align actions with specific interests or goals. This philosophy, which depends on the success of actions to emphasize truth, necessitates that every newborn change the purpose of his action from being intended to serve the natural environment and the purpose that his creators intended his coming into being among the living is supposed to serve to one into which the awareness that a person gains becomes a means to an end. Hence, the values that humans derive are manmade and concern ontological or epistemological truth that divides actions into true or false type relationships; this concept signifies that we can construct or define four different types of action → interest-based

relationships between man and nature or man and man. Those four functions⁹⁰ are:

1. Function with no arguments and no return value
2. Function with no arguments and a return value
3. Function with arguments and no return value
4. Function with arguments and a return value

Those four functions represent the set of tasks or purposeful action that people could define to carry out action to achieve the returns that they fix, which also depend on the changing conditions of the set of natural or philosophical criteria from which people build their perceptions.

Throughout history, all the relationships that humans construct seem to be situations that models recursive rules based on arguments that people use to generate a return value. The nesting of ambitions intended to strike a balance between one's own interests and the wide public interests has been generating patterns that achieve practical results for the greater well-being of society, but at the same time, it is nesting behaviors that seem to be having infinite complications on the maintenance of peace and security. Humans endeavor to explore, and their relationship with the emotional meanings that power carries seems to hinder individuals who accumulate wealth from translating their self-understanding into politics that yield policies capable of reinvesting knowledge to shape balanced international intellectual and material property rules for a changing world. Nor is the knowledge that the rich are gaining aiding the poor people who are enduring to understand what exactly the individuals with authority are hoping to achieve from keeping the recurrent insecurity that has been accompanying mankind ongoing.

Indeed, if the families (or the religious institutions) who control the money supply of the world are as wakeful about using the knowledge that they gain to stay the course when it makes sense and change course when that makes sense, in as much as they seem to be vigilant about the passing of the succession of their power to their offspring or heirs, perhaps mankind would have been able to construct by now the best form of government that would be neither tyrannical nor

90 <https://www.studytonight.com/c/type-of-functions-and-recursion.php>

democratic. However, what we know and where we have been has achieved nothing but allowing different people to mix and remix from the different ontological and epistemological truths that humans depend on to split their actions into true or false to find, say, the exact tenets that would make people begin to surrender some of their freedom to obtain the benefits of the political order.

Patrick Süskind (born 26 March 1949) is a German writer and screenwriter, known best for his novel *Perfume: The story of a Murderer*⁹¹ strikingly captures how newborns incessantly recreate social behaviors in response to the ruins of existing human actions. Süskind opens his novel with the birth of Jean-Baptiste Grenouille, who starts his journey without a scent of his own but with an extraordinary sense of smell. Grenouille transforms himself from being born without a scent into a character who mixes and remixes ingredients to create his own overpowering fragrance in this aromatic world.

The ongoing rejection of mythical tales, customs, or laws that newborns adopt to formulate tenets and actions on the hope that their success could emphasize truth is, in essence, the same activity that Grenouille in the novel of Süskind was mixing and doing. No one knows if newborns practice extracting and preserving their overpowering “scents” (or control) because it makes them feel human, or if they believe that without mixing or remixing tenets and actions, they would live lonely, lost, or ignored. This perception that people universally emphasize the need to prioritize emotional control over factual control makes it impossible to correct their behavior. Moreover, if we add the bottleneck or the complex patterns that science or awareness is always levying, hence thrusting continually the poor and the rich to derive strategies and tactics to resize each other, then it would be naïve to suppose that the shifting technology or knowledge would make it possible to establish a given operational or developmental balance. In other words, if we integrate how knowledge makes the poor continually calculate moral factors to discover through emotions how they can employ their prepotent thoughts or actions to resize the rich and how the rich are also doing the same to keep the poor under domination, then it would be highly unlikely that one group

91 https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Patrick_S%C3%BCskind

could place the other under psychological pressure to attain the protection or security that each class demands from the other. This scenario also signifies that the rich and the poor could always be devoted, as they have been doing since antiquity, to testing new ideas to strengthen social cohesion (i.e., strategies) but without the likelihood of the ends, ways, and means (i.e., operational art) employed connecting the details (i.e., the tactics) to the strategies or goals fixed. This scenario is because the poor and the rich are not employing the ends, ways, and means under their disposal in tactics that are exclusively consecrated to attain, under any circumstances, the strategies declared but rather to attain them without the product of their actions creating any resizing that affects their own capability to defend their best interests. In other words, the rich are ready to pursue social or economic strategies with the poor, provided that the command and control of the governance of the world they levy is maintained, and the concentration of power and wealth they possess is retained for the benefits of their heirs, their own families, and supporters. Hence, the tactics of the poor are the total opposite of the rich; this ongoing “undoing ↔ dismantling” process is mushrooming in two contradictory directions until, in due time, they collide to generate either a global war or a civil war. This is also why, during any crises or conflicts, both the rich and the poor may become overly eager to embrace new ideas in the hope that these strategies will help them rise from the ruins caused by their own actions.

If mankind had been patient and practiced the ideas proposed by the United States after WW2, they could have ended the cycle of "undoing↔dismantling" that the rich and poor pursue. Regrettably, the people who control the money supply in both poor and rich nations allowed their ego and emotions to overwhelm common sense and reason. Those people who control the money supply of the world decided to deviate away from the work program that the United States proposed in favor of wagering on the ends, ways, and means under their disposal (i.e., technology and money) to control the poor by pursuing a work program that aims to create an egalitarian world.

The new mixing and remixing of social behaviors by both the rich and poor is helping those who control the money supply to accumulate wealth; however, the principles and actions taken are not preparing

either the rich or the poor to relinquish some of their freedom in exchange for the benefits of the political order. The rules of conduct that the rich or the poor are expected to adhere to to reduce the social or economic gap between the two classes (or nations) are not aiding people to be tolerant. On the contrary, people are becoming increasingly disgusted, and their growing awareness of the benefits of technology is preventing them from being easily deceived. In fact, people's hatred is evolving into contempt! This situation is very serious and worrisome, because if people's tolerance continues to diminish, insecurity inversely rises. When insecurity rises, the power or authority of the group that controls the world's money supply diminishes because the people stop using common sense and begin to listen to their own personal power and conscience. When people become confused and stop sharing a common understanding (i.e., exercising good judgment), the freedom to exploit resources would increase. However, as I mentioned earlier, an organization based on residence could emerge. Those people who become organized based on residence rather than kinship could take the law into their hand.

In Süskind's novel, one of the scents created by Grenouille had such overwhelming power that it easily fooled people, making everyone fond of him, despite the absolute evidence that he was a murderer. In fact, the irresistible scent that Grenouille created not only overwhelmed all the senses of the townspeople but also led them to attribute the murders he committed to an innocent person who was hanged instead. However, the passion of the scent that Grenouille mixed enhanced the unique smell of every person who inhaled it. In other words, the perfume was making each person smell different and have his own scent identity. The novel ends with the people who developed their own scent identity literally eating Grenouille alive.

The United Nations could be the scent that the people who control the money supply of the world (or the religious institutions) mix to permanently control the rich and the poor by having them be devoted to mixing and remixing to eventually get it right or to learn to live with one another, but this begs lots of questions. For one, how did the group who control the money supply of the world conjecture that the people who are mixing and remixing tenets and ideas at the United Nations would not decide to create their own "scent" and use their personal

power and conscience to reverse them into a simpler form so they take over? Likewise, even if the administrators of the United Nations remain lawful servants to their masters, one question would still need to be answered. How did the people who control the world's money supply (or the religious institutions) conjecture that if UN subsidiary organizations and different international aid organizations continue to prompt people to reject their actual contentedness for an improved one, the identity arising from this action would not lead all those who developed a sense of self to "consume them" as Grenouille was consumed?

In 1651, Hobbes in the book *Leviathan*⁹² compared “the state to a monster (leviathan) composed of men, created under pressure of human needs and dissolved by civil strife due to human passions.”⁹³ Since antiquity, scholars have described the word "Leviathan" as a metaphor for a powerful enemy who represents the forces of chaos. No one knows if such a creature could be real. Many scholars describe this monster as being made not of one single creature, but a coupling of divers together.⁹⁴

Abraham Isaac Kook (1865–1935) was a Jewish thinker, posek, Kabbalist, and talmid Chacham.⁹⁵ Kook claimed that Leviathan “projects a vivid metaphor for the universe's underlying unity. This unity will only be revealed in the future”⁹⁶

Origen of Alexandria (c. 184–c. 253) was an early Christian scholar, ascetic, writer, and theologian who was regarded as one of the most influential figures in early Christian theology.⁹⁷ Origen accused a gnostic sect of venerating the biblical serpent of the Garden of Eden.⁹⁸ He then claimed that those gnostic sects “were evil, and just their advice was good.”

92 [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Leviathan_\(Hobbes_book\)](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Leviathan_(Hobbes_book))

93

[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Thomas_Hobbes#Civil_War_Period_\(1642%E2%80%931651\)](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Thomas_Hobbes#Civil_War_Period_(1642%E2%80%931651))

94 https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Leviathan#Etymology_and_origins

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

96 <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Leviathan#Judaism>

97 <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Origen>

98 <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Leviathan#Gnosticism>

What if the appetites of the overwhelmingly powerful people to prevent any challenges to their control of the world's money supply are causing them to underestimate the monster their ego is influencing?

The United Nations subsidiary organizations, NGOs, and international aid organizations are all entities that are interconnected in the same way that scholars have historically described the metaphorical concept of the "Leviathan." All the officials who are working at these bodies and institutions are producing good advice, but are they loaded with appetites and desires to control or exercise authority?

Kook, before his death, claimed that "the righteous will feast on the Leviathan." What if the overwhelmingly powerful people (i.e., the people who control the money supply of the world or religious institutions) are unknowingly building a Leviathan (a monster)? In the future, will the appetites and desires of officials at aid organizations that provide good advice become difficult to control? Hence, those officials are loaded with passion and ego and are not dedicating their lives to the service of their neighbor but are working on realizing the full development of their personality; their inner tendency would move them away from fulfilling their role and move them to want to control.

What if the competing conceptions that the people who control the money supply of the world or religious institutions connote (i.e., provide the greatest good to members without the power to command and control relinquished) and the one that the officials of the UN and the aid organizations are teaching (i.e., provide the greatest good to members while the power is shared on equal rights) overwhelm the powerful people and revert them to a simpler form so new families or institutions rise? In other words, what if the identity that the UN and the rest of the international aid community are gaining and/or thrusting the poor into believing that the worst insult that a person can commit could be to not have a role to play to create an egalitarian world would continue to douse people with impatience until the international order breaks down and everyone starts to eat the other person alive? When people stop to be ready to tolerate that specific individuals earn recognition for the public role they play or financial benefit for what

they invent or create, it becomes impossible to foster an environment in which peace and stability can flourish. Likewise, when people trade peace and security for priorities at heart, it becomes very complex to unite people around a common policy forum to shape in-country rules or across borders so any author can protect the moral and material interests that result from any scientific, literary, or artistic production or claim rights to it. When all the institutions, bodies, unions, and coalitions that individuals in positions of power rely on to establish standards and databases are undermined, the rules and laws that these powerful individuals depend on to gain advantages and deny others' rights become ineffective. The contempt or contention that could emerge could prompt new organizational configurations based on residence rather than on kinship, as I said before. Since all humans possess the same physical characteristics, the new people who would rise to power would have no choice but to rely on rhetoric or distinction to impose themselves (i.e., have good advice). Hence, humankind is programmed based on natural and man-made distinctions; it would not be possible to evade the fact that the majority impose themselves. This scenario signifies that if any urban revolution grows into becoming a worldwide disenchantment, it is possible to prompt a disfiguration in the balance of power and to create new organizational configurations based on residence rather than on kinship. Hence, the only idea that people could pursue to develop power cannot be other than to motivate consensus to create an egalitarian world to deepen social cohesion and/or to rely on natural distinction or manmade distinction, such as linguistic, religious, racial, and others, to create division; then it is possible that the existing families, bodies, countries, and religious affiliations that control the money supply of the world will be pushed to abdicate this power so new forces take over.

If the widespread disenchantment and protests that are ongoing around the world lead to a breakdown of the international order, the principal challenge would not be with how to rebuild the technical infrastructure (standards, databases, and platforms) necessary to shape a new balanced international intellectual property rule but how to ensure that the freedom of choice that already exists would be maintained to enable all countries to use their natural wealth and resources without any prejudice to any economic, social, and cultural development

cooperation tenet, as the case is right now. In other words, because we can never have a complete and absolute certainty of the result of an event until it occurs, this uncertainty means that we have no way of knowing if the international order is progressing to become like the social model that emerged in Egypt post-2011 protests, which is full of subjugation and domination, or if the freedom of choice that the societies that did not experience any civil wars post-1945 continue to grow. Since 2011, Egypt has been very volatile. The stripping of what was left from the free economy in 2011 so this country could become a nearly full-fledged military state will make the next revolt that Egypt knows much deadlier. This is because the people who would be disputing would be all professional killers.

Perceived control in psychology is defined as a “person’s belief that he or she is capable of obtaining desired outcomes, avoiding undesired outcomes, and achieving goals.”⁹⁹ The individuals or entities that control the world's money supply may believe that powerful nations, which act as global enforcers, can influence people's behaviors or emotions by legitimizing military-type governments, as seen in countries like Egypt, Turkey, India, China, Israel, Jordan, and Russia.

An end-to-end solution (E2ES) is a term that “means that the provider of an application program, software, and system will supply all the software as well as hardware requirements of the customer such that no other vendor is involved to meet the needs.”¹⁰⁰

The families or religious institutions that control the global money supply may be planning to reorganize the world order so that each country has only one vendor responsible for all goods and services, ensuring that nothing remains free as it does now, while allowing a single entity to oversee all production and distribution components. For example, the largest employer in Egypt is the Egyptian armed services. The army in Egypt imports most of the raw material, and the factories that this institution operates are the ones that fabricate and market and sell most of the staple foods or goods that people use. This solution greatly reduces hassle, costs, resources, and time, but one of its drawbacks is that it takes away freedom, particularly in terms of

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

100 <https://www.techopedia.com/definition/19057/end-to-end-solution-e2es>

economic independence and the ability for local businesses to compete effectively against larger entities like the Egyptian armed services.

In the past 50 years, there has been a rapid transformation in international trade relations, which generated growth in nearly all countries. This growth could have been due to the collapse of the pegging of most currencies to the US dollar and the trade volatilities that this deviation triggered. Nonetheless, after countries gained the ability to peg their currencies to other currencies, a significant consolidation appeared to be occurring, primarily due to the competition generated by this growth. In nearly all the countries, the private and public sectors are obliged to achieve economies of scale to keep pace with the ever-changing business needs, which may be influenced by the consolidation efforts of powerful special interests and wealthy international families aiming to maintain their dominance in the face of increasing competition.

What if the powerful special interests and the wealthy international families who control the money supply of the world are working on consolidating all the competitions that the increased wealth of people in nearly all the countries started posing to threaten their ability to defend their best interests pursuant to trade becoming competitive? In retrospect, mankind is undergoing a streamlining process so ultimately one vendor could dominate the political and economic control in any given country as opposed to having many individuals, families, bodies, institutions, unions, and coalitions posing a threat to the authority that the powerful special interests and the wealthy international families who control the money supply of the world leverage. In nearly all countries, people's increased awareness is making them very sensitive to how governments enforce both floating and fixed values on various actions. If a single larger authority in each country is groomed so it could dominate or administer the political and economic relations of people while being attentive to established international obligations arising from treaties, this concept will end or reduce greatly cross-border competition because one vendor is operating end-to-end solutions into and out of a country, including within. However, if we factor in how resources are not homogeneously distributed and how people throughout history have refused to accept that a sovereign enjoys unequal privileges despite giving to such a man or assembly of

men the right to act on their behalf, this signifies that even if a single larger authority is groomed in each country to dominate or administer the political and economic relations of people, this strategy would not stop people from using their personal power and conscience to gain advantage or obtain power.

It is difficult to conceptualize how the powerful special interests and the wealthy international families who control the money supply of the world expect to still be able to tie people to covenants after they allowed the UN and international aid organizations to foster human rights to create an egalitarian world when there is no guarantee that a servant is ready to remain faithful to his master and would not try to kill/deceive him to increase his own happiness or to widen his power. In fact, even when two men are not in conflict, they must remain vigilant against each other.

Indeed, all the insecurity that exists in the world post-1945 could have been avoided if the powerful special interests and the wealthy international families who control the money supply of the world did not grow impatient and allow the UN to interfere in the political and economic development of the powerful and the poor nations to create an egalitarian world.

Surely, the increased demand by people in certain countries to change their government threatens all the social conditions and relationships that influenced the right of succession, the development of parliamentary democracy, and many constitutional documents. As terrorism gains recognition, the right of the people to remove governments that do not serve their interests has become diluted. In many countries around the world, governments are interpreting the concept of the right of citizens to change the form of their government as an attack on the rule of law or an adverse antigovernment activity led by a terrorist militant group to create in-country instability or chaos. If governments continue to block their citizens from having rights to form new governments that serve their interests and continue to crush protests or strikes under the pretext that such mutiny is politically driven by dissidents who want to gain advantage, the international order could start to drift back to pre-1945 political

modalities. The situation also signifies that the pursuit of fellowship would become superfluous.

No one knows if the safest course of action to stabilize the international order would be to make people endure tyranny for as long as it could be borne or until mankind finds methodical ways to prevent discord and wars. Certainly, the decision of the wealthy international families who control the money supply of the world to be unconcerned that UN subsidiary organs or international aid organizations teach people to foster human rights to create an egalitarian world supports that those overwhelmingly powerful people perceive that such an action would preserve their order of power if people try to break it.

Some philosophers argue that rights and duties are correlative (i.e., a person's right exists by exerting a duty upon others).¹⁰¹ If rights and duties are indeed interconnected, and the UN and international aid organizations are imposing a duty on others to uphold their rights, then the wealthy international families who control the global money supply and those who assert power over matters of faith could potentially be the same entity. This conclusion is because only the people / institutions who assert power over matters of faith and/or matters of natural and manmade distinctions such as sex, race, color, language, etc. are permanent. Moreover, because any attempt to make newborns adhere to rules of conduct depends on the readiness of the people who combine executive, legislative, and judicial power to determine and enforce rules to separate political legitimacy from personal union, including ensuring that it does not hereditarily pass to the benefit of another member of their same family or their supporters, and on their ability to keep newborns from education, including ways in which ideas are transmitted, which until now, only a few sovereigns (i.e., a man or an assembly of men) managed to accomplish under either method, this signifies that people's pursuit to form government structures based on popular sovereignty would go on indeterminately.

Until powerful or wealthy individuals renounce their rights to all things, mankind will struggle to adhere to the laws, legislature, or customs that, in theory, are in the best interest of the rich for the poor

101 <http://www.globalization101.org/rights-vs-aspirations-vs-duties/>

to respect. Because only then could the requirement of the division of labor stratify people according to their wealth, prestige, or power, signifying that any attempt to accelerate people's awareness to create an egalitarian world is a threat to the people with supreme power. As I just said, only a few sovereigns (i.e., a man or an assembly of men) managed throughout history to separate political legitimacy from personal union, including ensuring that it does not hereditarily pass to the benefit of another member of their same family or their supporters, and were able to keep newborns from education, including ways in which ideas are transmitted. This scenario signifies that if the actual powerful or wealthy people who control the money supply of the world are reverted to a simpler form and new families rise, those new families would not be behaving any differently.

When people's awareness accelerates, mankind faces another challenge. The purpose of creating rules of conduct is to prevent the fittest (physically) from dictating to the weak (physically) their own rules of conduct. If people's awareness is accelerated fast, then the criteria that determine who considers others' opinions before taking action would include not only intellectual fitness but also physical fitness.

If increased awareness prompts a scenario in which the physical and intellectual fitness of two people (or two nations) would be determining, then the rich in the nations that are less populated are bound to be absorbed by the rich who operate in densely populated countries. This situation is very serious and worrisome. This is because until WW2 the countries that controlled world affairs were based in Western Europe, and they were not densely populated as compared to other nations. If those Western European countries welcome the UN and international aid agencies accelerating people's knowledge so new families from densely populated countries compete against them for the control of world affairs, then either their concurrence to lower trade barriers was programmed to keep the world insecure or the intolerance that emerged resulted from the teaching that the UN and international aid agencies were prompting. I will explain:

A person needs wealth to maintain his way despite the resistance of others and be able to pass from one member of his family to another

the power that the person holds when it becomes vacated. Until 1939, the wealthy in Western Europe depended on autocratic monarchs to ensure they and their families and supporters had rights free from the restrictions of written laws, legislation, or custom. As people's knowledge increased and public scrutiny started to become a challenge, those wealthy families and their supporters had only one choice ahead of them: to ensure every step of their lives remained out of the spotlight. This choice is to distance themselves from interfering in the governance of their commonwealth and that of other sovereign nations to avoid becoming obliged to provide opinions that could worsen public perception or support. To create this separation of powers, they ensured that constitutional monarchies were established in their home countries so that their dependents would not criticize or challenge them. In some countries, those wealthy families/dynasties began to pay taxes to support their compliance with the law.¹⁰² In the countries that were part of their overseas possessions, they maintained a presence in key countries that militarily posed a threat to their strength and stability. However, in the countries where they needed resources to generate income, these families divided the resources based on the value of the wealth they were acquiring. For example, in the countries whose resources were going to be serving them as principal income, they ensured that an absolute or autocratic form of government be installed in those countries to reduce competition over the control of those resources and/or bypass the trading posts that they owned, thus stripping them of income.

If the wealthy families / dynasties distanced themselves from interfering in the governance of their commonwealth and that of the countries that formed part of their overseas possessions to stop their own dependent people and others from making every step of their lives be under the spotlight, why did they agree that the UN and the international aid agencies make it mankind's priority if, in the first place, the purpose of distancing themselves from having to provide an opinion is to ensure that the public discontent with their wealth does not rise? Could those families / dynasties who maintain some commonwealth authority to the present day manage to continue to train their successors for their duties after they allowed the UN and the international aid agencies to make every step of their lives under the

102 https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Elizabeth_II#Public_perception_and_character

spotlight? In other words, if a big part of the insecurity that accompanied mankind throughout history could be traced to the refusal of those powerful or wealthy people to renounce their right to all things so others could be willing to do the same, it becomes hard to comprehend why they would embed the UN and international aid agencies in the realm to have them start teaching people to foster human rights to create an egalitarian world (i.e., scrutinize each other) when they already know that it is not easy for any man to separate political legitimacy from personal union. This is because the more people make every step of their life be about how to make their neighbor's life be under the spotlight, the more the scrutiny of the lives of the powerful or wealthy people should take center stage. If, as I said, those wealthy international families who control the money supply of the world do not mind that UN subsidiary organs or international aid organizations teach people to foster human rights so the poor make every step of their life be about how to reduce inequality, then either those overwhelmingly powerful people perceive that such an action would not ruin their order of power if people try to break it, or they implicitly programmed that people become empowered so that when they stop being able to put up with one another and create their own divide, they could afterwards, through their conciliatory initiatives, find ways with their wealth to control or rule.

Then again, if the rich families/dynasties are working to pass to their own family members and supporters their power or wealth when it becomes vacant, and if every member of the human family, including all the UN and international aid organization officials, are also working on doing the same, then it is highly likely that as more and more people become preoccupied with scrutinizing each other, this exercise will be producing winners and losers. The winners will definitely be those who are encouraging meaningful expenditures to increase equality. But since this philosophy does not suit the rich, their ability to defend their best interests would depend on the servants they would be tasking to protect the rule of law. However, since control can be ensured not only through military superiority or capital value but also through philosophical conviction, it is essential to promote an idea that encourages people to be willing to surrender their freedom in order to achieve the desired aspirations.

For example, in the aftermath of WW2, the idea that helped foster trust among people who held enmity against each other was to ensure that every member of the human family cooperated based on the principles of equal rights. The international intergovernmental organization, named the United Nations, was intended to serve as a platform that would guide people in adhering to the established rules of conduct. However, since the wealthy families and dynasties that control the world's money supply agreed to deviate from the work program proposed by the United States in favor of a new program aimed at creating an egalitarian world, the challenge posed by this shift is clear.

No new idea exists for mankind to secure newborns' readiness to voluntarily consent to giving up their natural freedom for the benefits of political order, beyond ensuring this relationship is based on the principle of equal rights as proposed by the United States. This scenario signifies that if the rich families / dynasties who control the money supply of the world and the poor do not agree to stop the UN and all the international aid organizations from interfering in their lives so they implement the work program that the United States proposed and which was not pursued when WW2 ended, the choices ahead are clear. The United Nations and international aid organizations, rather than UN member states, would continue to grow, because they preach the philosophical idea that they, not governments, are working for the best interests of the poor or society. Alternatively, the insecurity that has emerged post-WW2 would continue to grow until the rich families/dynasties who control the money supply of the world become incapable of controlling its best interests, which could either prompt a global war that no one knows the outcome of, and/or they would be replaced by new families without the recourse to a war to accomplish it.

If the first choice materializes, particularly given the necessity of a single algorithm to control the world's financial and scientific data, the crucial question arises: will the UN administrators remain loyal to their masters, or will they disrupt the existing power structure controlled by the current families/dynasties, allowing new ones to take their place?? Another question that is part of this larger question is the following: How would our world look when we trade the current global

governance system for one in which the UN would act as its common political authority? Would it lead to the perfection of a civil society, or would it make the preoccupation of Robert Welch materialize?

Our ancestors should have started naming and classifying everything that exists both within our physical human boundaries and outside of them, right after they developed a method of communication. Taxonomy is “the science of naming, defining, and classifying groups of biological organisms on the basis of shared characteristics.”¹⁰³ Carl Linnaeus (1707 – 1778) was a Swedish botanist and zoologist who formalized binomial nomenclature, the modern system of naming organisms. He is known as the "father of modern taxonomy."¹⁰⁴ Linnaeus divided all living things into groups: plants, animals, and minerals. Scientists still use to this day the work of Linnaeus to classify or name animal and plant species. Those who believe in the common descent of all life prepare a tree-of-life-type¹⁰⁵ diagram to show relationships between members of the plant and animal species.

Human taxonomy involves the placement or classification of humans within all known life forms. The people who argue that humans are interconnected by descent of organisms connect the human lineage to phylogenetic tree diagrams, in the evolution sense, that link the differences in people’s physical or genetic characteristics to other forms of life that exist. Those people argue that humans could have ascended from the animal kingdom.

Scientists do not know if the sound or gesture that animals like birds, fish, mammals, reptiles, etc. make signifies their own way to communicate with each other. Most animal trainers or experts claim that the sounds or gestures that animals make can be signs of communication. Incidentally, infants communicate with their parents in the same way animals do, up until they begin to make themselves understood by the verbal expression with which they are thought to express ideas.

103 [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Taxonomy_\(biology\)](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Taxonomy_(biology))

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

105 [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Tree_of_life_\(biology\)](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Tree_of_life_(biology))

The affinity in the way animals stay throughout their entire lives understanding each other (i.e., through making sound and gesture) and are understood by humans and vice versa, and the way infants are, up to a certain age, able to let the sound or gesture that they make be understood by those who began to make themselves understood by the verbal expression that they are thought to express ideas and vice versa, support that certain exploration that newborns are later oriented to pursue could be part of the principal challenge that is preventing people from getting to be tolerant.

All the verbal expressions that humans voice or put together are programmed so a newborn learns to recognize names of common objects and to determine what is right or wrong to satisfy their survival needs and earthly desires. If animals' sounds and gestures are programmed to express the same ideas humans communicate with these abilities, then if there are certain explorations humans comprehend and respect while others remain unrecognized by their brains, this problem could be due to specific endeavors humans pursue that animals do not.

Curiosity is defined as “a quality related to inquisitive thinking, such as exploration, investigation, and learning, evident by observation in humans and other animals.”¹⁰⁶ The gestures and sounds of living creatures—mammals, fish, birds, and reptiles—do not suggest that they cooperate to establish one dominant species or create an egalitarian world, as political leaders did after 1945. Humans, on the other hand, have a curiosity to understand and to influence and create change that is universal.

What if all the explorations that humans think are true about what differentiates them from animals are, in essence, the principal problems that prevent humans from ultimately ending this historical dynamic that has been accompanying humanity from one posterity to the next?

Humans believe many things differentiate them from animals, but when we examine these beliefs, we find that no admitted differences between animals apply to humans.

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

For example, researchers claim that dogs and wolves share a common ancestor instead of a direct lineage,¹⁰⁷ yet those who breed dogs (or wolves) claim that this list is divided into groups based on the dog's (or wolf's) purpose or function or upon its appearance or size.¹⁰⁸ Humans, on the other hand, do not believe that humans could be like animals programmed to behave or to serve different purposes or functions despite all humans showing very similar appearances or sizes.

What if the challenge with the inability of newborns to adhere to the rule of conduct that existing humans chart is due to existing people wanting newborns to believe that because all humans across the globe have small genetic variations that engender diverse physical appearances, such as variations in skin color, this variation signifies that they could all be organized to explore structures, constraints, and possibilities to reduce their associations or relationships into a simpler approach? What if the small genetic variations that engender diverse physical appearances, such as variations in skin color that philosophers and/or the people/institutions who assert power over matters of faith claim are minor are not so minor, and instead, the relatively minor morphological and genetic differences that we all share make us distinct in the same way the different animals with whom we cohabit the earth are?

Scientists claim that race is associated with biology, whereas ethnicity is associated with culture.¹⁰⁹ Culture is “an umbrella term that encompasses the social behavior and norms found in human societies, as well as the knowledge, beliefs, arts, laws, customs, capabilities, and habits of the individuals in these groups.”¹¹⁰

All the different animals are composed from more or less the same elements from which humans are made. Humans and animals are also similar in a lot of the ways their bodies work. If we count all the types of animals that exist, we find that their shapes and forms far exceed the

107 <https://www.livescience.com/50928-wolf-genome-dog-ancient-ancestor.html>

108 <https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/blog/canine-corner/201305/how-many-breeds-dogs-are-there-in-the-world>

109 <https://www.livescience.com/33903-difference-race-ethnicity.html>

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

number of racial or skin color differences that people name, define, and classify, even though there are “no two humans who are genetically identical.”¹¹¹

Most people agree that animals are not highly social creatures who devote their lives to domesticating each other to set purposes that go beyond their need for day-to-day survival. And so, what if all the “knowledge, beliefs, arts, laws, customs, capabilities, and habits” that existing people make newborns believe are true, and even claim that without them life would be solitary and poor, are in essence the principal motive that makes humans infringe on each other? This question is very serious and worrisome. The concern is because if the slight genetic variation that humans exhibit does not make them all perform in a similar way, this signifies that the strategy that the UN member states and the UN use to make UN subsidiary organs interfere in the lives of each other just because humans appear to have similar abilities or all look alike could be a threat much bigger than humans imagine.

Humans do not create communities to set purposes in life that are merely limited to surviving and reproducing like animals do but to prevent groups from ganging up on each other. If humans have different abilities and the people who control the world's money supply want the UN member states and the UN to bring people together to pursue ambitions that only some can perform, this signifies that what the UN subsidiary organizations and international aid organizations are interconnecting is not the same type of living things but rather the different “knowledge, beliefs, arts, laws, customs, capabilities, and habits” that those human-look-alike species believe are true.

Innatism is a philosophical doctrine that holds that the mind is born with ideas, knowledge, and beliefs, and that therefore the mind is not a “blank slate” at birth.¹¹² The opposing view to this concept argues that it is possible to develop behaviors based on all the knowledge acquired from experience and the senses.

111 https://en.m.wikipedia.org/wiki/Human_genetic_variation

112 <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Innatism>

More than half of the world population of 7.5 billion that exists was born post-1945 after people in all the nations began to cooperate in the economic, political, and social fields to create an egalitarian world. The ideas that the UN member states and the UN tried to implant in the minds of newborns to make them reject beliefs, customs, and habits to deepen social cohesion have not improved world peace so far.

If the awareness raised by UN member states and the UN continues to encourage people to build resilience and aspirations for an egalitarian world, this suggests that the diverse “knowledge, beliefs, arts, laws, customs, capabilities, and habits” being accumulated could evolve into complex systems that would be very difficult for the wealthy to control. This is because the power of ideas creates history or change.

For example, historians claim that early Christians were a movement that started for people who did not have a voice in Roman society (i.e., the impoverished). Christianity empowered those converts or subversives who previously lacked a voice in society, allowing them to express their rights. After a few hundred years of the initiation of the Christian movement, the early Christians who were meeting in secret houses to spread Christianity brought the collapse of the Roman Empire. The different “knowledge, beliefs, arts, laws, customs, capabilities, and habits” that the Christian converts agglomerated around to become a force to bring the collapse of the Roman Empire were not ideas related to teaching people about the need to create an egalitarian world but rather about the need to postpone material things for the afterlife. The various “knowledge, beliefs, arts, laws, customs, capabilities, and habits” that people are currently amalgamating do not aim to postpone happiness until the afterlife; instead, they focus on emphasizing rights. This scenario means that if the UN subsidiary organs and international aid organizations continue to teach the poor to foster human rights, the rich could be in great danger as people’s awareness continues to grow. It would be very difficult for the rich to reduce to a simpler form people’s expectations due to the large number of “curious” actions that are interacting with each other, such as increased demands for social justice, equitable resource distribution, and greater accountability from those in power.

Courage is the choice and willingness to confront pain, danger, or uncertainty.¹¹³ Philosophers divide courage into physical and moral bravery, but in classical antiquity, courage included aspects of perseverance and patience.¹¹⁴

The decision made by the successors of those who controlled the global money supply at the end of World War II to deviate from the work program proposed by the United States in 1941, which aimed to establish lasting peace, has contributed to the deterioration of personal functioning rather than its improvement. Their belief that humans can perform complex reasoning or engineer tools—which nature and other species cannot do—led them to exclude religious teachings that mankind’s purpose differs from that of other species sharing Earth. They thought this would serve their interests, but it did not.

In turn, the lack of fortitude, or endurance to confront fear, uncertainty, and intimidation, that the successors of the people who control the money supply of the world have expressed may have given rise to a mass schizophrenia epidemic in which the public began to feel that it would be possible to overcome natural competition to create an egalitarian world if every member of the human family started to have the courage to act rightly in the face of popular opposition, shame, scandal, corruption, discouragement, or intimidation and/or as per what the UN subsidiary organs and international aid organizations are teaching. Unfortunately, humans have no power to determine if the courage that an individual expresses is prompted to address physical courage or moral courage.

Accordingly, it is not possible to determine if the maladaptive patterns of behavior and cognition “regarding persons or objects outside the self” that people began to exhibit post-1945 are due to a feeling of systematized delusion that the UN and international aid organizations are occasioning or if this abnormal bravery to challenge the political order is because it has become necessary that for anyone to have a stake politically or economically, he must advocate human rights ideas.

113 <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Courage>

114 https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Cardinal_virtues

Our predecessors' presupposition, which we now recognize—that our species has been placed on earth to fulfill a purpose differing from that of other natural species, which seem focused on creating simpler rather than complex societies—has complicated things. If we add the obsession that humanity has with advancing transportation and communication, we can see that this process of interaction and integration may be a key reason for the ongoing historical dynamism that has accompanied mankind. In fact, this ongoing race that people, companies, and governments worldwide are promoting to challenge what we know could be a major threat to the custodians of the international order. This is because we already know, based on our past experiences, that all the strategies our predecessors implemented to increase social cohesion did not benefit our society; instead, the advances in transportation and communication accelerated competition and conflicts.

If people, companies, and governments worldwide continue to make newborns perceive that to have a stake in any political and economic area, a person needs to be translating his knowledge, beliefs, customs, etc. into becoming ideas that can be traded when there is no evidence to support that because we all look alike physically and this makes us all capable of performing in a similar way, then we could all be working on worsening the political standoff that emerged between the rich and the poor if this interaction and integration go on.

For example, in the Quran, Surat Al-Hujurat, verse 13 states, “O mankind, indeed We have created you from male and female and made you peoples and tribes that you may know one another.”¹¹⁵ This verse in the Quran states that God purposely programmed mankind in different races and that this was done so people could “know one another” and not “interact and integrate with one another” to merge all the social behaviors and norms found in human societies as well as knowledge, beliefs, capabilities, etc., to create an egalitarian world. If we have no way of knowing if we are like the different animals with whom we cohabit the earth, programmed with different attitudes and behaviors or not, and if the people in positions of power do not want that mankind get to know one another only but also to cooperate to increase production so we could let our pursuit to establish the same

115 <https://quran.com/49>

standards make them richer, could this “exaggerated feelings of self-importance, excessive need for admiration, and a lack of empathy”¹¹⁶ that people are manifesting be a result of those custodians of the money supply of the world having deviated away from what the United States proposed that people, companies, and governments be devoted to pursuing in the aftermath of WW2? Could the people who control the money supply of the world manage to control the malaise or backbiting that people’s increased pursuit of ideas is producing from affecting their best interests, or would this abnormal behavior continue to grow and convert until it becomes a long-term pattern that would not end until it reverts them to a simple form so new families take over? Evidently, what is at stake here is how the international order would change if new families took control of the money supply of the world. Would this transition encompass only a change of families, or will the transformation happen through the intermediary of a global war?

Indeed, every newborn should be elated to find that the rich and the poor are cooperating in the economic field post-1945 on the basis of no man being superior to the other, when up until this date the lineage and grandiose display of wealth and power were seen as the principal detriment for the gap between the rich and the poor and the insecurity that mankind had known. Yet, instead of the political leaders who succeeded the founding fathers of the UN marking a reform of the moral order so newborns begin to orient their actions in line with what the United States counselled in 1941—that people, companies, or governments should interest themselves in—they began instead to interest people in tools that distance the human body from fulfilling the role that the human body may have been programmed to serve.

No one knows if orienting mankind to live differently from other living creatures, disregarding what is right and wrong, would finally help the people who control the world’s money supply to feel secure against the awareness that people are continually gaining to install themselves in their place, but since 1945, this teaching does not seem to be making any difference in world peace. To the contrary, the more

116 Principles of Psychology. Oxford University Press.
p. 709. ISBN 9780199329366. Archived from the original on 8 September 2017.
Retrieved 17 July 2016.

people's awareness seems to grow, the more people are wanting to pursue grand dreams.

A paradox is a statement in logic that appears absurd or self-contradictory, and while it seems impossible, it cannot be definitively classified as true or false.¹¹⁷ If humans believe they are superior to other organisms and seek to do more than just survive and reproduce, common sense dictates that those who want to pursue grand dreams should teach newborns to voluntarily leave mainstream society and devote themselves to living like monks, rather than emphasizing the importance of the senses over happiness to reduce competition. Alternatively, do, at least, as per what Charles Spencer Chaplin [1889–1977], the English comic actor who rose to fame in the era of silent film, once said.^{118,119} Chaplin said, "Life could be wonderful if people would leave you alone."¹²⁰ In other words, if we understand that two people cannot occupy the same space, what is absurd about the decision made by those who control the world's money supply to allow powerful nations to approve the UN and international aid organizations teaching people to seek social justice? This decision reflects their expectations of what they will gain from this interference.

It has not yet been established whether peace on earth would improve if people left each other alone, but there is definitely a strong connection between the path that great thinkers in the United States proposed during WWII and Chaplin's suggestions. It seems that the great American thinkers who proposed that governments should freely determine their political status and pursue their economic, social, and cultural development after World War II were aware that no force can control how people act; therefore, they advocated for the end of colonialism in all its forms and manifestations.

It would be irrational to suppose that the US or the founding fathers of the UN planned for the newly independent nations to cooperate in ending poverty or injustice by a specific date, as UN member states and the UN began to do after 1945. It is also unreasonable to assume

117 <https://simple.m.wikipedia.org/wiki/Paradox>

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

119 Cousins, p. 72; Kemp, pp. 8, 22; Gunning, p. 41; Sarris, p. 139; Hansmeyer, p. 3.

120 https://www.brainyquote.com/quotes/charlie_chaplin_397478

that the US or the founding fathers of the UN would have advised the UN or its member states to interfere in preparing the people, companies, or governments of newly created nations to attain the goals fixed in the preamble of the UN Charter. The United States and all the countries that played a role in writing the UN Charter knew that no one wins when foreign countries or entities teach the people, companies, and governments of the newly formed nations how to dispose of their natural resources and wealth and how to prepare to be intolerant, as the UN subsidiary organs and international aid organizations are doing. If the United States and the countries that agreed to grant decolonization to poor people and nations wanted to keep the social order insecure, they would have recommended overseeing the UN's in-country harmonization through their embassies, as they did before WWII, instead of using an intermediary.

Peter March Roget [1779 – 1869] was a British physician and lexicographer. He is best known for publishing, in 1852, the *Thesaurus of English Words and Phrases (Roget's Thesaurus)*. On 9 December 1824, Roget presented a paper entitled *Explanation of an optical deception in the appearance of the spokes of a wheel when seen through vertical apertures*.¹²¹ Roget showed that when a series of still images are shown at a substantial speed in front of a viewer's eye, the images merge into one registered image that appears to show movement. Since Roget published his work, significant advancements have been made in this field, particularly in cinematography.

Filmmaking dates to 1895. Since this date, filmmakers have been creating illusions caused by visual perceptions that appear to mimic reality.

It has not yet been established how the brain processes the films that people watch, or whether the awareness gained by viewers stimulates an attitude that affects how the brain interprets the information continuously transmitted by the eyes and other senses in real life. However, it seems that as of the date filmmakers began to create optical illusions, the passion of people to improve social conditions has been increasing. Conversely, when the passion to improve social

121 Roget, Peter Mark (1824). "Explanation of an optical deception in the appearance of the spokes of a wheel when seen through vertical apertures".

conditions becomes the dominant focus in our thinking, it appears that people increasingly lose sight of their relationship with nature and concentrate solely on achieving practical results for the greater well-being of society. In fact, from 1945 to now, the more people prioritize wealth, prestige, power, and fame to increase their happiness, and the more human passion there is to emphasize the importance of morals or the senses, the deeper they seem to equally dive. In other words, the understanding that newborns are gaining is not making them want to emphasize the importance of the moral over the senses. Instead, this problem seems to be producing events that are not any different from the Achilles and the Tortoise paradox that Zeno of Elea (BC 490 – BC 430) devised to support that change or motion is nothing but an illusion.¹²² Yet if we consider the number of people who are running to catch up with the international families / dynasties who control the money supply of the world, we find that their number is growing. Zeno formulated another famous paradox about what happens when a large number of millet falls that Aristotle (BC 384 – BC 322) refuted. The Paradox of the Grain of Millet states that "a single grain of millet makes no sound upon falling, but a thousand grains make a sound."¹²³ Aristotle argued that "Zeno is wrong in saying that there is no part of the millet that does not make a sound: for there is no reason why any such part should not in any length of time fail to move the air that the whole bushel moves in falling." Hence, a thousand nothings become something. Can the people whom the UN subsidiary organs and the international aid organization started making them "run" to catch up with the people who are prioritizing wealth, prestige, power, and fame to increase their happiness prevent the appallingly large pluralism of people who are no longer willing to be content with their actual status from overtaking them? In other words, will the people who control the money supply of the world manage to control people's expectations when more people start to devote or consecrate all their internal and external powers to the noble goal of liberating mankind from the evils of injustice, or would this widespread political and corporate corruption plunge mankind into deeper incertitude and wars?

122 [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Zeno
%27s_paradoxes#Arrow_paradox_\(Fletcher's_paradox\)](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Zeno_%27s_paradoxes#Arrow_paradox_(Fletcher's_paradox))

123 [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Zeno
%27s_paradoxes#Paradox_of_the_Grain_of_Millet](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Zeno_%27s_paradoxes#Paradox_of_the_Grain_of_Millet)

Death is an unavoidable truth. Regardless of whether a person lives to one hundred or dies younger, all paths ultimately lead to this unavoidable truth. Humans determine relations and mental states on how the realm or relations should be structured by adopting conjectures and propositions that are derived from internal cognitive ideas. The linkage that people create between concepts and experiences is achieved through the senses. People fit all their concepts and experiences into patterns that they define as truthful or false themselves. Whether the behavioral response that people exhibit is intended to deepen morality or to strengthen one's own envy, the attitudes that emerge are normally directed to force events that the mind classes into good or evil. Anytime a person establishes a mental condition that interprets in two ways any hypothetical concept or experience, what the self would be in so doing interfering in is nothing but in the nature of reality. When humans interfere in how the nature of reality ought to operate or behave, what the self would be in so doing is nothing but attributing to itself criteria or standards that mankind may have not been programmed to assume or serve. The truthfulness or falseness of the different ontological concepts and distinctions that humans formulate has not been fully established. This signifies that this hierarchical paradigmatic state of mind that humans, on its premise, relate with the rest of the living and nonliving things that co-exist could be derived from the conviction that the human imagination forms upon becoming aware of its potential to create patterns or shapes that the rest of the living things, including nature, cannot produce. In theory, how the future of humanity turns out to be is irrelevant; hence, death is inescapable. The powerful people who are allowing UN subsidiary organs and international aid organizations to preach to newborns post-1945 that it is possible to create a better world if only everyone fosters human rights to create an egalitarian world know that there is no pleasure that a person can possess except the one that an individual experiences before death. The powerful people could continue to prompt the different UN subsidiary organs and international aid organizations to distort this truth and to lead newborns to believe that relations are not mediated or constructed upon the emotions of fear and self-interest, when humans throughout history have built relations on such philosophy or realism. But, if we

add the Melian Dialogue¹²⁴ account that the historian Thucydides¹²⁵ (BC 460 – BC 400) narrated, which took place when the Athenians made an offer to the Melians to surrender and pay tribute to Athens or be destroyed because, in practice, might makes right, this realism imposes a pragmatic approach that supports that selfishness can overwhelm power or change. However, if humans are all the time pursuing how to apply the power they possess, could the people who desire power to protect their interests manage to preserve their authority if power politics cannot be shackled? In other words, rolling strategies that force a change in the state of contentment of a person can antagonize a person to prioritize his beliefs or senses rather than to contain them.

No one knows if the ontological route that humans continually develop and use to classify the different categories of being and their respective relationships would eventually ensure that the diverse behavioral responses that people exhibit would end the historical dynamic that has been accompanying mankind in retrospect. Until then, we can expect that the different mood, temperament, personality, or disposition that humans exhibit will remain a constant and not change. Hence, the rational or irrational behavior of humans does not show awareness different from that of other living beings; humans have not intelligently used their potential. This statement also signifies that we cannot say that the inherent ideas that human imagination advances are programmed because humans were destined to achieve a higher category of purpose. Such a statement also means that this enduring interest in exploring could be due to humans interpreting their omnipotence wrongly. The ideas (or laws) that the mind (human imagination) is always formulating are hindering humanity's achievement of practical results for the greater well-being of society. This human rights or “peaceful engagement” strategy that the powerful people began promoting in industrialized and underdeveloped nations to eliminate poverty and injustice post-1945 is creating a major dilemma because no nation has a system that can respond to all the public needs. The lack of firm structures of cohesion and the public's dissatisfaction with the political system are leading governments to form totalitarian-type political systems. If governments continue to

124 https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Siege_of_Melos#The_Melian_Dialogue

125 <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Thucydides>

prohibit opposition parties, restrict individual opposition to the state and its claims, and exercise an extremely high degree of control over public and private life, the antagonism that this buildup creates could start to breed acute types of authoritarian regimes that its protectors would recognize as having no limits to their authority. The danger with allowing the personal power and conscience of a man (or an assembly of men) to drive the governance of a nation is that such legitimacy makes the individuals who start to get their way despite the resistance of others attempt to control virtually all aspects of social life, including the economy, education, art, science, private life, and morals of citizens. As I said before, death is unescapable, and so whether a person dies from natural causes or from refusing to adhere to rules of conduct, the end is one and the same. The risk with adopting antagonistic policies to formulate new behaviors is that there's always a tendency toward adventurism. When people start to take actions because they think that threats are so terrible that they need to act, this could have lots of consequences on the maintenance of their strength and stability, such as leading to impulsive decisions that undermine their long-term goals and relationships. When humans knowingly choose to do wrong instead of what is right, they may become actors in the drama of their own minds.

The term "narcissism" comes from the Greek myth of Narcissus, an adolescent who, mistaking his own reflection in a pool of water, fell in love with it and died when it failed to love him back.¹²⁶

In 1914, Freud published a paper titled *On Narcissism: An introduction*,¹²⁷ in which he explains what causes narcissism, or selfishness, and feelings of personal omnipotence and grandeur. Freud posited that people are “actors in the drama of their minds, pushed by desire, pulled by coincidence.” Underneath the surface, our personalities represent the power struggle going on deep within us.”¹²⁸ Freud’s assessment about the makeup of people could be right, but at the same time, the nature of reality along with the possible things that humans can and cannot do must have come from somewhere.

126 <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Narcissism>

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

128 https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Freud%27s_pschoanalytic_theories#Religion

Many archeologists and anthropologists claim that the idea of God could have evolved when people began to develop awareness and needed a narrative to explain the world and life. The inclusion of the concepts of heaven and hell, as well as good and evil, within the idea of God has provided significant benefits to our societies because categorizing human actions into these opposing forces has helped people connect and rely on one another, which is essential for harmonizing actions and satisfying human curiosity. Most importantly, this dualism concept enabled mankind to fit all the actions that humans prompt into a mandate and to class all the actions that people provoke and refer to as being evil as part of human nature and not necessarily due to the social contract that the human imagination adopts. At the same time, the challenge that mankind may have created by linking the idea of God to an essence with unlimited power and a particular system of governance is that it makes all the things that God can do become embodiments, mandates, or ambitions that the human imagination perceives that human ingenuity can also carry out.

There are only two ways that a man could use to gain power. The first is by counting on exploitation, and the other is by adopting a friendly relationship that would make the person being exploited surrender freedom voluntarily.

The idea of the state and the idea of religion were, until 1945, two forces that were using two tactics that are totally different from one another to aid the powerful people to gain advantage. For example, in the past, when public dissatisfaction intensified, it was in the best interests of powerful individuals or families for governments to increase violence in order to discredit popular movements and strengthen opposition. The idea of religion complemented the work of the government because the role of the people who asserted power over matters of faith was to talk those who were dissatisfied out of feeling distressed and calm them down. Allowing that UN subsidiary organs and international aid organizations infiltrate people in the social order and preach to them to foster human rights to create an egalitarian world is a technique that the best way to describe would be to compare it to what farmers do when they graft and bud horticulture to grow to produce the same type of fruit. In other words, if not stopped, it could greatly affect how society or the powerful survive. This is because if

the UN subsidiary organs and international aid organizations continue to graft and dub people to foster human rights to create an egalitarian world, the global crisis would continue to change from the type that historically humans have had experience with, whereby a specific crisis would gradually get larger and larger until it becomes out of control, into one in which the more people get grafted/dubbed by the UN subsidiary organs and the international aid organizations, the more the people who are not in crisis would start to show evidence of probably being in crisis and to identify themselves as having one. When the crisis (i.e., unpleasantness, disagreeableness, or hurtfulness) becomes all over the place, the shock effects would make things feel as if the crisis were not any different from an international one. Evidently, as more people identify with this systemic political, economic, racial, or religious crisis, this ill condition could start to disintegrate the international order so a new authority takes over. The collective force of people united to combat social injustice or inequality would primarily focus on assessing the wealth and power of the richest individuals first.

Moreover, allowing that UN subsidiary organs and international aid organizations to infiltrate people to graft and dub people to foster human rights to create an egalitarian world could be disintegrating the idea of the state and the idea of religion so both structures could either be reverted to a simpler one so a new authority rises or one of them would be disintegrated and the other remain. The worst-case scenario would occur if both the state and religion collapsed, as many nations possess weapons of mass destruction. If the international families/dynasties who control the money supply of the world do not stop the UN subsidiary organs and international aid organizations from grafting and dubbing people, the global risks could be overwhelming if people's revengeful inclination is allowed to expand.

Actually, the idea of the state and the idea of religion could be two forces that are confusing mankind to an unprecedented level because the governance system that the people who run each process rely on to profiteer is based on fostering two opposing or contrary approaches to consolidate power and gain advantage. In other words, religion is teaching people to be merciful and to postpone pleasure to the afterlife, while the UN and international aid organizations are teaching people

to be compassionate to increase pleasure. Likewise, the government is teaching people that the rule of conduct that people are supposed to follow increases the rule of law, and the UN subsidiary organs and the international aid organizations are teaching people that the laws that governments are determining and enforcing are to increase the gap between the rich and the poor.

Surely, the decision of the people who profiteer from the idea of God to depend on philosophical means that are based on fostering peace and brotherhood to lull and exploit instead of depending on rules of conduct or weapons (i.e., governments) must be a process that religious structures (or the people who assert power over matters of faith) reached not haphazardly but based on experience gained. However, the decline in the capability of the people who assert power over matters of faith, from arousing people to a point of being able to intercept the human imagination of followers to persuade them to reason, shows the degree of impairment that already exists. In fact, this rise in the number of indignant, frustrated, and revengeful people who are independently beheading or carrying out public executions in the name of God represents the significantly impaired intellectual and adaptive functioning that the UN subsidiary organs' and international aid organizations' teaching is prompting. Likewise, the people who use the idea of the state (or laws and weapons) to profiteer are becoming less and less capable of exploiting or neutralizing behaviors because it is very difficult to justify intercepting human bodies with actions that are not righteous. In other words, governments are not able to enforce the rule of law to stabilize the gap between the rich and the poor. This also means that the more governments or the rich depend on modern technology to make it easy for them to enforce laws, the more this action would not be creating a just world, but the more it would be enticing the poor to become more skeptical of the solutions that governments are employing to strengthen the rule of law. This is because technology can help humans achieve justice, but it often does so at the cost of sacrificing liberty and freedom. In fact, despite all the advances that were made in communication, thus making it simpler for nations to collect intelligence to control people, all this information-gathering system has proven ineffective so far at deracinating or uprooting the gaffing / dubbing that is taking place in all the countries. On the contrary, as time passes, it becomes impossible to know where

to start to do anything about the information that is collected. In essence, it is not only impossible to build a systematic strategic structure to deal with the information collected, but the people who get enlisted to sort through the collected data would start to pose the biggest threat due to the high political and economic stake this material contains, as their biases and interests may lead to manipulation or misuse of the information for personal or political gain.

In fact, all the social contracts that humans formulate serve a specific purpose. In other words, they are doctrines intended to legitimize the right to suppress or dominate. This argument signifies that the more governments resort to modern technology to confiscate liberty and freedom, the more the scientific methods adopted will be hurting the rich more than the poor because this approach intercepts the human body before the behavior. The poor endure misery and injustice because they believe they will be rewarded in the afterlife or for achieving a goal. Fear is another factor that makes people surrender freedom. This means that if religiosity is undermined, all the technological tactics that the rich use become trivial, as the poor may no longer believe in the promised rewards of an afterlife or future goals that justify their suffering.

Power refers to possible things.¹²⁹ As science increasingly makes "possible things" a reality, its aim shifts from simplifying difficult concepts for understanding to becoming a tool that both the poor and the rich perceive as a means to advance their own interests. For the poor, science would provide an opportunity to create the righteous world that religious profiteers blame on the rich for its shortcomings. In the case of the rich, science would finally lock away the knowledge that the poor continually gain to proclaim their right to rule, thereby reinforcing existing power structures and preventing equitable access to information that could empower the disadvantaged. If people are "actors in the drama of [their] own minds," as Freud claimed, the interventions to create an egalitarian world that the UN and the political leaders have been pursuing since 1945 could be prompting an irreparable state of affairs in the social order for as long as religion and science are increasing people's awareness. This is because this

129 <https://biblehub.com/greek/1415.htm>

teaching to create an egalitarian world could be prompting the poor to believe that the purpose of the coming together of nations in the aftermath of WW2 to collaborate in the economic field was prompted to create the social order that the people who assert power over matters of faith depend on to profiteer from the idea of God and/or to get their way despite the resistance of others. The United States did not propose to create an egalitarian world; instead, it advocated for egalitarian treatment regarding the enforcement of the rule of law. When people combine their beliefs with patience, all hopes become achievable.

For example, the characteristics of a kingdom consist of a sovereign, a domain, a covenant, subjects, principles, rights and benefits, lifestyles and conduct, security, protocol and procedures, and economic security.¹³⁰ The division of labor necessitates that every member within the domain and dominion of the kingdom fulfill a different job function, so cultivated affairs last for a long time. This concept also signifies that people within a kingdom must be organized under different strata or hierarchies. Whenever people are organized into a stratum, the level of happiness experienced by each member within the kingdom depends on the type of labor they are performing.

The origin of people's struggles to establish peace and security could have started from as early as the date when the people who dedicate their lives to the service of God and their neighbor began to spread the idea that humans need to come together as a species to conquer the earth to erect a kingdom where its dwellers cooperate with each other in a manner that is not any different from the one that those people who are asserting power over matters of faith were portraying a person ascends to after death. The ability of the people who dedicate their lives to the service of God and their neighbor to portray that in this kingdom where souls come from upon birth and go back to after death, where its dwellers experience no pain or suffering, is a brilliant concept to depend on to exploit, especially when humans believe that pleasure is good and pain is bad. Likewise, to condition that a person could win a chance to live in this painless kingdom after death only if he behaves in a certain way when humans are a type of species whose behavior changes in accordance with the degree of perceived fear is

130 <http://www.kingdomcitizens.org/what-is-a-kingdom.html>

definitely a concept that captures the power of human ingenuity to exploit.

Indeed, this kingdom, motivated by those who dedicate their lives to the service of God and their neighbor, and free from any abuse and instability, is without a doubt a brilliant idea that motivates newborns to this day to come together to build: continually surrendering freedom to later be granted the right to live in this realm that is free from any crying or pain after death—which could also be true. Its only drawback is that it makes newborns perceive that mankind can be organized in real life to erect this kingdom that the people who are dedicating their lives to the service of God and the neighbor are spreading and promoting, which may lead to unrealistic expectations about the nature of human cooperation and the complexities of societal organization. Two people can't fill the same space, so they can't apply the same force to an object. One must be idle while the other is doing work. Any time a person does work, there would be crying or pain. If the law of conservation of energy is true, the above signifies that the ongoing efforts of the people who dedicate their lives to the service of God and their neighbor are exhausting to motivate newborns to erect this imaginary social order that is free from any crying or pain on earth, and it has been aiding mankind in nothing other than inviting people to increase “crying or pain” to mount it. If we consider the lack of evidence supporting the existence of this realm or kingdom where those who assert power over matters of faith reside, or the possibility of its construction despite exhaustive efforts, combined with additional efforts to secure the imaginary world that the UN and the political leaders who succeeded the founding fathers of the UN are motivating people to erect post-1945, it signifies an acceleration of people's “crying or pain.” This scenario signifies that only if people cooperate based on the teaching that the US proposed and practice patience could mankind reduce their crying or pain. In fact, when people become ready to enforce the rule of laws on an egalitarian basis, and if the law of conservation is true, the less involved a person remains with determining or enforcing laws, the less pain he will experience.

Lions and ants don't work together to make a world free of pain; they each do their own thing. Likewise, different living colonies such as bees or ants do not create associations among each other to strengthen

peace and security. Each colony maintains its separate political and social authority. In fact, researchers tracked some bees in five bee hives to obtain a picture of how bees cooperate and found that “a small portion of bees were much busier than others.”¹³¹ The researchers reported that “some bees didn’t really do any work at all and were parasites to other bee species.” They even added that those lazy bees “stole food from others and laid their eggs in other bees’ nests.” Most importantly, the researchers suggested that “a hive isn’t divided into established workers and slackers, but every worker keeps tabs on the net activity of the colony and adjusts their activity accordingly to ensure that the colony’s needs are being met.”

Humans are not doing anything different than what researchers reported bees were doing, and that is “adjusting their activity accordingly to ensure that the colony’s needs are being met.” Since antiquity, new generations of humans have remained devoted to establishing a social order that those who dedicate their lives to serving God and their neighbors claim is possible; however, this process has, so far, made the world less safe. Regrettably, humans cannot “adjust their activity” to meet the needs of every member of the human family. For example, the idea of people coming together to erect a kingdom identical to God’s kingdom has failed to foster a culture of newborns ready to be tolerant and to behave in accordance with the religious principles being taught. The challenge has not been with visualizing how the idea of having newborns come together to conquer and to create a kingdom in which its dwellers would cooperate with each other in the same way the people who interpret religious scriptures claim in God’s kingdom people function, but with how to achieve the necessary transformation in actuality or in action. In other words, the challenge lies in figuring out how to cultivate patience in people. Accordingly, all the different ideas that people or different units of authority tested throughout history to create the necessary societal change have worsened peace and security instead of aiding a social culture rise that would be categorically ready to make wise choices to improve interrelationships. To the contrary, this new idea to have people come together to cooperate to strengthen righteousness post-1945 does not seem to be a process that is aiding mankind to make the world safer but rather to increase the safety of

131 <https://www.mentalfloss.com/article/58718/are-bees-really-all-busy>

the individuals who use their power to oblige others to test their ideas. The combination of global disorder and deteriorating environmental conditions increasingly indicates that if nations do not "adjust their own activity" to ensure that people become preoccupied again or to initiate a new global war, the situation will worsen significantly for the wealthy in the future. One way to preoccupy people could be to cut down on the use of technology to produce goods so real humans do the actual work instead. Another method involves dividing people in each nation into two groups: one group tasked with destroying existing infrastructure (i.e., roads, bridges, buildings, large ships, etc.) and the other group responsible for building it. Alternatively, humans could excavate tunnels through mountains, construct tunnels beneath the sea, create highways on the sea surface, and develop floating cities.

Only those within the families and dynasties that control the world's money supply could understand why their members remain unaware of the international order's shortcomings, which they contributed to by allowing UN subsidiary organs and international aid organizations to create the inequalities that emerged. Despite all the growing degree of dissatisfaction that people are expressing about how the social development order is evolving and the growing inclination to find alternative formulas, the families/dynasties who control the money supply of the world are still refusing to do something to slow down the global political, economic, and social awakening that they have prompted from deteriorating even further in their own best interests. The families and dynasties that control the world's money supply may choose to remain indifferent, allowing humanity to navigate a pivotal moment to determine if they can emerge unscathed from the mounting social upheaval, but unfortunately, current world events suggest that this time, the journey will not be easy. Currently, people's demand for increased happiness is threatening the way of life of the wealthy, as well as the moral values and dialogues they historically use to gain advantages, such as natural and legal rights. People refuse to be the object of pre-1945 policies and demand a share of that power. This situation poses a big challenge because people do not cooperate based on the principles of equal rights but rather by prioritizing distinction, family ties, and affiliations. In fact, when the collapse of the Roman Empire began, the hostility gradually increased but, unlike now, did not manifest universally and across ethnic distinctions. This social and

ethnic activation, of which Lebanon serves as a notable example, occurred only because the families and dynasties controlling the global money supply were driven by reckless ambitions to dominate the world stage without clear direction. Their decision to define priorities that aim at galvanizing their wealth instead of focusing on how to tackle the preponderance that all people were geared to fight post-WWII on their side to achieve made them commit an irreparable mistake. They decided to marginalize the United States' proposal to finally stabilize peace and security to let UN subsidiary organs and international aid organizations activate people's expectations, thus stopping them from remaining committed to the right or wrong values that their predecessors invested hundreds of years to legitimize to seek happiness. Fear is the greatest impediment to humanity; it can drive anyone out of balance. This disproportionate worldwide dissatisfaction that emerged could taper off without mankind needing to be involved in a global war to start prioritizing common sense over senses. One question will always invite itself. Will the rich and the families/dynasties who control the money supply of the world manage to address intelligently the enormous complexities that are piling up around the world and which they need to navigate in between their intricate facets without getting it escalated to a global war so they can hold on to their global power after their ill decision prompted this state of affairs that the international order is knowing?

To be able to answer the aforementioned question, one needs to know what exactly the families / dynasties who control the money supply of the world hoped to see change on earth when they decided to marginalize the United States work program so newborns cooperate to explore regulatory systems that would aid everyone to be organized under a specific organizational relationship or structure intended to create an egalitarian world when competition is natural. The families/dynasties who control the money supply of the world could be supposing that it would be possible for them to rely on the military leverage that they control in the nations with great powers to strike those who challenge their best interests or the wealth that they dispense to mobilize national resistance/commitment to get out intact from all the hostility that people are enduring pursuant to the UN subsidiary organs and international aid organizations prompting them to foster human rights to create an egalitarian world. It is highly likely

that the families and dynasties controlling the world's money supply are counting on the technological advances being made in powerful nations primarily to neutralize the awakening prompted by the UN and international aid organizations. In many respects, the families / dynasties who control the money supply could be perceiving that the advances that are being made in science in some nations, while in others they are stagnant, could help them to maintain or control the prevailing social and economic disparities after they tie them to a political system that behaves in function of financial manipulation. It may be all the scientific advances that people are making are also blinding the human imagination of the families / dynasties who control the money supply of the world and leading them to think that it is possible to organize humans in the same way the tools that people engineer complement each other. Surely, the push to develop societal regulatory systems that would prepare newborns to conform to the social contract dictated by the wealthy and those in power could be influenced by the hypotheses that scientists and philosophers frequently assert are possible. Actually, the forces of religion and science could be confusing and overpowering the human imagination of the people in positions of power, including pushing them to suppose that human ingenuity could triumph over the weakness of the will when history has been clear in showing that it was distinction that has driven all political wills throughout history.

Indeed, it is hard to imagine another better way for humans to be organized than the way researchers claim atoms establish attractive / repulsive forces. Scientists state that atoms consist of three basic parts: electrons, protons, and neutrons.¹³² Scientists also claim that the electrons of an atom spin around the center, also called the nucleus. Protons and neutrons are found in the nucleus. Scientists claim that electrons like to be in separate shells/orbitals that surround the nucleus of an atom. Each shell holds a fixed number of electrons, and when one is full, the next electron that is added has to move to the next shell.¹³³ If we accept what scientists tell us about how most living things consist of carbon atoms bonded with other elements such as oxygen and hydrogen,¹³⁴ which means that those elements could be

132 http://www.chem4kids.com/files/atom_structure.html

133 http://www.chem4kids.com/files/elements/007_shells.html

134 https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Carbon-based_life

densely packed in our human bodies, and about how the mass of an atom is located mainly in the nucleus,¹³⁵ we can say that the way humans organize themselves hierarchically or geographically is not any different from the way atoms relate. We can also say that what could be preventing humans from overcoming the challenge that would allow our species to bond in the same way atoms do is that electrons, whenever they find a shell/orbital that is full or occupied, move voluntarily to the next empty shell/orbital and do not compete to displace each other to occupy each other's space and/or are not rushing to be located in the nucleus but are always orbiting around. In the case of how the atoms are attracting/repulsing each other, this process is being done naturally, but in the case of humans, it is programmed from here on earth. The only difference is that in the case of how humans are structuring their relationship, they do not want a newborn who is born in a remote place, for example, to zip around in his environment, thus maintaining a specific distance between him and another newborn who was born closer to where the city or almost all the mass is located (i.e., the nucleus), but they want each newborn to have aspirations to displace the person who is already occupying a shell that is located closer to the center or in the center because they believe that the happiness of any person is better off when an individual does not stay in his shell/orbit and moves to the center of the mass or when the newborn aspires or competes to occupy a hierarchical position or a position of power. In other words, happiness increases when a person rejects relating with the natural world or what is in his orbit based on using his programmed human body to sustain his survival needs or earthly desires and moves to live in the city so others can preoccupy themselves with sustaining his survival needs or earthly desires using either tools or their programmed human bodies.

Surely, this method that humans want to establish relationships with one another is different from how atoms bond and the electrons of an atom attract/repulse each other to create balancing forces. People could continue to search for ways to attract or repel each other, a practice that has been ongoing since antiquity and has been accelerated by the UN and international aid organizations post-1945, or they could embrace the hope that they would be able to establish an order that would meet the expectations of each newborn. Unfortunately, humans

135 https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Atomic_nucleus

cannot afford this luxury because humans are mutable, unlike atoms. Humans are a cluster of atoms that is created and destroyed. Humans can't move like electrons, who can only go up, down, or sideways for a limited time before their mass is expended. This means that the more people try to displace each other to create a new balance, the less happy they will be. So, a person should be happier spinning in his shell than moving from one to another to increase his happiness.

In fact, there is an affinity between how the founding fathers of the new international post-war world order proposed that each political authority be responsible for the preparedness of its nationals in the economic and social fields in the aftermath of WW2 and the way atoms or molecules are arranged according to scientists. The recommendation they made to align territorial adjustments with the wishes of the affected peoples was not made randomly.¹³⁶ The founding fathers understood that once a person's awareness increases, it is impossible to force human imagination to surrender freedom or suppress its inherent desires for power. For this reason, they proposed to let every person be free to pick how to live and what to pursue for as long as the individual abides by and respects specific obligations. However, instead of acting on the recommendations of the founding fathers of the new international post-war world order, the UN and the political leaders who succeeded them began to promote human rights in an effort to create an egalitarian world. In fact, by doing so, it appears that the UN and the political leaders who succeeded the founding fathers intend to prolong the same hardships that humanity has faced since the beginning of efforts to establish a social order. The people who assert power over matters of faith believe that it is possible to construct and persuade permanent newborns to adopt.

Fixing aspirations is natural. From birth to death, all humans do is change matters. The conjecture that humans were programmed to subdue the earth and rule over every living creature that moves on the ground is unassailable as long as there are no sightings of other organisms capable of engineering tools like those humans can build. The idea that humans are meant to subdue and rule each other to realize their imaginations is unassailable if all they do is change matter. If the continuous pursuit of people to move from their

136 https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Atlantic_Charter

shell/orbit to one that is closer to the nucleus hasn't advanced the cause of peace since antiquity, could mankind be working on destabilizing the international order through having UN subsidiary organs and international aid organizations make people invest reactive action to stop being content with what they have to be modernized? Will the rich international families/dynasties manage to deter the convergence that the UN and international aid organizations are prompting so more people stop being ready to stay in their shell/orbit to compete to displace them from their positions or roles so new people fill them?

Al Afwah Al-Oudh (570 AD, year of death) was a Yemeni warrior, poet, and philosopher.¹³⁷ Al-Oudh asserted that "the right pegs and pillars are essential for erecting and maintaining a stable house." A community cannot stabilize disorder when it lacks the right leader, and no leader can ever fix a community's disorder if it's ignorantly ruled or ascended to power."

The heirs controlling the world's money supply post-1945 may be either ignorant or scheming to empower UN subsidiary organs and international aid organizations instead of governments, with their plans to be revealed by future world events. The challenges faced by people worldwide could be the result of the heirs of international families or dynasties controlling the global money supply trusting the UN and international aid officials to employ knowledgeable staff for social order intervention, but unfortunately, as Al-Oudh claimed, they picked ignorant officials. The UN Charter's preamble states that the UN's purpose is to teach tolerance and avoid policies that foster resentment. In other words, it would be illogical to assume that the wealthy individuals or international families and dynasties controlling the global money supply would desire for UN subsidiary organs and international aid organizations to implement policies that undermine their own ability to protect their interests and create opportunities for others that could work against them. In fact, the UN subsidiary organs and international aid organizations are the greatest threat to the rich and the international families/dynasties who control the money supply

137

https://ar.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D8%A7%D9%84%D8%A3%D9%81%D9%88%D9%87_%D8%A7%D9%84%D8%A3%D9%88%D8%AF%D9%8A

of the world. This is because the officials of those entities are playing a double role. They are mobilizers who are stirring social dynamics, and they are pursuing how to increase their happiness at the same time, often prioritizing their own interests over the needs of the communities they are meant to serve, which undermines the effectiveness of their initiatives and contributes to the ongoing challenges faced by those communities, such as poverty, inequality, and lack of access to essential services. In other words, they prioritize their pleasure over the needs of others, unlike those who assert power over matters of faith.

After 72 years of programming by the UN subsidiary organs and international aid organizations, there is a lack of evidence to support their success relative to their promises, the world's expectations, and the needs for genuine action. This situation is very serious and worrisome. The problem is because no one from outside the rich or international families/dynasties who control the money supply of the world knows what those powerful individuals are prepared to do in the world with others for the sake of their own well-being and that of others and what they are prepared to do to oppose those who threaten them. If we add how theoretically the world was not ready immediately post-WW2 to create UN subsidiary organs and international aid organizations and to launch them to foster human rights to create an egalitarian world because there were no clear relationships defined between the rich and poor nations immediately after the war, this scenario also could be another reason for this widespread intolerance that emerged. In 1945, poor people and countries had not yet established their identities and were merely learning to navigate their paths. The belief that wealthy individuals or international dynasties supported the establishment of UN subsidiary organs and international aid organizations to encourage people to abandon their traditional ways in favor of modernization was emotionally appealing but technically flawed.

The imposition of one conjecture over another outcome can prolong a crisis. As I said earlier, most awakenings involved intense uprisings initially that tapered off over time. Could the wealthy individuals or international families and dynasties that control the global money supply manage to influence people's expectations without facing

significant consequences after avoiding the work program proposed by the United States, which aimed to create a more egalitarian world? Therefore, if the wealthy individuals or international families and dynasties that control the global money supply, as well as the poor, do not make concessions, humanity may face a situation similar to what the Athenians offered the Melians: the choice to either surrender and pay tribute to Athens or face destruction. I believe that what is a cause of concern is how can we all be sure that the accomplishments that the United States made to strengthen freedom until 1945 would not continue to decline around the world and in this country in particular if its own political leaders start to shift from continuing to provide the overall historic leadership on how to strengthen freedom to favoring erecting a social order that its members would be cooperating with each other based on egalitarian principles, which we already know in advance that it is not possible to erect. First, nature was not designed to create a social system in which every member of the human family can equally enjoy what others possess. Second, people pursue an economic model that creates winners and losers while simultaneously freezing social mobility, which leads to increased inequality and social tension within communities. If UN member states, particularly the industrialized nations, continue to prioritize revamping infrastructure to control environmental degradation over reducing or managing expectations, such actions could exacerbate the already vulnerable political system susceptible to financial manipulation, leading to uncontrollable disparities among people and potentially driving the international order towards a complete collapse. This scenario raises numerous questions. For one, how can we be sure that the interventions that the United States is supporting at the United Nations are not weakening its ability to defend freedom? As of 1945, it is no longer the political leaders of the United States who are controlling most of their internal affairs inside this country, but financial aid from foreign partners is supporting and providing inputs as well, which raises concerns about the influence of external entities on domestic policy and governance. Likewise, as of 1945, the increasingly debilitating military involvement has shown that the United States' preeminence is marginalizing. Most importantly, the decision by UN member states to vote against the United States' choice to shift its embassy in Israel from one city to another in 2017 clearly demonstrates that the US is no longer the dominant power or the

world's global policeman.¹³⁸ If the US challenges a country protected by China or Russia in the future, it won't be as easy as when it bombed Japan in WW II.¹³⁹

To have a conversation about what humans should do to finally stabilize the international order, facts have to matter more than feelings. In the nucleus of an atom, the proton or neutron that defines the chemical element does not get organized in a hierarchical manner that gives one specific proton strata priority over all the others. If humans want to pursue a social contract that (i) allows members rights to freeze social space and to transfer it after death to designated individuals along with all the material things that a person accumulates, and (ii) if humans started as of 1945 to prompt each other to stop being content with what one has and to be devoted to becoming modernized to create an egalitarian world, then if supernatural forces are not confusing people, there must be a hand or a bug that is creating this ongoing confusion.

It would be irrational to conjecture that the founding fathers of the UN created the UN to be a workshop to make newborns stop being tolerant post-1945 in order to create the dynamisms that exist in the world today. In other words, even if the nations who created the UN had plotted to set up a totalitarian world government that would make all the different nations become subservient to them, and they even counted on reaching their goal by depending on modern technology because of its power to intercept the human body to stop it from being a power that can suppress or dominate others, it would be irrational to assume that they would have recommended achieving this goal by picking a work program that would be based on making the human imagination become dynamic so they can stay in power. This is because it is the human imagination that drives the human body to react and not the other way around.

If, throughout history, a good number of the political leaders who decided to rule on the basis of prioritizing the brotherly relations that the religious institutions counselled, they all reaped seeing their

138

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/United_Nations_General_Assembly_resolution_ES-10/L.22

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

authority decline in the hands of none other than the people they were uplifting; and if the rulers who abused the other social classes or decided to extend their sphere of influence to rule other people faced the same end as well, then only one motive could be perpetrating this dynamism. This must be due to a rule that humans refuse to stem from the social order.

It is not difficult for the human imagination to come up with fantastical beliefs that promulgate that because all humans look alike, it is possible to make every member of the human family behave in accordance with the conjecture that the powerful person or the majority deems pertinent. What is strange, however, is that each time the world has known a leader who claimed that his inspirations to strengthen solidarity are divine, we read that it is the existing religious denominations who were the first ones to protest and to reject abandoning their own teachings so the new body of religious principles could be put to the test to determine if it increases fellowship or not. From Moses to Christ to Muhammad to the United Nations, no religious denominations or doctrine that existed agreed to abandon its own belief system when a new body of principles emerged so humanity could know whether or not the revelations that are proposed could strengthen righteousness and increase social connectedness. The same phenomenon does not exist whenever people develop new tools. When people develop new tools, users stop using the older model and begin to use the new type. For example, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights stipulates that people should build relations without distinction of any kind, such as race, color, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth, or other status. All the existing religious denominations refuse to abstain from teaching their doctrines so mankind could test if righteousness could improve among future cohorts when there are less dogma competing and confusing newborns.

Can the UN member states manage to make people program-friendly relations without any reference to any distinction when all the pupils who they are supposed to be teaching are made to keep constantly in mind such principles, and all appertain from birth involuntarily to distinct religious denominations?

The unwillingness of all the religious denominations to discard or to abandon their teachings or interference when a new doctrine emerges could be due to avoiding creating the same gridlock that occurs when engineers develop new tools that aid workers to finish jobs faster but create a challenge to figure out what to use the time gained for. This also means that if all that humans do is to be divided into two groups whereby one is spreading immoral acts and the other is doing the curtailing, then if the people who gain from the idea of God are to abandon their teaching or interference each time a new doctrine emerges, we could be dealing with having to be confronted with the same challenges that modernization is creating—we will have lots of jobless people, and many people would be losing their power or authority.

Then again, the challenge with allowing that many religious factions to exist and compete to recruit newborns when one of the principal pillars that was programmed in the new post-war international order includes ensuring that all the programming is done without distinction of any kind has far more serious implications on humanity than dealing with the complications of having lots of jobless people roam if religious factions are not stemmed.

Aging is defined as the progressive physiological changes in an organism leading to senescence.¹⁴⁰ In the context of food or beverages, aging causes chemical changes that aid in either improving or deteriorating their flavor.¹⁴¹ The benefits of aging are many. From a social aspect, aging can help the aged individual to make good decisions because he can capitalize on his errors, either by eliminating the source of the error or reforming it. With wise choices comes more stability. Another benefit of aging is that this process allows the aged individuals (or organisms) to influence the particular organization of the society in which they exist.

If aging helps an institution (i.e., humans) to perfect what it needs to be devoted to teaching to ensure that it becomes a permanent host in the social realm, this scenario means that the people or the religious institutions that profit from the idea of God to gain advantage could

140 <https://www.britannica.com/science/aging-life-process>

141 [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Aging_\(food\)](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Aging_(food))

have recognized at the end of WW2 that the role religion would continue to play in the future to control people would be diminishing due to all the advances that science is making to regulate human behavior via the human body. To counter the diminished role that the people (or the religious institutions) who profit from the idea of God could confront if science continues to make us understand the natural processes that are still unexplained in simpler ways, thus reducing religiosity in the process, they decided to transition their authority from one that resides solely in religion to one that operates in combination with the human rights ideas (or solutions) that the UN is promoting to stay in power.

The state and the church worked well together to make the poor forget the injustices that humans perpetrate against each other. The state and the church managed to control people largely because of the strong support from societal norms and shared beliefs that reinforced their authority. However, after the awareness of people increased due mainly to science or all the knowledge gained, it has become very difficult to hide the abuse that rulers or nations leverage against one another or to defend how all the ongoing exploitation could have been the mandate of God. All the social unrest, instability, corruption, and abuse of power that were widespread until the first half of the 20th century created the conditions necessary for a new ruling authority that its people would not be as morally corrupt to rise.

Grooming is defined as an action in which something becomes ready for a specific objective.¹⁴² The concurrence of the existing states along with the different religious denominations that exist about the UN interesting itself in the social arena, so this organization establishing prominence in tasks normally reserved to governments to determine and enforce could not be haphazard. The indifference that governments and religious institutions are expressing about the UN's interest in the well-being of the “neighbor” could mean that the UN is being groomed to replace the role governments played in administering and controlling people, or this interference is intended to transition the diminished role that religion is playing in helping people maintain virtue so the UN starts to play this role. Evidently, the people who would be controlling the UN would want this council to

142 <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/groom>

counterbalance the people who would be controlling the technological tools that would be responsible for neutralizing the human body. By allowing the UN to interest itself in the well-being of the “neighbor,” it would be impossible for the people who would be operating the technological tools that would be employed to neutralize the human body to succeed in their mission to finally stabilize peace and security. This is because what causes poverty is not the unpreparedness of people in the political, economic, and social arena but the social contract that existing people dictate, which divides rights into natural and legal. If the UN were preaching to people about righteousness and the importance of fostering human rights to create an egalitarian world when people are pursuing an economic model that is based on freezing social space and on transferring it to designated individuals along with all the material things that one accumulates, then all this interference would be achieving is that it would replace the role that religion was playing to keep peace and security dynamic so the UN could fulfill this role. In other words, instead of having the idea of the state and religion stabilize people, we will have the companies or the people who own and run the technological machines that control human behavior and the UN doing it. Arranging that the UN spread why people should foster human rights would make it difficult for the people who own or control the technological tools that would be employed to regulate and structure the common people to abuse their power. However, this handover that the people who devote their lives to the practice of God and their neighbor are making to the UN to have the latter interest itself in the well-being of the neighbor, which the different religious factions have been doing next to the state, would kill two birds with one stone. First, the people who administer the religious institutions would continue to ensure that they would remain a permanent host in the social realm because it would be the UN officials who would be interfering in the social order to interest people in the importance of working together to build a replica of the kingdom of God on earth, thus keeping people dynamic and keeping the idea of God alive. Second, and most importantly, it would be the UN officials who would be committing the abuse and the corruptive and immoral acts, which is impossible to prevent, instead of the people who devote their lives to the practice of God and their neighbor, thus prompting more people to lose confidence in the idea of God.

When the rulers in antiquity were abusing the other social classes and God supposedly sent his only son to stop the social unrest and instability, the converts or the followers who were preaching the doctrine that Jesus was proclaiming managed to seize power and to revert to a simpler form of the prevailing religions and political and social codes of beliefs that were in vigor. The same happened when God interfered and sent Mohammad. If the Islamic conquests were not stopped in the same way the Christian, Jewish, Buddhist, or Confucian conquests underwent before, the world could be dominated on the basis of the principles of one of those religions or philosophies. Apparently, it was the immoral behavior or abuse that the people who were preaching any one of those aforementioned doctrines that preceded the other ones had that led to each one losing its status and reversing to a simpler form so a new dogma could rise.

The social justice solutions that the ruling class started sponsoring and financing post-1945 through the UN and through all the different development aid organizations have not fomented the political climax to assure that people are becoming more tolerant. To the contrary, involving the UN and all the different development aid organizations in making people reject their old way of doing things in favor of new methods is keeping the production lines that the ruling class control or own up and running, but it is creating a major upset at the same time. This strategy does not lull people into complacency, making them more tolerant and easier to govern or exploit. The employment of the UN and all the different development aid organizations as a marketing medium to make people reject their old way of doing things in favor of new methods seems to be making people more clamorous and dissatisfied.

If the idea of freedom and democracy is a concept that requires constant guarding and protection when people's awareness increases, then this philosophy becomes like any other doctrine that people have tested, because it is not possible to stop production. This means that the use of the idea of freedom or democracy would be to sustain the security of the people who operate the institution of government that teaches such principles instead of those institutions being a tool that would aid people to develop a better understanding of themselves, which is a prerequisite to people becoming compassionate. Many

questions this begs. How can we be sure that the UN would not concentrate power in its hands and its officials would not exhibit the same immoral conduct that the followers of the different religious or philosophical doctrines that mankind has known exhibited? In other words, the UN would start to punish those who refuse to integrate into the social contract that they design to prevent the people who express defiance from ganging up to weaken its best interests. This is how all the people who profited from doctrines behaved.

Mark Twain once said, “History does not repeat itself, but it often rhymes.”¹⁴³ Throughout history, people’s attachment to political and religious institutions has always led to changes in allegiance, but none of the beliefs pursued have shaped a specific permanent mentality. Since antiquity, new people have swung from a centralized to a decentralized governance system to address the abuse, confusion, and corruption that the people in positions of authority exhibit after they ascend to power. Is mankind working on abolishing the decentralized governance system that has been in vigor for a few centuries to replace it with a centralized order to enable that technology to exert its influence or accede to the needs of everyone since there is no need for real humans to do it anymore? It is apparent that it would not be possible to control and regulate the international order using the prevailing decentralized sovereign approach when we have a large number of expectations competing for wealth and power at the same time and political barriers. Pursuing a centralized approach can ensure that everyone maintains allegiance to the central power since it is technology that would be doing the bulk of the control and not real humans as was the case before.

Then again, mankind can’t have a conversation about what types of interventions could stabilize people’s expectations and make newborns forget the injustices that man’s pursuit of happiness provokes if the political leaders do not recognize that crises and conflicts are a function of modernization and vice versa [Maloof 2005]. Most importantly, to recognize that if the UN member states continue to let the UN and the international development aid agencies make people abandon their old ways of doing things to accelerate modernization,

143 <https://quoteinvestigator.com/2014/01/12/history-rhymes/>

humanity could be putting at stakes all the milestones that our forefathers achieved to strengthen liberty and freedom.

The UN member states are allowing the UN and the international development aid agencies to make people reject their old way of doing things in favor of new methods without there being any evidence to support that when people's expectations are accelerated, the desires that would be awakened would not backfire and make people be bound by their personal power and conscience.

There is a relative lack of research to determine if the state of mind that humans hold, that they are destined to rule the earth and/or have been programmed to save or assist each other, including being preoccupied with themselves, is a complexity due to humans being the victims of their own imagination or if their inflated feelings are due to humans suffering from grandiose delusion symptoms.

If throughout history humans tried to control each other and/or to be systemized, and if all the attempts failed, this means that either people are trying to make the human body adopt principles that this mass was not programmed to fulfill or all the concepts that people come up with and argue that it is possible to conquer are unquestionably a result of humans' quest for wholeness.

Psychoanalytic theory is defined as “the theory of personality organization and the dynamics of personality that guides psychoanalysis.”¹⁴⁴ Psychoanalysis is defined as “a system of psychological theory and therapy that aims to treat mental disorders by investigating the interaction of conscious and unconscious elements in the mind and bringing repressed fears and conflicts into the conscious mind by techniques such as dream interpretation and free association.”¹⁴⁵

If pursuant to all the attempts that humans have tested with to be systemized, there are new people who believe that it would be possible for them to prompt a behavioral change, this delusion or odd belief that those new individuals are firmly insisting is true despite evidence

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

145 [www.google.com / psychoanalysis](http://www.google.com/psychoanalysis)

that it is not has to be a form of delusions of grandeur that the unconscious mind is prompting and not the conscious one. If the UN member states had acted on the recommendations that the founding fathers of the UN counselled that people (or nations) start to cooperate with one another on their premise post-1945 and had not allowed those feelings to matter more than facts, there is a big chance that fellowships could have deepened during the past 75 years instead of the growing enmities that emerged.

The Merriam-Webster Dictionary defines "unconscious" as being a state that is "not marked by conscious thought, sensation, or feeling."¹⁴⁶ Throughout history, many philosophers and theorists from various fields and across various orientations investigated if the thought, sensation, or feeling that people express is a pattern that derives from the id, the superego, or the ego that Sigmund Freud [1856 – 1939] claimed could be a potential source. Alternatively, if there is a supernatural force that affects the way we think or has programmed us to behave in a certain way.

No one knows if the drives and forces that prompt the thought, sensation, or feeling that people express are abilities that specific supernatural power is motivating, as some believers argue is the case, or if those aptitudes are capabilities that are invoked as a result of people's own misleading effects of perception.

A large number of people believe that a deity exists and that the rules that humans depend on to control and regulate each other were also initiated by such a divine being. Indeed, humans are not honoring in their entirety what the biblical (or religious) scriptures instruct mankind to harmonize actions like. The god(s) could be interfering with the way people are attempting to understand themselves and are punishing mankind consequently.

Freud did not believe there is a supernatural force that has pre-programmed mankind to behave in a certain way. Freud said, "Religion is an illusion, and it derives its strength from the fact that it

146 <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/unconscious>

falls in with our instinctual desires."^{147,148} I disagree with Freud's claim, especially in the absence of evidence to support it otherwise. As I said before, humans seem to be the only species who are working on exploring to discover new worlds and are not acting as per the way the rest of the other species are doing servicing the natural world.

Then again, even if God(s) were an illusion, all the religious wars that people became entangled with throughout history were to address anxieties and tensions and to behave in a moral way. Religion is thus a tool—a vehicle to deepen ethics. A tool is a device that does not slow down a person but is a means to attain goals faster. Humans do not stop their reliance on tools to improve their livelihoods but are always coming up with new tools to accelerate even faster how they attain their ends. If mankind fails to solve why human nature is the ultimate source of war and peace, it is highly likely that the “bug” is woven into the tools (or laws) that existing people derive and not the users (or newborns), as most investigators and philosophers claim.

In the Bible, the story of the Fall of Man (Genesis, chapter 3, verse 22) tells us that God stated, "man has now become like one of us."¹⁴⁹ If mankind became like the supernatural force that programmed our species, this transformation means that humans became possessed with a faculty that is not any different than the force that is referred to in this religious text as having programmed the universe. Survival is defined as the act of living.¹⁵⁰ There is nothing worth more than living. From birth until right when a person becomes mature and one begins to influence change in matter on his own, the power that parents exercise to permit the continuity of one's life is not any different in weight than the controlling power that the supernatural force that could have programmed us to operate unsupervised exercises. Strangely, after a person begins to support his own survival needs, his focus begins to include how to increase pleasure and how to be bound by his personal power and conscience.

147 Freud & Religion. (n.d.). About.com Psychology.

148 https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Freud%27s_psychoanalytic_theories#Religion

149 <https://www.biblegateway.com/passage/?search=Genesis+3&version=NIV>

150 <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/survival>

Nonetheless, since all people are able to not act irrationally throughout the interval of time in which a person changes matter on his own, this means that humans are empowered to distinguish between good and evil. Even if humans can distinguish good from evil, we cannot say that a person's erratic actions, once human ingenuity can change matter independently, are controlled or influenced by any force, including Freud's id or ego. Since a person understands that doing good leads to greater benefits while doing wrong results in more harm, the irrational thoughts, sensations, or feelings expressed by individuals may be influenced by a superego "duty" that compels them to act against their will. This conscience is unable to adhere to the requirement of this superego. In other words, the need to respect this duty prompts a person to do wrong. The superego makes the behavior unable to override the desire that this duty drives to do wrong. The individual does wrong despite genuinely wanting to do right.

Respect and esteem are two positive concepts that seem very similar, but the differences between them are crucial. Respect and esteem are both positive feelings that a person expresses toward someone or something considered important.¹⁵¹After a person begins to support their own survival needs, the respect or esteem that they hold toward others becomes divided. The human mind places the people that an individual considers important, such as family members and relatives, in a separate category and is ready to defend them even with one's own life. However, to the people who the individual considers strangers, the mind regards them (i.e., esteems them, honors them, and respects them) based on a positive evaluation that this aptitude carries out.

Each time a person evaluates someone, they are quantifying their regard for that individual. Each time a person quantifies the degree of regard to assign to another person or object, the appraisal can be either subjective or objective, which introduces a level of uncertainty. Therefore, since "respect" and "esteem" mean, on one hand, to accept things as they are and, on the other, a form of admiration that the mind expresses toward an object or a person, this signifies that the latter is more a materialistic appreciation while the former is moral.

151 <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Respect>

Newborns must obey the laws set by others, but they need not do so with those who accept them or vice versa. The irrational thoughts, sensations, or feelings that people express may be prompted by a duty related to aspects that all newborns are encouraged to change. This means that the things encouraging irrational behavior in newborns could be linked to duties that existing people expect newborns to accept without trying to change. Existing people expect newborns to accept rules related to conduct and not attempt to change them.

Ethics and morals relate to “right” and “wrong” conduct. Those two concepts are sometimes used interchangeably, but they are different. Ethics refer to the "rules provided by an external source, such as codes of conduct in workplaces or principles in religions," while morals refer to an individual's own principles regarding right and wrong.”¹⁵²

All known wars are due to those who refuse to follow a code of ethics as it would apply to a system. Most people choose to let their personal conscience be the compass that prescribes what is right from what is wrong. The principle states that individuals who are bound by their personal power and conscience and choose to align their behavior with its teachings are typically influenced by external forces such as religious beliefs or develop their values internally.

Mankind focused until 1945 on how to make a person work around his principles to not violate the ethical principles that the majority felt were in the best interests of society. For example, Sigmund Freud, who is considered the founder of psychoanalysis, and Carl Gustav Jung (1875-1961), a Swiss psychiatrist and psychoanalyst who founded analytical psychology,^{153,154} have both emphasized the importance of unconscious psychological conflicts in shaping behavior and personality. Those two researchers who defined the world of psychology believed that we can learn more about the thought, sensation, or feeling of a person through their unconscious rather than through their conscious mind. Freud and Jung also believed that if people were to make conscious their unconscious minds, an individual could manage to correct the distortions that skew one's analyses of

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

153 https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Carl_Jung#Relationship_with_Freud

154 https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Analytical_psychology

benefits and costs, ultimately leading to improved mental health and more rational decision-making.

Freud passed away in 1939. Jung lived until 1961, but historians claim that in 1943, he began to lead a private life after a heart attack and that in 1952, he became ill again.¹⁵⁵ The conjecture that Freud and Jung posited about what people need to be doing to act upon a person's deepest desires reflects an appraisal or a diagnosis that supports that those two were basing all their assumptions on humans continuing to be strictly following moral principles to obtain the benefits of political order.

The decision of the founding fathers of the UN in the aftermath of WW2 to pledge every member of the human family, rich or poor, to follow a code of ethics as it would apply to a system makes it impossible to argue against the proposed ethical codes anymore. This is because humans cannot cooperate with one another beyond allowing actions to be taken based on the principle of equal rights. In other words, mankind's determination to cooperate economically based on the principles of equal rights since 1945 renders Freud and Jung's tenet about unconscious drives and ego defenses an invalid motive for explaining conflicts between those drives and civilized behavior.

If, as of 1945, one can no longer violate the ethical principles that the United States secured in the aftermath of this global war so we could all have a fit, all principles that make it unnecessary that one could resort to his consciousness to deepen or maintain his own moral integrity (i.e., distinction) signify that the lack of readiness of newborns to be tolerant post-1945 to make headway on the postwar international world order could not be due to people's id, ego, or superego interfering in preventing one from voluntarily consenting and giving up one's natural freedom but rather to existing people refusing to surrender freedom to follow the new prescribed ethical principles. The motives for people's refusal could be due to people pursuing different ethical principles than the one prescribed at the end of WW2 or people not having purged from their awareness the delusional grandeur perception that the people who lived until 1945 were

155 https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Carl_Jung#Later_years_and_death

cooperating with one another on its premise. This scenario is very serious and worrisome.

In other words, if after mankind agreed to let the id and the instinct energy or force that houses the totality of the human mind, conscious and unconscious, not conflict with the conventions of civilized behavior, humans are still depending on ego defenses to get their way, then the major tenets of evolution concerning the relationship of humans to great apes could be true, or the superego that humans are continually coming up with is the principal perpetrator of the motives that are preventing the psyche from acting on the solutions that human ingenuity proposes to reduce a person's reliance on ego defenses.

It was not established yet if humans evolved from primates. Until scientists demonstrate if humans evolved from apes, we can say that the civilized behavior that the mind is always coming up with could be what is preventing mankind from conforming to the tenet that the founding fathers of the UN counselled that starting from 1945 every member of the human family should strive to observe. In other words, if based on what Freud and Jung posited about the instincts (i.e., the id) being what prevent humans from acting in a conscientious way because the consideration of the unconscious mind prevents a person from conforming to the political order, then these energies or instincts have to do with all that may be comprised under the word "love" or "grandeur delusion" symptoms. This phenomenon is because all the superegos that humans come up with are progressive measures that humans undertake to strengthen narcissistic or fantastic beliefs that are typically related to religious or scientific themes.

It appears that mankind's challenge in developing the minimum mindfulness necessary to act on psychological drives and forces since 1945 may stem from an inability to distinguish between right and wrong, which contradicts the belief held by many that the majority of people born after 1945 are diagnosed with narcissistic disorders. This phenomenon means that the more "love" or compassion that the UN and the international development aid encourage to create an egalitarian world rises, the more people's awareness to foster human rights would reciprocally rise and would be driving people to crisscross each other due to natural inequality. Unfortunately, the more

people begin to convert legal rights into becoming an interest right instead of remaining a will right, the more entropy, or disorder, will rise.

The second law of thermodynamics states that an orderly system will always become disorderly.¹⁵⁶ If, according to the second law of thermodynamics, disorder or chaos always increases and does not decrease, this scenario means that the drives and forces that are preventing people from reducing their reliance on ego defenses could be provoked by this spontaneous development mission that the UN member states embarked on post-1945 to systemize obligations and/or to create an egalitarian world, which is a work program that the founding fathers of the UN did not counsel be pursued.

If the drives and forces that existing humans pursue to increase awareness, to systemize obligations, or to accelerate compassion are an impediment, then if the UN and the international development aid continue to make people reject their old way of doing things in favor of new methods so we could allow the international order to be more orderly, peace and security could deteriorate to an uncontrollable level. This is because the entities involved in this mixing are not gases, but rather humans. Humans are a species that consent voluntarily or under duress. Humans are a species that depend on multilateralism to gain advantage, particularly in negotiations and collaborations that can lead to beneficial outcomes for their communities and societies. Most importantly, humans are cunning and mischievous. They can use their dexterity for trickery.

This firm belief in fostering compassion, claimed by the political leaders who succeeded the UN's founding fathers as necessary for lasting peace—despite a lack of evidence that such programming could make people tolerate one another—may be what is preventing people from surrendering freedom for organization post-1945. In fact, many philosophers such as Max Weber (1864 – 1920), Karl Marx (1818 – 1883), Emile Durkheim (1858 – 1917), etc. cautioned about making people abandon their traditions and values to replace them with modern actions on peace and security. Unfortunately, the people in power did not consider the implications of uplifting expectations

156 https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Second_law_of_thermodynamics

and social standards for peace and security. The insecurity caused by the work program pursued by UN member states is forcing humanity to return to a course of action that aligns with the advice given by the aforementioned philosophers. Interestingly, this slower pace aligns with the advice given by the founding fathers of the UN, who recommended that nations pursue a gradual approach to revamping the social order in order to achieve the goals outlined in the preamble of the UN charter.

Mistakes are underlying lessons that we learn from them as much as doing things right. The past seventy years have shown that acting fast is crucial in life-threatening situations, but not when it comes to raising awareness about fostering human rights to create an egalitarian world because its impact on foregoing one's own security or authority could have adverse impacts for as long as humans are adopting a social contract that splits rights into natural and legal ones. The specific lesson I want to build on in this work is as follows. Could the “drives and forces” that propel people to exhibit mindfulness related to aspects of doctrine, social organization, and legislation be a spontaneous recourse that humans fuel or meddle in to address fantastical beliefs that transcend nature, rather than primarily to strengthen universal peace, as those who argue their interference is revered to only serve? In other words, when humans are presented with a conflict between biological drives and social expectations, most people become incapable of distinguishing between what is right and what is wrong due to our species being subjective in evaluating its worth. To put it differently, humans' preoccupation with how they are distinct from other elements in the world makes people focus on innate elements of personality instead of focusing on tackling the only truth that is known to man so far—death.

Evidently, humans' exclusive understanding of the world obliges newborns from one generation to the next to be devoted to cleaning up the subjective evaluation that existing people come up with of what is worth. For this reason, a vast number of philosophers, investigators, and humanists, including, supposedly, God, have proposed solutions that humans could use to navigate through the set of rules that a newborn must recognize and even aid them to correct the distortions that skew one's analyses of benefit and cost. Unfortunately, none of

the tenets that existing people determined to regulate the actions of newborns and even, in some instances, claimed that it was God who instructed them to be followed managed to create lasting change. This is mainly because the newborns who benefit from protecting the laws, wealth, power, and title that they inherit or accumulate expect all others to change what is in themselves and to adopt the tenets that govern all conduct instead of changing.

"Tipping point" is defined as a point when an individual or a group changes its behavior by widely adopting a previous practice or a new one.¹⁵⁷ People's efforts to free themselves from the constraints of rules, analogies, policies, principles, or customs that those with laws, wealth, power, or titles rely on to govern the actions of the less fortunate have been influencing the beliefs or tenets that, in principle, all newborns should adhere to year after year.

Sun Tzu (544 BC–496 BC) was a Chinese general, military strategist, writer, and philosopher who lived in the Eastern Zhou period of ancient China. In his treatise *The Art of War*, Sun Tzu counsels leaving an opponent an opportunity to withdraw in order to not force them to act out of desperation.¹⁵⁸

Charles Jean Jacques Joseph Ardant du Picq (1821–1870) was a French Army officer and military theorist whose writings had a significant effect on military theory and doctrine.¹⁵⁹ In his book titled *Battle Studies*,¹⁶⁰ Picq asserts that "moral force is the trump card for any military event because, as events change, the human elements of war remain unchanged."¹⁶¹

The rich have been depending on moral force to change the behavioral attitude of the poor so that the continuous events do not push those who are disenchanted with the social order to act out of desperation, as

157 [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Tipping_point_\(sociology\)](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Tipping_point_(sociology))

158 https://en.wikiquote.org/wiki/Sun_Tzu

159 https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ardant_du_Picq

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

161

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_military_strategies_and_concepts#Strategic_concepts

Sun Tzu claimed could happen when humans are feeling desperate and calling for change.

For example, in the last century, Freud claimed that children go through a series of five psychosexual stages (i.e., psychosexual theory of development) that lead to the development of the adult personality. At each stage, Freud claimed, a person faces a conflict between biological drives and social expectations. He then suggests that the “mastery of each developmental stage” would help a person to successfully navigate through the conflict that each stage prompts to ultimately attain a fully mature personality.

Socrates (470–399 BC) was a Greek philosopher who is credited with being one of the founders of Western philosophy and the first moral philosopher.¹⁶² Socrates claimed, more than two thousand years earlier, that if people “master” what he referred to as “the art of measurement,” they could successfully navigate through the five internal conflicts that Freud identified in his psychoanalytic theory, which help individuals make their unconscious thoughts conscious in order to attain ultimate wisdom.

Reality is defined as “the sum or aggregate of all that is real or existent, rather than that which is only imaginary.”¹⁶³ The entire body of writings on world history shows that people were unable to bond with one another, leading to the formulation of new moral behaviors that allowed the human mind “to assess the reality of the external world and act accordingly, rather than simply acting on the pleasure principle.”¹⁶⁴

Ferdinand Foch (1851–1929) was a French general and military theorist who served as the Supreme Allied Commander during the First World War.¹⁶⁵ Fosh claimed that “technological advances could not change the human condition and how men react to warfare.”¹⁶⁶

162 <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Socrates>

163 <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Reality>

164 https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Reality_principle

165 https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ferdinand_Foch

166 https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ardant_du_Picq#Assessment

Neither moral aspects nor technological advances are encouraging people to master what philosophers and investigators claim could aid mankind in formulating new behavior, but, since antiquity, every cohort has been forcing the rich to surrender freedom to prevent the majority (i.e., the poor) from withdrawing their obligation to obey and create a state of anarchy in which the rich would be the greatest losers; and if from antiquity until now all the rich have been doing is legitimizing new tenets on the hope that such added losers; and if from antiquity until now all the rich have been doing is legitimizing new tenets on the hope that such added information could finally calm people instead of tackling and solving the right and justification to exercise power, then the choice ahead is straightforward. For one, future generations would continue forcing the rich to surrender freedom, lacking evidence that the rich's concessions address the actual problem. Alternatively, the rich could continue to enlist governments, philosophers, or investigators to help them develop coping mechanisms that the majority (i.e., the poor) could depend on to help them be content or master how to live with the deprivation they perceive.

Paradoxically, mankind cannot establish relationships with one another based on anything other than the principles of equal rights, and in 1945, all people from all nations agreed to uphold this milestone. In other words, the psychological reasons philosophers or investigators claimed had stopped people from surrendering freedom for the benefits of political order were irrelevant to securing the UN Charter's goals. This conclusion is because all the relations that humankind has to adhere to to attain the ends set forth in the preamble of the UN Charter are to cooperate with one another on the principles of equal rights.

If people lack the courage to accept the second-best option when the first-best is unattainable, we cannot start examining what prevents humans from coping based on the principle our predecessors claimed is the only path to lasting peace because, as I said, people can only interrelate through this method. Likewise, the drawback is not due to human nature because human nature remained unchanged before and after 1945. Most importantly, our predecessors did not cooperate with each other based on the principles of equal rights, which suggests that

we are attempting to implement a strategy that has been tested before. In other words, if existing people cannot formulate new social behaviors that encourage newborns to have the courage to accept the second best when the first best is unattainable, the motive for this nasty and brutish human life must arise from people's unwillingness to fulfill their part of the agreement. The agreement was to work together based on equal rights and to accept the second best if the first was unattainable.

Humans do not honor binding agreements when the obligation called for under the accord is impossible to perform or when the default act is the result of one's own renouncement. Humans can cooperate based on the principles of equal rights because all sporting events function based on this principle. All people who compete in sporting events and lose demonstrate the courage to accept the second best when the first best is not attainable. This scenario means that what could be preventing people from performing their obligations and/or cooperating with one another based on the principles of equal rights must be a rule whose drawbacks are preventing humans from fulfilling their part of the agreement.

If after making all the distinctions that our predecessors were claiming are real or existent in reality, they become not factorable to justify any irrational behavior, and humankind continues to express the same attitudes that our precursors exhibited, then two motives could be prompting humans to not fulfill their part of the agreement and be ready to cooperate on the principles of equal rights to obtain the resources or knowledge that newborns claim their lack is what prevents them from acting on their pleasure, preferring instead to resort to their human nature to improve their livelihood. The first is that humans are a species that does not know how to distinguish between what is right and what is wrong. The other is if an agent started to confuse people post-1945 and the consequence of this interference is making people unable to demonstrate the same attitude they show they possess the power to display in matters unrelated to morality. I will use an example to explain the above.

Lebanon and the United States were two countries that did not have anything in common pre-1945. The people of the United States and the

people of Lebanon agreed to cooperate with one another based on the principle of equal rights post 1945. The two countries' people are ready to cooperate in sports, art, science, etc., and the contestants from each country would have the courage to accept the second best if the first best were unattainable. If the same contestants compete in the economic field, neither would be ready to have the courage to accept the second best if what one considers the first best is unattainable, and both participants doubt that the rules were correctly applied or that they favor one group over the other.

In 1939, Jean Renoir (1894–1979) was a French film director, producer, and author.¹⁶⁷ In 1939, he released a French comedy-drama satirical film titled *The Rules of the Game*. The film depicts “members of upper-class French society and their servants just before the beginning of World War II, showing their moral callousness on the eve of impending destruction.”¹⁶⁸ This film, regarded by many film critics and directors as one of the greatest of all time, has prompted analysis from critics and directors since its release in 1939.¹⁶⁹ Renoir's biographer Leo Braudy (1941–), an American philosopher, observed that the film “embodies a social world in which there are rules but no values.” “If you don't know the rules, you are crushed; but if you do know the rules, you are cut off from your own nature.”¹⁷⁰

Because most people are ready to tolerate the behaviors of their family members, friends, mates, etc., we cannot say that the rules or directives defining when an individual becomes unable to honor his obligations are related to human nature. This means that humans live in a social world that embodies both rules and values. Hence, if the values are man-made, then there is a good chance that what could be preventing people from honoring their obligation post-1945 is that there are new rules that could have emerged, which could be cutting off our species from its nature.

This situation is very serious and worrisome. If humans are cooperating to achieve a goal that is above and beyond teaching

167 https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Jean_Renoir

168 https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/The_Rules_of_the_Game

169 https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/The_Rules_of_the_Game#Legacy

170 https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Leo_Braudy

newborns post-1945 to have the courage to accept the second best if what one considers the first best is unattainable or to be tolerant so the complete understanding that they would gain of themselves would help them to possess wisdom, but instead are working to cut off our psyche from its own nature, then there is a big chance that the international order could completely break down.

The human rights milestone that our predecessors secured during WWII entailed obtaining the concurrence of the rich and the poor to cooperate in the economic field in the aftermath of this global war based on the principles of equal rights and not to slash from the human heart or the psyche programmed aptitudes such as envy, jealousy, distrust, etc.

All the social contracts and political orders that people created and defended were simply means toward an end. They were intended to benefit the individuals involved. Their legitimacy was valid to the extent of the member's readiness to fulfill their part of the agreement.

Recently, many people in industrialized and non-industrialized nations are more and more questioning the performance of their political authority. In fact, the disenchantment that emerged against royal families or people with wealth, title, prestige, etc. benefiting from status continues to grow significantly recently. Most people seem to be more interested in the lifestyle of the rich, royals, and officials than in their official duties.

Distrust and mistrust are two forms of perceptions that have the potential to destroy relationships. Experts claim that "distrust is a complete lack of trust, and it's often based on experience." Mistrust is a general lack of trust or confidence, sometimes based on instinct.¹⁷¹ When a pattern of unreliable behavior becomes the trend, distrust and mistrust give rise to doubt, suspicion, anxiety, fear, and self-protection.¹⁷² Experts claim that severing trust can lead to withdrawal, task-oriented movement, unbalanced "giver" relationships, and the formation of bad habits.

171 <https://www.dictionary.com/e/mistrust-vs-distrust/>

172 <https://leadingwithtrust.com/2014/05/18/5-stages-of-distrust-and-how-it-destroys-your-relationships/>

No one knows if the lack of trust that emerged in the rich, royals, officials, etc. post-1945 stems from accumulated experience of unreliability or if it arises from a more vague, feeling-based perception, as experts claim. In either case, we can say that the confident perception an individual develops regarding another person's distrustful and mistrustful behavior—classifying it as sinister and harmful—likely stems from certain knowledge. This knowledge is what prompts a person to take steps to reduce one's own vulnerability. Experts claim that when a person's lack of trust in another person diminishes, “distrust forms a powerful frame on subsequent events in the relationship, such that even good-faith efforts by the offender to restore the relationship are met with skepticism and suspicion. The result is a "self-fulfilling prophecy," where every move the other person makes is interpreted as additional evidence that justifies an initial decision to distrust him/her.”¹⁷³

Could this distrust that emerged post-1945 in the rich, royals, officials, governments, etc. be the result of a retaliation that people's added knowledge has fueled, and is its impact inhibiting our cooperation?

The UN and the political leaders who succeeded the founding fathers of the UN are working on fostering human rights to create an egalitarian world and not to teach people to be tolerant and content until the rich, royals, officials, and governments progress to achieve the ends set forth in the preamble of the UN Charter.

"Self-fulfilling prophecy" refers to the “socio-psychological phenomenon of someone predicting or expecting something, and this prediction or expectation comes true simply because one believes it will, and their resulting behaviors align to fulfill those beliefs.”¹⁷⁴

According to the concept of "self-fulfilling prophecy," people's beliefs influence their actions. It is natural that people would be taking steps to protect their interests. This is because self-fulfilling prophecy is applicable to negative and positive outcomes. On the other hand, until 1945, governments were theoretically excluded from the original

173 <https://www.beyondintractability.org/essay/distrust>

174 https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Self-fulfilling_prophecy

social contract in which citizens surrendered some freedom for protection of their remaining rights to enable checks and balances. All humans are programmed with thoughts or feelings of insecurity, fear, jealousy, distrust, etc.

Could this large number of factionalism and civil unrest that emerged post-1945 be due to allowing the UN and the governments to be parties in this social contract that those two entities were supposed to be protecting?

What if the decision of the UN and the political leaders to expand the cooperation that all people came together in 1945 to only attain, which was to teach people to cooperate on equal rights principles, includes cutting off our own natural elements such as jealousy, envy, etc.? This would allow us to create an egalitarian world. What is fueling this skepticism or suspicion that emerged?

Can the UN member states cut elements of jealousy, envy, etc. from the behavior of the UN officials so we could expect that those members would remain a faithful partner to their masters? It looks as if the decision of the UN member states to expand the pursuit of human cooperation post-1945 to include tackling issues related to the elements of human nature that persist in a person's personality, despite even the best intentions to purge them, could be fueling this escalation of conflicts that emerged.

The situation is very serious and worrisome. This is because if people's confidence in the rich, royals, officials, governments, etc. is not restored, people's thoughts or feelings of insecurity, fear, and concern will continue to grow. People would continue to be creating consequences based on what the UN and the different aid agencies are teaching them about the rich, royals, or governments preventing them from realizing the full development of their personalities, which may lead to a cycle of mistrust and resentment that hinders social progress and personal growth. As I said before, there is no concession that the rich could make after they agreed to cooperate on the principle of equal rights post 1945. This means that from 1945 to now, humans' disenchantment with one another could not be principally due to the rich withholding from the poor the resources that they claim their lack

of access to is what is preventing them from acting on their pleasure principle. The conflicts that emerged seem to be oriented to strip from the rich their wealth, title, prestige, etc. It was perpetrated by a culture that the UN and the UN member states spearheaded when they distrusted the work program that the United States, Great Britain, and other nations, who, during WW2, worked with them to create lasting peace.

This culture, which the UN and the development aid agencies bred after they deviated away from the work program that the founding fathers of the International proposed in order to allow the poor to criticize the rich, governments, and officials to create an egalitarian world, has been deepening dysfunctional distrust rather than functional. It has been breeding a culture of violence because humans cannot change their nature. Most importantly, it has been creating consequences based on one's own biased perspective. This is very serious and worrisome. As I said before, all the social contracts and political orders that people create and defend are simply a mean towards an end. They are intended to benefit the individuals involved. If people create consequences based on their beliefs, it means they are bullying each other to force insurgents to agree with their subjective views, rather than cooperating to advance the international order established after 1945.

Governments can approve austerity measures and even depend on E-government to cut costs and address the perception of distrust that emerged about public officials failing to strengthen democracy. Likewise, we can expel everyone from Buckingham Palace and allow only the Queen of England to live in this mansion so none of her family members can be gaining privileges. The question that would be important to know its answers would always be one: Is it possible to satiate the desires of people when all the events or reality is continually changing? Should the UN member states pause the UN and the rest of the international development agencies from interfering in the political order of nations to spare mankind from a total social breakdown?

If, despite mankind already agreeing to cooperate with one on the principles of equal rights, humans are not able to master how to

harmonize actions based on such a tenet, the same patterns of conscious thought, sensation, or feeling that emerge when a natural disaster, mass epidemic, or war strike occurs, this means that people's search to arrive at political and ethical truths would remain indeterminately impossible for as long as the UN and development aid agencies are teaching people to abandon their contentedness to create an egalitarian world.

No one can predict if governments could take action on all the issues that their citizens are declaring important when awareness or knowledge makes people start to listen more and more to their own biases. Governments could defeat and contain those who challenge or criticize their authority under the pretext that it is being done to govern responsibly, but the million-dollar question remains one. Can governments manage to synchronize political, security, economic, and informational components that reinforce governmental legitimacy and effectiveness when the UN and development aid agencies are influencing their dependent people on why they should withdraw their obligation to obey (i.e., to create an egalitarian world)?

Punters could be betting on artificial intelligence to help with controlling the new challenges that are yet to come to maintain world peace. Artificial intelligence can inform governments to really contemplate what can be done, but the success of this path will always depend on answering one question. Can mankind develop big data that can forecast how to quantify a human bias to remove its threat? Perhaps governments are betting on the evolution of transhumanism (i.e., linking humans with technology) to bypass natural human programming and, as a result, enhance the human psyche, including both conscious and unconscious thoughts and forces. Since antiquity, humans have been trying to distinguish between good and evil in order to be like God, capable of changing reality. Scientists are already able to implant chips into skulls to enable people to perceive sounds or colors. Most likely, the ultimate goal of the transhumanists is to control the mind. If scientists were to control the mind, humanity would function in the image and likeness of those who are doing the controlling. This scenario signifies that it would not be possible to make newborns interrelate with one another in the same way that the prophets who God communicates with us through them claim “people

do it in heaven.” If scientists were to decide to take control of the minds of newborns, the main character in Mary Shelley’s¹⁷⁵ 1818 novel *Frankenstein*; or the *Modern Prometheus*¹⁷⁶ could serve as a useful example of what mankind might expect when transhumanists begin to interfere with human nature.

Man’s propensity to kill, deceive, abuse, and commit wicked acts on a mass basis has not changed or decreased, despite such actions being sanctioned by society throughout history. This scenario signifies that the more humans pick policies that interact and integrate people to pursue aspirations such as fostering human rights to create an egalitarian world, the more entropy or disorder the advances in transportation and communication technology would be creating. The choices moving forward are therefore clear.

First, the UN member states could let the American culture, which represents the pinnacle of mankind’s effort to “preserve freedom,” continue to evolve as per what Confucius, Socrates, Ali ibn Abi Taleb (601 – 661), Ibn Khaldun (1332 – 1406), Freud, Jung, and many other philosophers believed could make mankind begin to show permanent patterns of conscious thoughts, sensations, or feelings to ultimately create world peace. Alternatively, continue to blame the drawbacks that are preventing mankind from domesticating newborns to make conscious their unconscious thoughts to ultimately correct the distortions that skew one’s analyses of benefits and costs on the liberalization of trade barriers, religion, and the environment as per what most philosophers, researchers, and even the UN have been trumpeting for the UN member states in recent years, which include issues such as economic inequality, cultural misunderstandings, and environmental degradation.

Roy T. Bennett, an American writer, stated, "Every choice comes with a consequence."¹⁷⁷ No one knows how world history would have looked if the philosophers and thinkers who lived before 1945 had been able to build upon the foundation that our predecessors handed to us at the end of this global war. The goal was to let the American

175 https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mary_Shelley

176 <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Frankenstein>

177 https://www.goodreads.com/author/quotes/15042371.Roy_T_Bennett

culture be no longer a privilege just for the people who were born in the Americas but for mankind in its entirety.

All those people (or nations) who have been unwilling to surrender freedom to the United States—this country that managed to make its people the happiest in modern history—teach us how to master harmonizing actions based on the principles of equal rights, but they are underestimating what they are wagering on. If all those people (or nations) who continue to be bound by their personal power and conscience stop to reflect on what the United States managed to aid mankind to achieve during WW2, perhaps new permanent patterns of conscious thought, sensation, or feeling to ultimately create world peace could start to emerge. The United States dismantled the empires that many Western European nations had established and committed wealthy individuals worldwide to collaborate in the economic field based on the principles of equal rights and self-determination. Most importantly, it was the United States that helped to restore self-government in all the nations that were deprived of this freedom.

In effect, all the "cumulative deposits of knowledge, experience, beliefs, values, attitudes, meanings, hierarchies, religion, notions of time, roles, spatial relations, concepts of the universe, and material objects and possessions"¹⁷⁸ that existed before 1945 were focused on how to achieve a milestone in which the wealthy would begin to recognize the worth of the human person. For this reason, all philosophical thought that informed theories and assumptions before 1945 was not based on the idea of humans becoming "equal in dignity and rights" as proclaimed in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights; instead, it was rooted in a social contract that suggested people surrender some of their freedoms and submit to the authority of a ruler in exchange for the protection of their remaining rights. In 1941, the United States entered WWII only if the war's aims were to dismantle all practices of segregation and discrimination associated therewith. If the United States had wanted to allow colonialism to continue, it would not have proposed that the post-WWII aims include dismantling the domination established by many Western European nations worldwide and rebuilding the social order from the ground up. The

178 <http://people.tamu.edu/~i-choudhury/culture.html>

collective efforts of individuals and groups over generations helped the American people develop a necessary understanding of themselves, enabling them to work towards a world free from fear and want alongside others from different parts of the globe.

Indeed, no one knows why, since 1945, a large number of newborns have been unable to control their propensity to kill, deceive, abuse, or commit wicked acts on a mass basis, despite such actions being sanctioned by society. However, it seems as if the ill success, despite obvious sincerity, of the rich and the poor in the past 73 years to cooperate to ensure lasting peace resides purely from a spill of the pre-1945 programming to post, coupled with the UN member states' decision to foster human rights to create an egalitarian world instead of implementing the work program of the United States.

The phrase "all men are created equal" was first written in 1776 during the American Revolutionary War. However, it took until 1960, during the Civil Rights movements, when full political, social, and economic rights for African Americans started to be secured in the United States. Perhaps, in 200 years from now, when the influence of the people who could be spilling pre-1945 programming fades, most newborns would begin to stop resorting to killing, deceiving, abusing, or committing wicked acts to defend their best interests much more than to be ready to put up with one another to harmonize actions based on the principles that are stipulated in the UN Charter or the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

On the other hand, if in the next 200 years the people who would be succeeding us continue to be devoted to pursuing authority, wealth, power, prestige, and fame like us now instead of focusing on possessing a complete understanding of themselves to be able to deal with their biological drives and social expectations conflicts in the same way the American people did from 1776 to 1960, the outcome is very serious and worrisome. This situation is because we have no historical experience that we could refer to in order to look for lessons learned to draw conclusions and fix corrective action. This is the first time in the history of the world that all the members of the human family collaborate to erect a social order in which every human member is entitled to realize the full development of his personality or

increase his wealth, power, prestige, and fame. How peace and security will evolve when three tenets (i.e., religion, government, and the UN) and not only two (i.e., religion and government) are pitting people against each other, similar to what occurs in a tug-of-war game, is unknown. Religion teaches that all violent compulsion is a result of human wickedness; therefore, individuals are expected to practice tolerance and postpone their desires for the afterlife. The United Nations is educating people on why every individual should stop coping based on religious teachings and instead harmonize their actions to be devoted to fighting poverty, injustice, and inequality in order to create an egalitarian world. And governments are teaching people to emphasize the importance of human reason (ethical principles) over the human body (moral principles).

Blame is the act of censuring, holding responsible, and making negative statements about an individual or group for their action or actions being socially or morally irresponsible.¹⁷⁹ People could continue to play the blame game for their failure to surrender freedom post-1945 and/or in their relationships with one another. People could also continue to count on this tug of war that the UN, governments, and religious congregations are each prompting to gain an advantage in the hope that the lure or the pitting that would take place would help one entity to manage to make the most number of newborns tilt toward its teachings or beliefs so it could conquer. This spike in intolerance that emerged post-1945 seems to be motivated to lure people to become systemized to satisfy crux perceptions that the division of labor makes it impossible to attain even if humans agree to come together as a species to conquer the earth jointly. The drives and forces that the mind invented to thrust each other to abandon tribalism and to be enlisted to militarize to achieve this development mission of seeing everyone become capable of realizing the full development of their personality could be the principal cause for the insecurity that emerged post-1945.

It looks as if the decision of the political leaders who succeeded the founding fathers of the UN and the UN to interest themselves in having people stop doing what other living species are doing, serving the natural world, and thrusting them to develop awareness to erect the

¹⁷⁹ <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Blame>

imaginary kingdom that the religious scriptures claim exists in the afterlife here on earth has created two scenarios on the way forward to control peace and security. The first scenario is to continue relying on persuasion and technology to neutralize the human body in order to create the necessary conditions for peace, while the second scenario is to revert to the work program proposed by the United States in 1939, which called for mankind to harmonize its actions based on principles that strengthen freedom and ensure lasting peace.

Persuasion is defined as being a process that is aimed at changing a person's belief or behavior toward a different belief / behavior or set of beliefs / behaviors.¹⁸⁰ Archaeologists and anthropologists say that classical Greece debated rhetoric: the Sophists vs. Socrates, Plato, and Aristotle. According to Socrates, Plato, and Aristotle, rhetoric is concerned with probability because persuasion manipulates others by appealing to emotion and omitting facts, whereas logic and dialectic establish facts based on knowledge, as decisions rely on scientific certainty.

Many philosophers and scientists acknowledged that rhetoric is concerned with probability, but it was not yet established. Coincidentally, many of the philosophical religious predictions related to the consequences that could encumber humanity if people are not mindful of the dignity and worth of the human person have so far materialized.

It looks as if the impediment that is challenging or preventing people from managing to harmonize actions based on the principles that are stipulated in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights post-1945 is embedded in the new work program that the UN and the UN member states approved and are pursuing. Since? It is unknown whether some of the more serious predictions reported in religious scriptures will occur if the UN and its member states continue to deviate from the work program proposed by US political leaders during WWII.

This work aims not to investigate whether the predictions in religious scriptures will materialize but to understand the likelihood of Welch's

180 <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Persuasion>

speculation about international families creating a one-world order being true and those individuals succeeding.

Everything we do today is aimed at reaping benefits in the future. Presuming that Welch's speculation is true, the specific question that I want to investigate in the remainder of this work will be related to comprehending the following. How did the international families conjecture that when they deviated from the work program the United States proposed in the Atlantic Charter, they could switch it with one that would allow the UN to preach to the poor why they should stop coping so that their successors would be able to preserve their power? Certain families and dynasties managed to maintain an evolutionary course, which allows their authority to progress based on kinship and lineage principles. Those families / dynasties aligned their work program with the principles that the people who dedicate their lives to the service of God and their neighbor depend on to domesticate people and gain advantage. I want to understand how these families or dynasties plan to maintain their authority and continue progressing based on kinship and lineage principles, especially now that the UN is educating people on the importance of seeking social justice instead of accepting complacency to improve their life chances.

Earlier I said the American Revolutionary War of 1776 penned a milestone in human history that was not only limited to collapsing the brutish social programming that was common until this date, but at the same time, this event brought along a concept unheard of of its kind before in the history of the world. This was the birth of the individualism idea. Thenceforward, we are now witnessing the same revolution that our predecessors fought in 1776 to stop the ruling class from continuing to set themselves above the restrictions of the laws being played out in the entire world, with only one difference. Post-1945, people disenchanted with how their governments address problems caused by industrialization, urbanization, immigration, and corruption express their dissatisfaction beyond their own country. The UN has shifted from an organization meant to coordinate member states' work to one that teaches why everyone should fight injustice to establish the same standards, changing from a frustration that people exhibited to change the rule of conduct that a specific government follows to one that involves changing the international political order

so it could be addressing each individual's rights to have to say something on how it should be organized. The individualism concept that the 1776 revolution gave birth to has now branched out in the same way a tree diagram shows the hierarchical nature of a structure in a graphical form. Currently, more than 7 billion people are protesting and revolting against the ruling class and each other, leading to a situation where individuals forfeit their personal freedom in order to replace legal disabilities with equal laws for all.

There is a well-known proverb that claims that “a man reaps what he sows.” In 1945, the United States engineered a solution aimed at liberating the quest for international security from the evils of war. However, the leaders who succeeded the founding fathers of the UN decided to deviate away from this engineered solution to let the powerful special interests who control so much in the economic and political life of any nation have their way. The decision of the leaders who succeeded the founding fathers of the UN to let the UN support the operations of the companies that are organized to earn profit so the people whom the UN is teaching why they need to abandon their traditions and values to be modernized to increase their access to material things so assembly lines do not slow down has created a major challenge to put back under control the enormous desires that they have awakened.

One of the principal parables in the Bible tells a story about God having asked Adam not to eat from a particular apple tree, but Adam disobeyed God and ate. This story then illustrates that when Adam and Eve ate from the fruit of this tree, their “eyes opened up, and they became like God, knowing good and evil.”¹⁸¹ The Bible then claims that God became furious and cursed both. In this same story, Adam and Eve’s excuse to God for having disobeyed his instruction was that they listened to a serpent. Most historians are ready to support that the American people, despite all their internal challenges, were among the happiest by 1939. The founding fathers of the UN advised that to achieve lasting peace, we should abandon actions based on distinctions or status and instead focus on integrating newcomers, similar to how immigrants who came to live in the US from 1776 to 1939 demonstrated their capabilities. Those founding fathers counseled us to

181 <https://www.biblegateway.com/passage/?search=Genesis+3&version=NIV>

let existing nations determine their political status and freely determine their economic, social, and cultural development post-WW2. They did not counsel us to cooperate to establish an egalitarian world and to let the UN foster human rights or to provide economic and social solutions so people start believing that they deserve everything that they get for equal rights. Are the forces who are undermining the American culture and the framework that the United States proposed in 1941 acting in the same way as the serpent that is reported in the story of the Fall of Man behaved? Is the United Nations analogous to the serpent in the story of the Fall of Man, which paralyzes humanity's efforts to achieve lasting peace?

So many questions this begs. As I said before, the parameter that determines how the social order changes is not the laws that humans produce but people's faithfulness. Powerful special interests that control much of a nation's economic and political life could either continue to channel their resources through the UN, leading to the creation of degenerated human conditions as suggested by its teachings, or revert to allowing governments to build communities of tolerance and respect, as initially proposed by the United States. The process must involve recognizing how nations produce goods and services to eventually bring their people to the same standards of integration that Europeans achieved after WWII.

It looks as if mankind's painful struggle to deepen connectedness could be due to the political leaders who succeeded the founding fathers of the UN having listened to a "serpent," similar to Adam and Eve disobeying God's counsel. Most importantly, it appears that the insecurity we began to experience after 1945 relates to how we should continue organizing human evolution rather than focusing solely on preventing the breakdown of the United States' sovereignty (i.e., the concept of freedom). In other words, how can we be certain that the insecurity we began to experience after 1945 will not lead our successors to confront the same fate that the Bible describes for the descendants of Adam and his wife after they listened to the "serpent" and chose to disobey God?

In conclusion, if we use this story as a teaching tool to draw out effective ways that could have spared Adam and Eve from the

punishment that they faced after they disobeyed God, we learn that if Adam and Eve were not granted free will to make choices and to act on their accord or listened to this serpent, they would not have faced the punishment that they dealt with afterwards. They disobeyed God, either to seek pleasure or pain. If they had known that the punishment their successors faced would be so harsh, they would have obeyed God.

If Adam and Eve had been faithful and wise servants to God, who put them in charge of the garden, their successors would not have faced punishment. Let us examine in the coming chapters how the UN teaching people to be faithful and wise servants is aiding their masters or if it is aligning them and their successors and servants to face the same fate that the Bible claims happened to the successors of Adam and Eve. This analysis would help us to determine if Welch's preoccupation was erroneous or not and if the UN member states should revamp the social order to let the UN go back to doing what the founding fathers of the UN counselled and the US to help us to implement the vision that the founding fathers of the UN sketched, since this country is the only one that has know-how.