

“Orwell invented human rights”.¹

The notion of human rights took over 100 years to remove from the human lexicon. The 21st century is almost over, and we look back at how a safer and simpler, stable society was assured.

Of course, you all realise that my great grandfather, Emmanuel Goldstein, predicted all this in his book entitled “1984”, which was stolen from him in 1949 (ironically the same year the Universal Declaration of Human Rights was issued) by an English gentleman, if he can be called that, named Eric Blair. Eric Blair not only stole my grandfather’s work, but did not have the decency to put his own name on the book.

Taking political ideas is not at all a new phenomenon. Over 150 years ago in an essay entitled “The God of the Nations and God” Martin Buber refined and developed an idea that Nachman Krochmal took from Gimambattista Vico. This was the idea that every nation elevates itself as its absolute principle. Its own national existence becomes the god it worships and it knows no higher principle than that. This absolute principle was embedded in the Charter of the United Nations.

Just common sense really. If every nation was its own absolute principle and its national existence was the god that it worshipped, then its national existence necessarily took precedence over any of the people in that nation.

¹ © David D. Knoll 2010

It follows that the only equality people have is that which flows from their loyalty to their nation.

If they are not loyal to the nation, then they are not observing the highest principle of the nation.

And, to offend against the highest principle, of course invites, and indeed necessitates, elimination. No nation can allow disloyalty to be seeded, or, indeed, to grow within itself.

And of course, the fewer nations there are, the lower the risk of divided loyalties arising.

Early in the 21st century a tipping point occurred that enabled these simple truths to be realised.

The world finally understood that it was important to abolish the God-idea and the people who so stubbornly and misguidedly projected it.

The problem, in simple terms, was that the nation of Israel believed that God was something higher than the nation of Israel itself. If there was something higher than any nation, then there was a challenge to the absolute sovereignty of the nation. Neither the seed nor the growth of such an idea could be permitted. It destabilised the entire world and created unnatural aspirations, which the insidious nation of Israel spread to others. Whilst other pre-modern religions, particularly Christianity and Islam, purported to follow the idea of the one god that was supreme above all others, each in their own way, subsumed its god in the service of the nation.

For Christianity, at least until Protestantism – and its progeny known as democracy - the Church was the Christian nation. It alone decided what God was, what God wanted, and what God required. The idea of God was nothing more than a euphemism for the Christian nation.

Similarly, Islam, though it sometimes denied it, worshipped the Prophet Mohammed and his teachings. The Nation of Islam, as it was called in various languages and in various places, also used the idea of god as a euphemism for the service of the Nation of Islam.

Israel, uniquely, survived the attempt to abort its rebirth by the invasion of five armies, and subsequent military and paramilitary efforts to destroy it.

But in surviving, it defied the absolute principle. In order to overcome that defiance in a world which still mistakenly thought that human rights could exist alongside the absolute principle, a political fiction had to be developed. It was based on my grandfather's concept of doublethink. Doublethink, as you will recall, means the power of holding two contradictory beliefs in one's mind simultaneously, and accepting both of them. By way of example, the idea that the nation was the absolute principle, while a nation had to be destroyed was well accepted. So was the idea, about which I shall expand further, that advocacy for human rights means attacking the nation most committed to upholding human rights. This two-step doublethink had a name. It was called the Boycott, Divestment and Sanctions movement.

It used the euphemism of Palestinian human rights to try and end the nation of Israel.

The proposition was a euphemism because as we all understand today the objective was to expand the nation of Islam and to subsume the territory of Israel within it.

The problem was that Israel worshiped something more than the nation. It worshiped a God with no pronounceable name. This God was not a mere euphemism for the nation because it was worshipped by the Israelite people not only in Israel, but all over the world. For them the nation of Israel was the euphemism for God's will, rather than God being a euphemism for the nation of Israel. This unfortunate inversion of the proper power relationship was most troubling.

It wasn't just the belief in this God of Israel that was problematic. The effect of that belief was even more dangerous. You see, before Israel was eliminated, the people of Israel, who used to call themselves, Jews, actually believed that their God had saved them from destruction many times over many centuries. For example, every year they sat at their tables at a festival called "Passover" at which they celebrated the intervention of their God to remove a million slaves from the rule of the Egyptian Pharaoh. Then, seven weeks later, they celebrated the introduction of the rule of law at another festival called "Shavuot".

Indeed, earlier, the Egyptian pharaoh had tried to destroy these troublesome Israelites with their belief in God by killing all their first-born sons.

The Egyptians were very sloppy, and indeed one of the first-born sons of an Israelite woman infiltrated the pharaoh's palace, and unbeknownst to the rather primitive pharaoh, was raised as his own son. It was that very Israelite

who roused all the people to believe in this amazing god and by a revolution which undermined the nation of Egypt.

More recently, efforts to destroy the Israelites, without first destroying their God, were only partially successful. One third of them were murdered in something that used to be called “the Holocaust”.

Regrettably, too many nations did not understand the importance of this cleansing, and intervened to stop it. The job remained unfinished, and the intervening and intermeddling nations created an opportunity for this nation of Israel to rise again. They stupidly thought that once Israel became a nation, it too would subscribe to the idea of the nation as god and be just like all the other nations.

A foolish mistake.

Of course, if there was a god, and the nation was not supreme, then the nation could not demand absolute loyalty from the people within it. This Israelite idea spread to many nations. In each of those nations, the people were allowed to make claims against the nation or its government. They called these claims: “human rights”. They relied on the rule of law, which as I have already mentioned, was yet another noxious weed exported by the nation of Israel.

The infection called “human rights” spread all too quickly. Shortly after, indeed, less than two years after, the United Nations approved the rebirth of the Nation of Israel, they adopted a document that was quite inconsistent

with the United Nations Charter, called the “Universal Declaration of Human Rights”.

The crazy idea sprung up that ordinary human beings could insist upon rights as some absolute principle that was more important than loyalty to their nation. This made it very difficult for many nations to control their people. But the idea of “human rights” had to be turned to good use before it could be eliminated.

Distracting people with the absolutely impossible idea of a universal declaration of human rights, nations gradually built the necessary power that they needed to enforce their absolute sovereignty.

The nations that understood the impossibility of human rights used the United Nations to shame and ostracise nations that allowed human rights. They did this by accusing them of violating the human rights of their own people.

This scheme took a long time to bed down because in approximately one-third of the world, a decision had been taken to create something called a parliament, or a congress, and people were allowed to elect representatives who made decisions about various inconsequential matters, but certainly nothing to do with security or the continuity of the nation.

Quite sensibly, defence departments remained responsible for the security of the nation, and from time to time, when people who insisted upon human rights, undertook activities that were inconsistent with the security of the nation, they were quietly eliminated.

This approach worked mostly in countries where Christianity was predominant. People could protest. They could walk up and down the street and yell and scream, they could telephone talkback radio, but in the end the real decision makers did not have to listen to them, and often did not. Of course, from time to time, they did, just to keep the population quiet, or to win an election. Real power, however, always rested with the nation.

In another third of the world, that which was dominated by the religion of Islam, the Islamic idea was used to the same purpose. The governments realised that if they said that something was required by the Prophet Mohammed, the people obeyed. They questioned not at all. If need be, they killed each other. Women were subservient to men. Homosexuals lived in daily fear of their lives. People accused of crimes were publically punished, often by physical mutilation or death, and the weapon of fear was used to keep daily behaviour consistent with the ultimate sovereignty of the Islamic nation. Of course, during the 20th century, and into the early part of the 21st century, the nation of Islam had lots of sub-nations. They had various names. Different races of people lived within them, but they were all part of the nation, and when push came to shove they understood, and were loyal. The idea of Mohammed was essential to making sure that the nation was the absolute principle.

The third part of the world was very primitive. It had lots of natural resources, but the people were very, very stupid. And they were initially loyal to what they called the "tribe". This third group of people existed largely in the continent of Africa, and some of them existed in the continent of South America.

One of the most important parts of creating the United Nations Charter was that nations were created in these continents, whereupon the majority tribes quickly subjugated the minority tribes, often killing as many as were necessary to ensure that there was loyalty to the absolute sovereignty of the nation. They did not need to use the subterfuge of loyalty to Mohammed or the more difficult subterfuge of parliamentary democracy to ensure loyalty, to preserve security, and to make sure the nation was the absolute principle. In these primitive places fear was easily induced, and loyalty easily obtained.

Gradually, throughout the 21st century, the stronger nations began to subsume the weak. No other nation intervened. No nation acted to protect the silly idea of “human rights”. Every nation understood that what was important was the nation, not the people in it, because the people needed to be kept subservient.

Gradually there were fewer and fewer nations as the more powerful nations enforced their dominance upon the weaker ones. It took some time for the people in the weaker nations to understand the importance of the absolute principle of loyalty to their new sovereign nation, but in time, through fear, and through the essential work of defence departments, security organisations, and occasionally using the rouse of loyalty to parliamentary democracy or the Church of Rome or to Mohammed, the number of nations became fewer and fewer.

In the end there were only three.

There is Americana, which straddles the Atlantic Ocean and included a few small nations in the southern hemisphere, where the absolute principle is

enforced using doublethink to ensure that any disloyalty to the nation was seen as a challenge to a safe, simple and secure country, which of course, was what everybody wanted.

The second nation, of course, is Iran, which gradually subsumed all the other nations that believed in Mohammed, threatening them with nuclear annihilation or chemical weapons as necessary to ensure that they too became loyal to the nation of Iran as the absolute principle.

Iran, of course, stretches from just a few hundred miles from the Atlantic coast, which is the edge of Americana, all the way to South East Asia.

The third nation is, of course, Sinn-Africa, which is governed principally by the government in Beijing. Beijing was fortunate. It does not need to use the rouse of Mohammed or the rouse of parliamentary democracy, and through military emissaries it also it also governs most of East Asia and all of Africa south of Sudan.

Having only three nations has made the absolute principle easier to keep in place.

The people understand loyalty to the nation as absolute principle. Each nation has abolished the need for laws because it became widely accepted that they simply interfered with loyalty to the nation as the absolute principle.

And by insisting upon endless activities to demonstrate patriotic fervour, none of the people have terribly much time to be distracted by unnecessary challenges to the absolute principle.

The Israel irritant however lasted much longer than it should have. In various guises, and using various euphemisms ranging from communism, socialism, social democracy, people's alliances, civic dialogue and other strange concepts, the insidious Israelites tried everywhere in the world to insist that there was something bigger and more important than the nation as sovereign. You will recall that whenever people believed that there is something more significant than the nation as sovereign, it becomes possible for inappropriate and wrongful behaviours to proliferate. This rule of law idea, for which, as I have already mentioned, the Israelites created the festival of "Shavuot", was a counterproductive attempt to undermine the absolute principle.

Given the difficulty of eliminating the Israelites, which was tried of course just over 100 years ago, it became more important to eliminate their idea. And it was quite apparent that their idea centred upon this rebirth of the Nation of Israel. Thus, when, with the delighted, discerning and no doubt intelligently obtained approval of Americana and Sinn-Africa, Iran obliterated the Nation of Israel using the nuclear weapons that were long known to have been developed for that very purpose, fear was instilled into the Israelite people everywhere in the world. Those that did not immediately pledge and demonstrate their loyalty to one of the three nations were quickly and effectively eliminated.

Just as it took so little to engage Europeans in willing complicity in the destruction, or rather attempted destruction, of the Israelites during the middle of the 20th century, it was relatively easy to engage the whole world in the more subtle Boycott, Disinvestment and Sanctions movement in the latter part of the 20th century and the early part of this century to single out the

nation of Israel, the nation from which respect for human rights as opposed to national sovereignty had emanated, as the nation most dangerous towards human rights. By convincing most of the world to believe that Israel was against human rights, it became very easy for them to believe that in the interest of human rights, Israel had to be destroyed. And, essential to permanently destroying Israel was the effort to destroy the very God-idea that gave rise to human rights. This again is where the very necessary principle of doublethink operated so successfully. You have all read about it in my other great work entitled “The Theory and Practice of Oligarchiacal Collectivism”.

Oh, there might be a few Israelites left around, but they won't last long. You see it was also very easy, because even as Iran was announcing and developing the necessary nuclear weapons, the Israelites naively did not realise that in the newly developed world where nations were indeed the absolute principle, once Israel as a nation had ceased to exist, eliminating the god-idea would not take very long.

At about the same time as larger nations were beginning to swallow up and subjugate smaller ones, without any coordination at all, the destruction of libraries, universities and other places of ideas began and quickly gathered pace. In Americana, a simple yet unstoppable virus was developed and injected into computers. It enabled all internet infrastructures to be located and destroyed.

One additional element was necessary in order to secure the absolute loyalty of people to the nation as the absolute principle. We had to eliminate seeking after wealth. This terrible idea initiated by Adam Smith centuries ago that

people could act in their own self interest, and that thereby everybody's self interest would be advanced, led to things like the industrial revolution two centuries ago and the information age of last century.

If people become wealthy they work shorter hours, have enough to eat, and have time to think. When they have time to think, they might germinate ideas similar to the now eliminated god-idea and they challenge the absolute sovereignty of the nation. Thus it was necessary to create the doublethink version of Newton's laws. Every act of wealth creation must be met with an equal and opposite act of wealth destruction. This simple theorem is effected and repeated by working people in all three nations. Thus, some of the people are engaged in creative activity, and as many people as are necessary are then engaged in the activity of destroying what is created. Everyone is busy, paid just a living wage and there is no economic growth. There is always just enough to eat and more than enough to do.

Of course, when people are busy, they feel useful, and when they feel useful they feel contented. Contented people are accepting people, and their loyalty to the absolute principle is assured.