

# The Record

## Essay

# Universalism

**Victor Saltero**

***Free***editorial 

## ***Additional Contents***

To the reader:

When you purchase a movie in any format, it usually includes a “making-of”. Well, at the editor’s suggestion, we decided to do a “making-of” of ***The Record***. But rather than focusing on ***how*** it was made we’re going to talk about ***why*** it was made. What was the logic behind it? Are its proposals utopian or a necessity?

Actually, hidden among the intrigue and suspense, there are various ideas that are, in short, what motivated me to write this novel. Let’s talk about it, shall we?

Let me begin with a fastidious request. When I originally wrote this book, I titled it ***The Record***, so for sentimental reasons, please don’t mind when I refer to it as such.

As you may have noticed, despite the story’s futuristic setting, it steers away from the inhumane and robotic societies often created by science-fiction authors. I do not believe in that robotic man in a cold and technological society; which is why I do not reflect this in my writings. For a long time I have had a passion for studying and understanding mankind’s journey on Earth over thousands of years and it has taught me that, in essence, man has not changed since the beginning of time. We make the same mistakes over and over again, and hardly learn anything from them. We tend to think that our current technical skills make us better than previous generations, and that is a deeply flawed assessment.

Indeed, history shows us that the men who walked the streets of Athens 2,500 years ago were not much different than those of today. They worried about their welfare, economics, children, politics and sports, which they were so fond of, that even wars stopped during the Olympics. They liked to have drinks with friends to chat about their city’s latest political gossip, the next much talked about divorce or the latest sports scores. They wanted to love and be loved. They wondered who they were and where they were going. Does that seem very different from people today?

Consequently, there are no grounds to believe that citizens of the future will be different from citizens of today. Contemporary technology will provide the ability to develop easier and more massive ways of killing each other over the ages, but man, in essence, is and will remain the same.

I thought it would be interesting to develop these ideas, which embedded in the plot, would support the novel. On this occasion, however, we will leave the future. We will travel to the past and present for the purpose of displaying the world of universalism and the reasons for the need to convert planet Earth into a single country for all of its inhabitants.

And so, let us take another peek through the window of time that allowed us to observe our civilization fifteen centuries into the future, and together we will undertake a journey into the past and present.

# I

## The Crossroads

At a glance, the first pages of ***The Record***, take us to a society achieved via a Universalist revolution that has made planet Earth home to all of its inhabitants, and through this achievement, a society that is much better than the one we live in today.

The story takes place in the future, around the year 3500. It was evident – actually, not so evident, as we shall later see – that in the 21st century, mankind had reached a dead end, finding that Universalism would be the only solution for survival.

After envisioning the grave consequences that the latest applications of science and technology to the art of war would have on humanity, Albert Einstein wrote a letter to President Roosevelt in 1939, in which he defended the establishment of a world government as the only possible guarantor of global peace.

When Truman gave the order to drop the first atomic bomb on Japan in 1945, it was the beginning of a new and disturbing stage in our history. For the first time, mankind had the technology to wipe itself off the face of the Earth, but was not smart enough to control this enormously destructive power.

Among others, this great technological change, made it necessary to introduce major reforms in the organization of man on the planet, to ensure their survival.

Time and again, the brightest scientific minds of the twentieth century have indicated the need to form a world government as the only way to address the problems and dangers that loom over us. Isaac Asimov insisted on it when he wrote, “All the Troubles of the World”, indicating that the truly dire ones, are of global proportions. Overpopulation, pollution, and nuclear war are unsolvable for any nation or group of nations. In other words, we are in dire need of a world government.

One thing was very clear to Einstein, Asimov and other great prophets of the twentieth century that were advocates of science and technology: our

technology has advanced significantly more than our level of competence, this being the reason why we can no longer control it. If no appropriate action is taken, this dangerous instrument, placed in the hands of the inevitably unconscious and irresponsible, will destroy humanity. This conviction was the base for the First Authority to lead the Universalist Revolution. Aware that the existing, outdated, and comfortably situated economic and political structures, will snatch any possibility of a future for man as an individual and as a whole if we do not fight for change. The solutions will never come from those that are already in power, because they feel satisfied and often think like that great cynic who was once asked, "When do you think the world will end?" He replied without blinking, "When I die." There is no doubt that the necessary solutions should come from new people with different ideas. That is what the ruling classes symbolize in ***The Record***.

The need for this profound change is evident, as weapons of mass destruction have placed humanity at a dangerous crossroads: destroy them or be destroyed by them. It is disturbing to see how man's behavior does not change when the circumstances are identical - even if there are thousands of years of history between them. Governments and the powers that be, whatever their political views, have never refrained from sacrificing human lives in the name of their country. They will always justify by claiming it is for the greater good, adding, of course, the prospect of economic benefits or of a potential loss of power. The dominant classes always find an excuse, whether religious or territorial, for justifying the intervention of nations in conflict behind any flag. As long as there are tribes or countries on Earth, war will exist. This conviction is what motivates the revolution that sets the stage for ***The Record***.

Everyone knows that the United States used atomic bombs against Japan in 1945, but there have been other times in recent history that we have been on the brink of a nuclear confrontation. During the Cold War, the late President Kennedy did not hesitate, even for a moment, to put humanity on the verge of a new world war when he demanded the Soviet Union to dismantle their nuclear warheads that were installed in Cuba, an independent country that had accepted them, just as Turkey had allowed the U.S. to deploy missiles near the Soviet border. Fortunately, the world was spared the imminent disaster when the Soviet Prime Minister Khrushchev decided to withdraw the missiles when he realized war seemed inevitable. Meanwhile, Kennedy lived the last days of the crisis

locked in his nuclear bunker, while we, the ingenuous people who inhabit this beautiful and troubled Earth, moved across its surface without any protection and without the slightest possibility of influencing the grave decisions being made from remote locations.

If this has been done by countries that, theoretically, have control mechanisms in place over their leaders, just imagine what can be expected from countries that offer less guarantees to their citizens and also have full capacity for destruction; countries such as Pakistan, India, China, Israel, Korea and a long list of European countries? Surely new countries will be added to the "nuclear club" in the future, not to mention the possibility of uncontrollable international terrorist groups being added to this category.

Einstein, Asimov and other wise men posed: *there can be no local solutions to universal problems, and it is absolutely impossible for the governments of the more than two hundred nations that make up the current political map, to reach agreement that would be sufficient to resolve such serious and urgent matters.*

But the current risks are much broader. Can anyone with the slightest sense of reality really believe that an accident occurring in a nuclear center of any country will not affect the rest of us? That the existence of borders can prevent disaster from affecting them, the way it already occurred with Chernobyl?

Can anyone really think that the multiple and expensive state structures on our planet can provide reasonable safeguards to prevent the existing hunger in the world from resulting in a destructive confrontation between rich nations and people who have nothing to lose except their misery?

Can anyone guarantee that countries that possess weapons of mass destruction would not use them if circumstances called for it? Does anyone believe that existing borders and governments will provide some sort of protection against the consequences of radioactivity, which would claim the lives of humans on the planet?

Can anyone expect a country to jeopardize its economic growth by giving up its industrial development in order to prevent the polluting gases from destroying the forests that generate the oxygen needed for the

maintenance of life on our planet, without a superior political power forcing them to do so?

To make this more relevant to our current reality, let's reflect on the key issues that sustain our troubled society. In the novel we look at these issues from a balcony in the future. It is a journey from a bird's-eye view about a society where Universalism is a reality enjoyed by all of Earth's inhabitants. A civilization where there are no wars because there are no countries, where the global economy allows for one region to cover for another's deficiencies through the bartering of goods. A civilization where man travels the world freely, where the only borders are his own ambitions and he is not driven by hunger. A world where national interests affecting the environment have disappeared with the abolition of all nations, and where the legal framework and the language is the same for everyone. In a nutshell, a society that is nearly perfect.

## II

### The World We Live In

It would make sense that we begin by analyzing ourselves, the men and women who make up the raw materials of society, as we are the essence of our greatest concerns given that nothing is dearer than oneself and the gender to which one belongs. Both sexes are united by an overwhelming majority of common characteristics, making up what we call the human race.

Like any other animal species, we are guided by the instinct of survival, which is the engine that moves everything; it is why we love, eat, have sex, strive to improve ourselves, form organized groups, seek shelter and fear death.

Biology further clarifies these common characteristics. Over hundreds of thousands of years, each sex has developed distinctive behaviors that distinguish one from the other. The prehistoric period more or less made us what we are today. It was hundreds of centuries, which is a long period of time compared to the barely thirty centuries that we know as “history”, and it had the most influence in our small daily behaviors; we are still mesmerized by the figures made by fire in a fireplace, which make us feel secure and at home. This is because for thousands of years fire accounted for the only way for humans to break the darkness of night and protect themselves against predators and the cold, leaving those sensations imprinted in our subconscious minds, even though we no longer have the same needs. In addition, for thousands of years, the male human was responsible for hunting and gathering food. During this time, they developed the ability to work in teams, establish strategies and **carry out** physical labor. Meanwhile, their female counterparts would remain in caves procreating and taking care of children at what today would be considered a very early age. For the females it was essential that the males return with food for them and their children. This led them to develop the art of seduction as a means to ensure that men would tend to their basic needs, including reproduction. These behaviors are still seen today, although in highly advanced countries it is more out of tradition than real need, given that women are now more autonomous. Nevertheless, there are several industries founded on these behaviors (fashion, cosmetics, etc.) Companies whose clients are generally women.



Historically, it is also common that when a society achieves high levels of stability and security, these nuances in behavior become diluted, exposing more similarities between men and woman, due to the fact that women no longer need men for support. However, when these concepts of stability and security disappear (e.g., in the Middle Ages, at the end of the Roman Empire) we tend to return to our roots.

Also, for the same historical reasons, men developed an adventurous spirit, given the need to go out in search of food, while women generally have more homey and sedentary characteristics.

Since the dawn of time, facing suffering or the awareness of death itself, our species has found it necessary to create religions that provide the hope of a life after death.

In short, the things that sustain our way of being are biology, the survival instinct and history, in that order; and different conditions that arise when there are varying socioeconomic circumstances.

The sense of ownership is another manifestation of our instincts. The prehistoric man - much like today's man - guarded his cave in order to protect himself and his family from the elements and wild animals. He marked and tended to his hunting grounds, and later the cultivation of crops, to ensure their subsistence. This organization to defend their territories is the foundation for what is known today as countries. This is the main reason for the failure of any political system - such as communism - that seeks to abolish private property, which is an attack on one of the manifestations of man's survival instinct. Any political philosophy that ignores man's natural way of being is simply an aberration.

Currently we are living in an interesting stage in the history of mankind on Earth, with the coexistence of societies that have existed throughout the centuries and are at different stages of evolution: the tribe, the medieval, the industrial, and technological societies.

The first two have coincided in time for thousands of years, usually ignoring each other. The birth and evolution of the others came about with the industrial revolution, and currently lead the contemporary world.

Men and women living in organized tribes, as our ancestors did thousands of years ago still exist in some parts of Africa and South America, as if time in these regions has stood still. These are weak social organizations that are inevitably condemned to disappear when they come in contact with others. Their survival depends on nature and a reduced number of members. This is the only way their social structures can continue to operate with such a low level of skills and a chief or king, who usually holds political power, based on divine principles and controls the warriors that support it, and a sorcerer or witch doctor who has a monopoly on religion and education. When these communities grow, rather than staying together and becoming stronger societies, they divide and give rise to new tribes, which usually end up being rivals. As the number of people on the planet continues to rise, habitable space for these tribes is on the decline, and as sad as it may be, there's little we can do about it. Evolution is a strong force and, just like animals that are unable to adapt have a tendency to disappear, human groups who do not adjust with the times will have difficulty surviving.

On the other hand, multiple countries, mainly in Africa and Asia, are still deeply immersed in practices from the Middle Ages. One example of this is today's Arab countries, which embody all the characteristics that define the Middle Ages: the atomization of kingdoms, the immense social and economic inequalities, the isolation of their cities (where the authorities try to keep them from external influences), the divine and patrimonial origin of power that mixes politics and religion, and the bigotry with which the latter factor is enhanced.

It seems as though through these countries we are witnessing the Middle Ages first hand. Beyond the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, this comparative anachronism constitutes one of the root causes why Islamic leaders perceive the information and images that come to their cities from the West as an attack on their interests. They are manifestations of a world other than their own and threaten the stability of political and religious power in their states. As a result of globalization, this information exposes its people to a society where the rights of women and men are equal, where rulers are elected and judged by their people, where citizens are not just subordinates, where torture and slavery have been banished, and where religions remain in the private sphere. This collection of differentiating factors, which directly attacks the principles keeping the leaders in power, makes them react defensively, brainwashing their

citizens with religion and ignorance, in order to protect their world from the influences of the West, which is viewed as an enemy. Many of these leaders - as rich as if straight out of *A Thousand and One Nights* - are to blame for not modernizing their societies, by making proper use of the immense economic opportunities that oil provides for them (similar to what takes place in Mexico, Brazil and Venezuela). Its citizens should claim this right urgently, before the wells run dry and all they have left is the desert sand to sustain them.

The fact is that not all Arab countries have oil, but the ones that do, have it in mass quantities. The leaders of these countries should be directing the development in those regions of the planet, instead of flaunting their wealth in the most exclusive places. These are the same political and religious parties that are responsible for keeping their citizens in the Middle Ages, knowing that as long as they reign and keep their people ignorant, said people will never claim their right to a more useful and fair distribution of wealth. In several Asian countries, including China, with an ancient culture that until recently was stuck in the Middle Ages, the progression toward an industrial society has developed with varying degrees of success.

As for Latin American countries, here we have societies with roots in Western culture, taking continuous steps to advance and then going backwards with strong jolts from right to left, always torn between attempts at sociopolitical progress and the endemic despotism that corrodes them. This particular erratic behavior arises from these countries' origins: they are a product of Spain and Portugal in the Middle Ages and the aristocratic world that dominated during the time of discovery and that established societies that were primarily agricultural in those lands. The Industrial and French Revolutions developed far from its borders, so their influence only reached them sparingly. For this reason, they still swing between certain medieval habits and irregular attempts to establish themselves as modern states. Much like the Arab countries, they are not taking advantage of their natural resources, including oil, which is abundant in some regions, to modernize.

This phenomenon was not reproduced in North America because their first European settlers were from more advanced societies, where there was already a strong industrial and commercial bourgeoisie. This circumstance

allowed practiced colonization to be different from what was developed some centuries earlier by the conquistadores from the Iberian Peninsula.

The nations that emerged from the remnants of the former Soviet Union find themselves in a situation similar to that of Latin America, where there still remains a long and hard path to reconstructing obsolete structures before replacing them with those more consistent with the new times.

Finally, there are the so-called Western democracies, which have passed the earlier evolutionary stages, and lead global socioeconomic progress today. To follow that evolutionary path, they had to overcome great difficulties; there were moments of deep setbacks and other significant social advances. Overall it can be said that the democratic states are the children of Greco-Roman thought and organization, recovered in Europe during the Renaissance, and the Industrial and French revolutions.

Geographically these countries are distributed between Europe, North America, Australia and Japan. Although there are slight differences, their people enjoy a standard of living that has never before been achieved, but at the same time, they have a certain sense of guilt for the misery existing in other parts of the world, which is enhanced by lack of understanding and not necessarily due to a cause-effect relationship between their own wealth and the deficiencies of others. The United States is the leader of all of them.

This is not the first time in history where one single nation exercises superpowers. In another era, Rome was not only a superpower but was expected to watch over the rest of the world. For the most part, it exercised this role with prudence and not a little wisdom. Its prestige was such that, when a neighboring king invaded Egypt, (both were allies of Rome), the Senate sent an ambassador to the court of the invading king to make him desist. The invading king, after hearing Rome's arguments, said he would think about it. The Roman ambassador drew a circle on the floor around the king and told him that he would need an answer before stepping out of the circle. Immediately, the invading king withdrew his troops. The fact is that conflicts were not always resolved without the use of weapons, but it is true that the world enjoyed the longest period of peace that man has ever known.

After the fall of the Soviet Union, Winston Churchill defined the United States as the "new Rome". This being the case, its government should use maximum restraint and wisdom in the exercise of its sole superpower status. It is true, however, that the variable which implies the existence of nuclear, chemical or biological weapons, like so many other universal problems, makes this role not just difficult, but almost impossible. Today, weapons of mass destruction are available with relatively few resources and are not just in the hands of many countries, but also in the hands of groups of extremists willing to do just about anything. Consequently, it is impossible to perform the role of sentinel of the world without, at the same time, subjecting humanity to a risk it cannot assume, even if the best of intentions are utilized in that capacity.

In order to better understand the general approach of the ideas proposed by ***The Record***, and with no claim to be exhaustive as it could become boring, let's explore with a bird's eye view, the world around us and the obsolete power mechanisms that move it: governments, economy, culture, science, information, religion and many other elements that are so common in our everyday lives that many times they go by virtually unnoticed.

### **III**

## **The Government**

Unlike many other species, the ability to establish communities along with the technological skills that mankind has been able to develop throughout his existence has allowed humans to spread throughout the Earth and stand the test of time.

Government is the instrument that keeps the people organized. Without Government, there would be anarchy, leading humans to a primitive disorder, where individuals would establish their own rules of conduct, resulting in their inability to grow as a species. It would be an overwhelming combination of individual insecurities that would lead to chaos, and, by the same token, force people to live by the law of the jungle where “only the strongest survive”, putting humans just a step away from extinction. Iraq is a perfect example of what happens when a government collapses without being replaced immediately by another: passions, ambitions and selfishness of individuals translate into killings, lootings and other calamities. These acts make any attempt at collective life impossible, which is essential for citizens to be at peace. Anarchism is a beautiful poetic alternative that would be possible to implement if we were angels. However, unfortunately, this is not the case, which is why we must learn to love, be familiar with and respect each other as we are.

Governments are born of the instinctive human need to structure their lives collectively in order to survive, and are built around a set of institutions needed to achieve that goal. Since the beginning of time, societies that have achieved the highest levels of stability and civilization have been those that knew how to better consolidate their social organization. Government plays a key role in achieving that goal.

Small villages or tribes were accustomed to choosing a chief or king, an equal amongst them, whom they trusted with the priestly duties in order to maintain a good relationship with their particular god, be it the Sun, Water or Mother Earth. However, when it came to major decisions, they were made with everyone’s participation. It was the perfect democracy, without social classes. This worked well amid the primitive peoples until their population grew and their community organization became more complex and they began specializing their functions. The king no longer

had time to assume all of his responsibilities and so he began to appoint "officials" to act as delegates. This was the birth of bureaucracy. It then became necessary for someone to take care of the roads, sanitation, trade, etc., and he appointed competent people to perform each function and thus the birth of departments or ministries.

At some point, as the number of citizens grew, not all of them could participate in decisions-making meetings, and so delegates were appointed to represent them and assume the role of advisor to the king, as well as intervene in more fundamental decisions such as: creation of taxes, regulation, declare war ... and thus the birth of parliaments.

Finally, when, due to their growth, the tribe or the village came too close to another neighbor, they established defensive criteria on the territory that they occupied, in anticipation of conflict. Thus the birth of nations with borders and armies to defend them.

Throughout history (with some variables), these have been the roots from which existing governments and the institutions that compose them have germinated. It was Rome that led the concept of "state" or "government" to its highest form; one might even say Rome invented the concept. This occurred as a result of its expansion into Italy, when it stopped thinking in terms of village and tribe, to do so as a nation equipped with the same language and the same laws regulating coexistence.

This structure has had its ups and downs throughout history. At times, the executive branch has usurped the power of parliament, giving rise to what we call a dictatorship. In contrast, when the parliamentary, judicial and executive branches have remained separate from each other and the citizens that carry out these functions have been elected by popular vote, we call it a democracy.

The history of mankind is a continuous relay of nations and forms of government associated with them, where there are no truths more ephemeral than politics.

If we look around us with a little cunning, we conclude that, in some ways, we are still in the tribal era. We have not outgrown that stage. As explained before, a tribe, with their civilization in tow, inexorably grew at the expense of another, which, being weaker or poorly organized, was

absorbed by the first. Do you see, dear reader, any differences with what is happening today?

The world we live in has more than two hundred tribes or nations, with their corresponding governments, which, as has always happened, continue to be relentlessly at war with each other. In fact, the past century has had the dubious honor of being the most prolific in wars throughout the history of mankind.

As we were saying, modern governments are deeply rooted in the Roman organization, and have become obsolete to meet the new challenges posed in today's world. The basic function of each of them is to provide their citizens safety, welfare and perspectives of a good future. However, as already pointed out by the great scientists of the twentieth century, the current technology has made them anachronistic. Among other things, due to this modern technology, those nations and the governments who run them are no longer able to fulfill the basic functions that justify their existence, and consequently, it is necessary to evolve into a new form of government that considers the Earth as a single unit and man as a universal citizen. It is the authentic revolution still pending.

Even if it is from a selfish perspective, we all want to solve the pressing problems of hunger in the Third World. If not, its inhabitants will peacefully or violently try to immigrate to Western countries. They have nothing to lose at this point, as all they have is the monopoly of hunger, and against this, there are no effective borders.

If Pakistan and India, as countries with a significant nuclear arsenal and in constant conflict over possession of Kashmir, decided to use their power of destruction (which they would not hesitate to consider, if, at some point, they were placed in a position where they felt threatened), our borders and governments could do nothing to prevent radioactivity from eradicating life in large areas of the planet.

Using globalization for their purposes, terrorism has been internationalized and is harshly punishing many nations. It is not likely to disappear from the world as long as there are countries that provide refuge and encouragement. Governments are powerless to act effectively in this area, as they would need global agreements to eradicate it. These



agreements are not just difficult to achieve, but almost impossible, due to the confluence of different criteria and interests.

Every year, the polluting factories of developed countries and of those in the process of developing, destroy thousands of hectares of forest that provide the oxygen we breathe. If we continue down this path, our descendants will have no Earth to inherit, as the novel says. Even with the best of intentions, each individual government alone cannot do anything to avoid the consequences of this phenomenon, a product of industrialization.

The planet has become smaller. The globalization of communications has also provided universal availability of part of the economy, mainly the movement of capital and information, which, in itself, is not a positive thing without the production and purchasing power of citizens. So much so that a fall in the Tokyo stock market affects the investor in London and the bankruptcy of an English bank may result in the suspension of payments, leading to the subsequent generation of unemployment in many companies in other parts of the world. In response, there is nothing national governments can do, as they are unable to confront decisions made thousands of miles away. Shouldn't this be enough reason for us to change them?

We, the citizens of this planet will have to revolt someday, and the sooner the better. We need to revolt against the ill-intentioned message from the powers that be, in the sense that the creation of a world government is utopian. It is not true, as we will explain later in this book. But, even if it were, is there anything more beautiful than the fight for a dream?

## **IV**

### **The Economy**

The concept of "economy" is very broad and has much influence in the past and present of mankind. It also bears weight on political decisions made by governments, which, while not intending to make an exhaustive study, we find it necessary to get acquainted with its general principles, in order to best describe the world we inhabit.

In the novel we see an economy where large corporations have disappeared because their power nucleus is hard to control and thus they manage to impose criteria regardless of its usefulness. We propose a free economy, recovering the artisan and small farmer, but making them co-exist with larger, specialized companies in those fields where it is necessary due to productive complexity. Trade should be fully globalized, so that each region produces that which their natural conditions facilitate, or that the very talent and imagination of its people make possible - all this within a universal framework.

To make all this a bit easier to understand, we will try to reflect on some basic aspects of the economy.

#### **1. Production**

In order to cover his basic needs, man needs access to food, shelter, clothing, and so on. In the beginning of time he tended to be self-sufficient: hunting for food, building a house or seeking a cave for shelter, and used animal skins as clothing. As the population grew, individuals began to specialize in different types of production; thus the birth of the farmer, the agriculturist, the artisan ... Later on, and in order to meet the vital needs, man started exchanging goods, and this became the forerunner of trade as we know it today.

Subsequently, as societies progressed, it became unnecessary for its members to invest all of their available time in the search for food or clothing. Now, for the first time, man became familiar with free time, and so he began to create things that go beyond the bare necessities: culture, entertainment and a host of second tier goods.

The increase in demand resulted in an increase in production and of course, its organization became more complex. This brought about the need for two additional specializations: entrepreneurs and workers. The first contributed the idea and the funding required to develop it, and either directly or via a delegate, managed and directed the structure of production. The latter, in return for a wage, contributed the labor required for the manufacture of the goods that society demanded. Later, as a result of the evolution of technology, mechanization was introduced to the production processes.

On the other hand, the entrepreneur operated as an individual or via partnerships or corporations. Some centuries later, these partnerships or corporations decided to increase their production in several countries, and so the so-called multinationals were born. These companies, as we know them today, originated in the industrial revolution, when larger companies gradually replaced artisans who produced copious amounts of goods. In order to thrive, these mass producers needed a broader market than that offered by their own cities or countries.

Also a product of the industrial revolution is the enduring mistrust between management and the workforce. This confrontation is absurd, as both are essential to one another, and the first would do well to share the profits that without their workers they would not have obtained. It would be wise to involve the laborers in the common shared adventure: the enterprise from which they all live.

Currently, multinationals have become such a strong influence on the economy, that they have limited the decision-making capacity of the governments of the countries where they are settled. The great majority of these companies have developed from what we know as the capitalist world.

In socialized economies of recent and spectacular collapse, the government became the entrepreneur, and all its citizens became the workers. It was based on a principle that is as beautiful as it is demagogic: create a government of workers in a world of workers. First of all, let us point out the inconsistency of this premise. In reality, an entrepreneur is simply a worker, who takes risks by investing his money and employs other men in pursuit of an idea. When this philosophy of socialized economy was put

into practice, what really happened was that it created a world of men working for a single employer: the government. This same government wanted a monopoly of all power, both economic and political, and this made it impossible to maintain a healthy balance between employer and employee, whose production criteria was tilted towards the interests of the ruling party and its members, and not necessarily in the good of the community. Once the people became aware of all this, they stopped producing, deeply discouraged by the lack of individual initiative. Such was the case in the Soviet Union.

The failure of this production system is explained by the very nature of man. It not only stunts man's growth capacity, it also fails to satisfy man's constant need of possessions, which is something inherent to all human beings as we discussed in another chapter. This is well illustrated in the reply given by a high Soviet leader, in the final stage of communism, when a reporter asked how it was possible that a country so rich in natural resources had such a shortage of primary goods. Quite calmly, the leader said: "They (in reference to the people), pretend to work, and we, the government, pretend to pay them." Indeed, the lack of individual freedom and work incentives, among other things, was the downfall of the communist production system.

China has learned the lesson. Little by little, it is getting rid of communism, through a slow evolution towards a liberalized economy. The fact is that the industriousness of its people and the vastness of its own market can easily lead this country to become the world's leading power in a few years. If it stays on this path, its political system will eventually evolve into a democracy - something that will be possible when the middle class is sufficiently large. Let's not forget however, to credit communism for helping China advance from medieval misery to its current poverty, an indispensable precursor to the new social and economic progress they can achieve in the future.

At the other end of the spectrum, we find capitalism, which, left to its logical consequences, it tends to create huge inequalities between men. This should be corrected without sacrificing the creativity of the person, by any government that is inspired by social justice.

Almost all European nations, faced with the choice between socialism and capitalism, have opted for a mixed economic system in which the

government intervenes for strategic reasons in certain areas of the economy, making them somehow coexist.

In reality what is happening is that the part of the liberalized economy that is in the hands of civil society, is hiding losses while financing - in conditions of unequal competition-, the large deficits of the companies controlled by the government. In order to pay, the government uses the citizen's tax dollars through national budgets. This system is designed to fail. In the next fifty years we can expect to see the collapse of what we know as the European welfare state, driven by competition that will be coming from Asia. This old continent will lose its weight in the world.

In conclusion, the role of government should be to set the right framework where free men can develop, on equal terms, their ideas, ambitions and professional and personal goals, while protecting the disadvantaged, which should not be swallowed by the ambition and power of the strongest. This is the premise of ***The Record***.

## **2. Money**

We use it every day, but very seldom have we wondered what it really is.

First, it should be clarified that money is nothing more than a simple agreement. Its strength is based on its holder trusting that he can change that piece of metal, or paper, for goods from the country that issues the particular currency.

Money was created due to man's need to possess an effective tool with which to conduct trade in goods. In ancient times, in societies that were much simpler than the current ones, that transaction was limited to the mere exchange of goods between people, so, for example, a person with a wheat surplus and in need of leather for clothing, would try to exchange with someone possessing a surplus of leather and in need of wheat. This probably gave birth to the art of bargaining, which still persists in many parts of the world. It would have been quite difficult to determine how much wheat to exchange for a sheepskin. Presumably, these transactions would be carried out after long nights of discussions, which no doubt were fascinating.

Things began to get complicated when, as a result of population growth and the specialization of production, it became difficult to conduct large commercial operations and equate prices and values, which clearly held back large-scale trade. This issue was resolved with the ingenious invention of what we now know as money. Now, trade expanded rapidly since it facilitated the exchange of goods, both among individuals and between communities.

Initially, as there was no monetary system, trading was done using chickens, cows or pigs as payment. In fact, the first coins that were minted by the Roman had images of these animals and were called *pecunia*, a term derived from *pecus*, which in Latin means "cattle". Before the start of the Punic Wars, Carthage had the most advanced economic system of the time. When Rome had barely started to mint rough metal coins, the Carthaginians already had banknotes: leather strips that showed different stamps based on their value. These 'notes' were guaranteed by the gold stored by the government.

But what is money in reality? As stated earlier, it is an agreement, an unwritten agreement. Physically, it is usually a piece of metal or paper with little value in itself. Without detailing an analysis of its evolution throughout history, let us point out some important points that may shed some light on what money really is.

Until recently, all money put into circulation by each country, corresponded to the total value of the gold reserves existing in the state bank. This system was extended from antiquity until almost the present day. Money was a sort of cashier's check, immediately due, issued by the government and the holder expected to convert its concrete value into gold or equivalent goods. For example, if the Bank of France had in its coffers a hundred tons of gold, it manufactured coins and bills with a total equivalent value and put it into circulation, its division into smaller units led to what was known as currency or national currency, which each country gave a different name. This meant that any currency in circulation was warranted in its value, by the percentage equivalent of gold deposited in the state bank. At other times, coins were made directly in gold or silver, so they had their own value.

This system of gold as the standard, ceased to be used in the early 1930s, as a result of the deflationary crisis of 1929. It was replaced by a complex

system, usually directed by the central banks of each country, with more or less independence from their governments, in which multiple factors are taken into account when deciding how much money is to be put into circulation: working capital needs of businesses and individuals as well as governments, payment balances, inflation, gross domestic product, and so on. The effectiveness of this approach has varied, depending on the use of that power made by rulers in their respective economies.

There have been cases in which the authorities of a country, beset by their government debt, put large amounts of money into circulation. In these cases, the value of the currency decreases in that it represents a smaller percentage of the total current circulating needs. Consequently, with the same currency fewer goods can be bought, resulting in more expensive products and often leading to a rampant inflation.

Sometimes governments make decisions that are as populist as they are irresponsible. The spending commitments they make to their citizens often exceeds the amount of taxes they will be able to collect, meaning that they are spending more than they are collecting. When this is the case, they will often turn first to the market for credit. After exhausting these possibilities (usually for breach of its payment obligations), they tend to resolve the situation with the circulation of large amounts of the country's currency, which generates high inflation rates. This is a trick often used by governments to cover up their poor administration, with the most immediate consequence being the impoverishment of the citizens, who suddenly find that they can buy less today than they did yesterday with the same amount they receive for their work. By the same token, their savings will automatically lose value as their ability to be exchanged for goods or services is reduced.

Nevertheless, although it is the most severe, this is not the only cause for the growth of inflation. Other causes are the increased demand regarding the available supply, which is the case when society requires more goods than it produces, thus increasing the expense. Another cause is the upward movement of imported goods, resulting in an increase in domestic prices.

On the other hand, if the amount of currency put into circulation is much lower than the gross domestic product or capital needs, its value increases and so does the purchasing power of the citizens. This may occur as a result of large excess in the production of consumer goods that wind up

accumulating in warehouses, making the supply exceed the demand. It can also happen due to the withdrawal of money from the market. For the economy, the consequences of this situation are even worse than those of inflation. Companies experience great losses because the money used to buy raw materials has a lower purchasing power than the money received through the sale of the final product. In other words, the manufacturing cost exceeds the profit of sales. In short, they lose money and end up going bankrupt, resulting in business closures and a rampant raise of unemployment. When entering a dynamic of this sort, in which the prices of goods are higher today than they will be tomorrow, we face the phenomenon known as deflation.

In any case, markets tend to regulate themselves and produce the goods that citizens request and in the quantities that they demand. Therefore, a reasonable, controlled inflation is healthy for the economy because it indicates that we are immersed in a dynamic society. Deflation, however, is a symptom of an economy in a true recession.

The natural law of the market is to produce what sells, because that's what people want to buy. Governments that have attempted to replace this logic with a planned economy, where the government determines what goods are to be produced and consumed have failed miserably. As previously explained, the closest and best examples are the former Soviet Union countries, which practiced this system and it led them to the economic collapse, which in turn led to a political shutdown.

Currency also reflects this unwritten market law: if there is too much of it in circulation, its value drops and generates inflation. On the other hand, if there is very little, its value rises but it leads to a recession. It would therefore be very interesting if monetary decisions were made by independent technical entities, which would remain on the sidelines of the whims of whatever political party is currently in power. In any case, responsible governments must maintain a monetary discipline that will avoid the negative consequences of both inflation and deflation, by trying to circulate only the amount of money necessary so that the purchasing power of citizens is not affected.

Universalism, as referred to in the novel, takes the gross domestic product as the standard for the manufacture and circulation of money. Thus, the money circulating corresponds to the total production of consumer goods,



and stays away from decisions or interests that may be more or less arbitrary. In other words, if the production of goods and services is valued at a hundred billion (expressed in world currency), the Government should make and circulate its equivalent in fractioned monetary units; thus citizens can exchange them anywhere in the world for products they wish to own, without any political interference.

### **3. Taxes**

Governments must provide a range of services to their citizens: health, education, housing, justice, security, transportation, and so on. To handle all that, what is needed are people willing to devote themselves to these tasks – officials, as well as the means and facilities to carry them out. To finance these services and resources, financial contributions are required from their citizens who, in turn, must also be the beneficiaries. These contributions are known as taxes.

In democracies, governments submit their annual accounts for approval by their respective parliaments, explaining how much income they expect to raise through taxes and how they are going to spend it: these are national budgets.

There are two types of taxes: direct and indirect. The first are those paid based on the profits made by companies, the range of salaries earned by workers and professionals, and so on. Indirect taxes, on the other hand, are those levied directly on products or services purchased, such as gasoline, clothing, housing, etc.

Governments sometimes use taxes for their own political purposes. When they want to penalize an economic activity, they heap taxes on it; in contrast, when they want to promote it, they lighten its tax burden. They even play "educational" politics: governments who do not want their citizens to be too demanding, try to arrange it so that most people, particularly the working class, do not realize that they are paying. By using the simple trick of forcing companies to retain these taxes directly from the worker's payroll, and it is the companies who, acting as tax collectors, pay into the government's coffers. This way, the worker loses sight of the fact that it is the government that is charging him a tax for working, and he

is more tolerant of the errors and corruption on the part of his leaders, because he does not feel that his money is being misappropriated.

The most progressive governments make each citizen or business entity responsible for the direct payment of their tax obligations. The worker who is obliged to pay to the public Treasury's account a large percentage of his salary every month, is usually more demanding with regard to the way politicians and officials use his money.

Reflecting on this point, we can state the obvious: governments do not have more money than what their citizens contribute. Consequently, if taxes get too high, they can choke the economy and make it less competitive as a result of the cost increase of products. On the other hand, if taxes are too low, the government can find itself in deficit (spending more than it has), so it will be forced to go into debt, and then pay the relevant amounts for interest on the debt, or it will print money, which will result in a devaluation of the currency, which will in turn impoverish the citizens.

Therefore, it is extremely important to demand that governments do not make financial commitments that endanger the economic stability of their respective countries. This is what is happening in Europe today, and future generations will probably pay the price, with a dramatic decline in their standard of living.

Unfortunately, there are many examples of such irresponsible behavior. When some governments, such as Argentina in recent decades, promote subsidies for civil servant pensions, usually attached to expansive phrases like progress and solidarity, what they are really trying to hide is nothing more than vulgar vote buying. They do not care if they ruin the working classes, who are responsible for creating the wealth necessary for there to be something to divide, and they end up discouraging them, burdening them with taxes, and stupefying taxpayers, making them selfish, eternal consumers of the resources vital for those who are really in need. True social progress is maximizing the imagination to create wealth, jobs, and helping those in real need with the resources resulting from the efforts of businessmen and workers, but without them sinking under the weight of the others, as this would create only misery, and misery is not divisible.

In short, government budgets, like those of any individual, consist of income and expenses. If it is important to hold those in charge accountable for the taxes that they want to create, it is no less important to hold them accountable for the way they want to spend it.

In the final instance, people must hold their governments accountable for the way they use the taxes and understand that government accounts, like those of any family, must maintain a satisfactory balance between income and expenditure.

#### **4. Trade and Prices**

Trade is as old as the presence of man on Earth, and is closely linked to man's own nature, to the satisfying of his most urgent needs and his desire for possessions. It is, in short, the art of exchanging goods or services. In other sections, we describe its main features, but here, we will only deal with its fundamental relationship to pricing.

First, we must accept that all movement of buying and selling is a commercial activity. When we receive, as well as when we deliver goods of any kind, products, services, etc., in exchange for money, or any other way of payment in kind. This leads us to make a fundamental observation: How are the prices of what we buy fixed?

The first principle is that every demand gives rise to an offer, and if demand for a particular good exceeds the existing supply, the price will go up. In the opposite situation, it will fall. However, every product has an objective and a subjective price: one is the cost of manufacturing it, and the other is what the market is willing to pay for it. Combining these two factors, you arrive at a final price. This principle is of universal application. When you buy a house, there is an objective price, which is what it cost the builder to build it, in addition to the workers' wages, taxes, materials used and the profit to the business. There is also a subjective price, which is the value of the land, and it has a great influence on the final purchase price, which will be more or less, depending on the law of supply and demand. This means that if your municipality has abundant land for development, the house will be cheaper than if land were scarce; in the latter case, the price will tend to rise.

As we were saying, prices are governed by the unwritten law of supply and demand. However, sometimes voluntary and undesirable distortions are introduced into the system. Sometimes, for example, the shortage is fictitiously created, not just for the purpose of preventing a particular product from being priced excessively low, but to keep it steady, and if possible, make it rise. We've all read or heard at times that a country has thrown their surplus agricultural production into the sea, because the year has been magnificent and the abundance of the crops has given rise to such a large demand that the prices sank to below what it cost the farmers to produce them, so the excess itself could ruin them. To avoid this overabundance, they destroy part of the crop and sell the rest at the desired price.

The question everyone asks is: why not take those surpluses to other areas of the world where they are needed to feed the people? Indeed, that is what should be done, but unfortunately, experience shows that when this has been attempted, the government of the country receiving the aid has re-sold it to other parts of the world, usually in exchange for weapons to ensure their stay in power, and nothing has reached the people in need. It is not done just by corrupt governments, but also by groups of unscrupulous individuals who trade in the humanitarian contributions that other citizens of the world, with the best of intentions, have donated.

On one occasion, I discussed with a senior European official, the need to send the surplus milk from our continent to Africa, as he was complaining of the high cost of storage. He replied that he had tried several times, but with frustrating results, because these surpluses, after a time, had reappeared in Europe, sold at low prices, thereby affecting local producers. He explained that the only way to ensure that aid reached those who really needed it would be by controlling the distribution in the host country. However, their own governments prevent it and make a great fuss when it is suggested, citing interference by colonialists who deliver aid.

Once again, we face a difficult problem in the current global context.

## **5. The Stock Exchange**

Given the importance and popularity it has achieved in recent years, we will try to explain below what the Stock Exchange is.

The Exchange began as a financial instrument for companies, as a complement or a substitute for traditional credit. In turn, it has become a mechanism for ownership in the companies, as it allows any citizen to buy in at a relatively low cost. Companies that need an injection of capital to take on new projects or to stabilize those which are in the developmental stage, have the opportunity to obtain funds through those persons or entities that have entrusted their savings to them, and thus have become shareholders.

The main advantage for publicly traded companies is that, in addition to obtaining funding, they do not pay interest on money received, unlike what happens with credits. The shareholder or investor, meanwhile, becomes a co-owner of the company and therefore is subject to its financial development. In other words, if the company in which he has purchased shares obtains benefits, a portion of it will be for him, depending on his percentage of ownership. However, if the company generates losses, the shareholder may lose all the capital he invested in it.

As mentioned, this financial tool has played a key role in the growth of companies in recent decades, and has increased public ownership in them, because, worldwide, there are millions of small investors who spend their savings to purchase shares in the stock market. These investments are known as risk capital, because if the company generates losses, stocks go down in value and some of the savings are lost, but if it makes a profit, the shareholder may participate in them and revalue his shares. Nonetheless, there is a subjective value to the shares, which carry greater weight each day, resulting from the law of supply and demand. If some securities have many more applications where the purchaser is making more than the seller, the price tends to rise. For the most part, this is due to capricious purchasing movements rather than the results of the operating accounts of the companies concerned. By contrast, stocks go down when the number of buyers – the amount of purchasing money – is less than the offer of securities offered at a determined price.

Currently, this behavior has caused speculative movements on such a scale, that there can be overvaluing of shares in a company facing a delicate economic situation and undervaluing of others with a healthy economy. Consequently, over time, the stock has lost its usefulness as a barometer of the health of the economy of a country.

The problem is that they have confused the means with the ends. The initial objective of the Exchange as a recipient of funding for business projects has been blurred, to benefit the speculating game that looks for immediate results. Hardly anyone trusts their savings to them on a long-term basis to receive the income shares of company profits when their projects succeed. In the current situation, stock market investors buy and sell stocks compulsively, seeking an immediate benefit in raising or lowering the speculative trading securities. In other words, the stock market has become, basically, something like a virtual business which, most of the time, does not generate any collective wealth.

It would be interesting to consider the stock market returning to its origins, especially after the globalization of the financial world, as this causes speculation in New York, for example, to pull in the savings of thousands of investors from multiple countries, who have neither the information nor, much less, sufficient training to exercise minimal control over the investment.

## **6. Credit**

Another way to access funding, both by companies and individuals, is via credit. Credit is money that is received, with a commitment to return it within a given period and with a previously agreed interest. That interest is usually a few points above the inflation rate in the country where it is requested.

In ancient times, the temples were in charge of this credit mechanism but in today's world, it is the banks, where people place their money in exchange for a small interest, in the best-case scenario. Banks, in turn, lend your money to other persons or entities in need of funding, and this is the basis of their business. In short, they take one's savings to loan them to others, and they keep a gross profit margin that we call interest. This means that they never have in their coffers, at any time, all the money they have received from the savers, since a significant part has been loaned to others requesting funding. Therefore, if a high percentage of the bank depositors were to simultaneously reclaim their deposits, it would be physically impossible to return them. Recently, we have had an example in Argentina, with the famous "*Corralito*".

As can be seen, one of the keys to the economy is trust. We invest in the stock market hoping to get benefits, but if for any reason there is a panic chain reaction, everyone would want to sell and, therefore, shares would collapse, as there would not be sufficient purchasers. If that same panic reaction were to be produced because of doubts regarding the stability of a financial institution where we deposit our savings, they would suspend payments, because they would be unable to repay the funds we had deposited, and which everyone, in their fright, would be trying to withdraw. To prevent the situation from reaching these proportions, most Western countries have introduced mechanisms to prevent the failure of the financial system: support from other banks, and from the central bank itself, and even the government, as a last resort, through the taxes paid by its citizens.

## V

### Culture and Nationalism

As you have seen, there is no doubt that *The Record* outlines a decidedly anti-nationalist philosophy. However, this conviction does not simply arise from an educated guess or a hunch, but rather from the careful study of history, man's trajectory within that history, evolution, and above all, from reason. In light of the problems that the world faces today, the existence of nations is not only an obstacle for the true development of man, but a breeding ground for continuing and unsolvable conflicts, and the pyre that can end our civilization as we know it. In short, the existence of countries as a way of organizing our life on planet Earth has not only lost its usefulness, but it has also become extremely dangerous.

The current defense of nationalism is the product of individual interests, and quite similar to the feudal lords in the Middle Ages. These interests hide the more concrete ambitions of a group of people, who usually dress-up arguments that are as empty as they are demagogic and then present them. Let's think about this.

Culture, for example, is one of the key points wielded by the defenders of nations and nationalism, to justify its existence. They often resort to the "differentiating factor" as the main argument to support their ideas. It is, therefore, advisable to continue this discussion using these terms, as they lead to considerable confusion.

It is logical to suppose that man originated from a common root, but we will leave this discussion to the anthropologists. In any case, it is undeniable that, for centuries, various tribes were formed, each founded by members who separated from other tribes. These separated members settled in a different place and populated, subsequently forming cities as they expanded their territorial domains. Over the centuries, this led to what we now know as countries.

In each of these primitive and isolated settlements, man evolved differently from others with whom he had no contact. He developed his own language, customs, religion, nutritional habits and craft characteristics, according to what the nature of the place provided and conditioned him to. The sum of all these characteristics forged the



particular behaviors that resulted in the evolution of a unique human group. It is what we call a people's culture.

This is obviously a very broad concept, with mixed components that are closely related to the natural conditions of the environment where the different groups decided to settle. Each natural environment creates specific habits and customs according to its characteristics. Thus, it makes sense that the character of the people who inhabited the valley of the Guadalquivir, endowed with a generous nature, should be different from the character of those that crossed the African deserts. While one was encouraged by nature itself, to lead a sedentary life, the other was forced by his harsh surroundings to develop a nomadic lifestyle, as the arid soil offered no incentive to settle there. Thus the birth of different foods and their preparation, as well as different values and habits. They also adopted gods that were suited to their different needs and therefore different religions with different rites were born. All of this, in turn, gave way to different customs and cultures.

As a result of population growth and the need to find new sources of food in order to survive, tribes began to spread and settle on lands that surrounded them. Inevitably, they came up against other human settlements, which hindered their expansive movement. When two groups came in contact, they discovered they had different languages, worshiped different gods, ate different foods, and had developed different techniques and handicraft goods, although they descended from a common root.

These contacts were not always friendly. However, for a time, they used to coexist, giving each other sideways glances, marking their territory for hunting and farming, and placing sentinels at their limits to safeguard them, and thus, countries were born.

Sooner rather than later, be it from ambition or by an increase of their needs, these groups of people wound up confronting each other. The strongest and best organized defeated and absorbed the other and from this traumatic merging a new culture took shape with traces of both. With the passage of time, the consolidation put forth a new language, different gods, customs, cuisine, crafts, etc. As soon as they came into contact with another tribe, the process started all over again.

Throughout history, these fusions of cultures have occurred continuously, even to this day. They will continue to happen, and we will continue to be enriched by it in the future, if we do not self-destruct before.

Greek culture, which provokes so much well deserved admiration, was born from the fusion of the Minoan, Achaean and Dorian civilizations. The Romans took over and absorbed it, and this has continued to occur until today. Consequently, what we understand by "culture" is not set in stone: it is in a perpetual state of evolution, resulting from man's contact with his fellow man.

Let us ponder upon one of these cultural components: language. Usually, language is seen as a cultural element of the first order and a "differential factor", justifying nationalism. Perhaps the first thing we should ask ourselves is: What is its purpose? The answer is obvious: Communication between people. It therefore seems reasonable to conclude that if we all spoke the same language, the ability to communicate would increase significantly. Thus it can be considered a demagogic aberration for governments to use language as a value in itself, to justify the existence of their countries. It's not a matter of making them suddenly disappear. It is simply a matter of public authorities not artificially enhancing those that, due to the passage of time and the small number of current speakers, are being relegated to oblivion. An obvious example of this practice is what is happening in the Spanish Basque Country. Let us, therefore, allow history and evolution to walk their natural path, because from a world like today's world, with globalized communications, a universal language will undoubtedly be born as a synthesis of several existing ones, and that will facilitate communication between the people who inhabit the Earth.

As the best field of sociological experimentation available to man, History offers multiple choices in this regard, so let's have a look at it to see what our behaviors have been throughout time on these issues. Roman culture, the mother of the current Western culture, was formed with the contribution of Sabine, Etruscan and Latin cultures, to which later Greek and even Asian influences were added. And thus it is repeated because all countries leave their mark on the culture of the conqueror, through which a new one is born, with renewed vigor, and takes over the previous one. In other words, cultures do not disappear but are transformed. Attempting to

stay anchored in one of them would go against evolution and against History itself, an attempt that is always doomed to fail.

The Roman era is very enlightening, since, for centuries, Rome was consolidated in the known world with enormous force. They shared the laws, language, architecture, crafts, trade, and they were even responsible for the most prolonged period of peace and prosperity ever known to mankind. It was so rich and varied in its coherence that we still continue to feed off of it. Its concept of government, its laws, its language and its philosophy, still illuminate modern man. Even the Greek culture, which Rome declared to admire, has come down to us through them, because otherwise, it would have been diluted with the passage of time. No other culture has had such an impact on history, and it's a shame that most of the time we only learn about it through bad movies, *Asterix* comic books, political propaganda or biased legends, which, interestingly enough, have been enhanced by the Christian Church itself. What makes this even more interesting is the fact that it had to become Roman to universalize itself, and is, in some ways, the heiress of the institutions and the prestige that Rome left in memory of the people.

With the fall of the Roman Empire, that world was shattered, and of those fragments, many kingdoms were born. As a result, hundreds of human groups, which until then had maintained a fluid means of communication, were once again isolated. Thus was born the era we call the Middle Ages.

Centuries later, the isolation of the dozens of kingdoms which arose from the fall of the Roman Empire resulted in new languages, different customs, conflicting religions and territorial claims. Once more, the people were dragged into a string of endless wars that continue, even to this day, and have given shape, among other things, to the current European map.

In short, we must be aware that the differential cultural events that are frequently used as a justification of nationalist movements have their origin in the isolation of groups and are especially encouraged by those who use them to satisfy their lust for power. But we must not lose sight of the fact that just like in the Middle Ages, this isolation has numbed the thinking capacity of the people even more so than the stages of History in which communications and relationships between men have been fluid.

The term "culture", however, is not merely limited to language or customs, but also refers to the artistic or recreational activities that occur in a given region. Some nationalist politicians will use the uniqueness of the art produced in their country or region as one of the distinguishing features that justify its existence. We are again faced with a monumental aberration, as nothing is more universal than art. Every masterpiece created by mankind, individually or collectively, raises man above his own essence, and becomes heritage and comfort of all. There is no doubt that this is the ultimate reward that an artist may receive.

We must understand that culture is a universal phenomenon in a perpetual state of evolution. Mixing cultures is very enriching and it is deeply reprehensible when it becomes an element of separation between men. It is even worse when used as an excuse to encourage and justify terrorist movements from nationalisms.

In conclusion, cultures that have been shaped over the centuries in each of the countries or nations of our world are the result of prolonged periods of isolation. When cultural forms make contact with others, they evolve. This has happened and will continue to happen as long as man inhabits Earth. Therefore, for politicians to use culture as an instrument to justify nationalisms is not only a perverse anachronism, but also, above all, it is an attack against evolution and human history.

Educating man in understanding that Earth is a commonplace for all, should be an essential objective of every human being, and more so of those who hold political power.

## VI Religion

The novel enters deeply within this topic. It describes a society that, much like today's, in what we call advanced countries, and what happened in Rome centuries ago, has reached a high peak in social and economic progress, which has led to the apathy that always emerges when man finds no new convictions that are worth fighting and living for. We are unable to combine the ideas that feed our spirits, with a materialism that provides safety and welfare. Materialism always comes out on top, but man needs other things to survive. The consequences are often palpable: low birthrate, an aging population, and a younger generation unable to make new contributions, as they are trapped by consumerism. That is, what Authority expressed in his speech: "Man's development as a species was no different than it was as an individual: birth, maturity, old age and death." This is a serious, real, and curious problem of our species - as long as we have a conviction for which to struggle, we develop a creative and dynamic society, even in difficult material situations. When there is nothing to fight for, usually as the result of a high level of comfort and security, man gentrifies and slowly begins to die. Our Western world presents all of these symptoms.

As previously mentioned, Rome also found itself in this situation. The emperor Constantine saw this problem and embraced the Christian religion, not necessarily from religious conviction, but as a political solution as he observed that its members lived a more laborious and orderly life. With the Christians as an example, he sought to recover the ethical values that give meaning to the much-satiated existence of his people. This measure sought to curb the decline of the Roman citizen, who no longer believed in anything, not even in itself.

In ***The Record***, the rulers do something similar. They create a new religion based on the limitless evolution of man, symbolized and highlighted by The Race, which results from applying the theories of Professor Jacson. This is necessary because after years of peace and prosperity, man is showing obvious signs of decay. In short, the story leads you to the conclusion that man needs faith and values to survive his own limitations.

Religions represent a set of beliefs, beyond material things, and are based on the conviction of the existence of a superior being or beings (god or gods) along with the promise of a life after death, thus resulting in the ethical and moral behavior of men.

Following the Marxist views, political leftists defined religion as the opium of the people. It is likely that this assertion better fit those who sustained it, considering the damage they have caused to the very people they claimed to defend and represent. Such a definition cannot be applied to religions, as these have put hope in the hearts of millions of men and women throughout the troubled history of mankind. This is most certainly not the case for political ideologists; much less in a durable manner.

Religion has played and continues to play, a key role in the evolution of humanity. It has given man a set of ethical and moral behavioral guidelines and has facilitated coexistence as well as individual enrichment.

But if History has taught us anything, it is that the contributions of religions have been extremely positive only when they have adjusted to a personal scale. When religion and power have mixed, directly or indirectly it has been thrown completely out of balance. A good example of this is the Inquisition, sponsored by the Christian Church for centuries; it is no coincidence that during that time, it is closely linked to the stale and patrimonial European monarchies. These behaviors of the Church were deeply distanced from the source of their ideology, which was unifying and humanistic, but which, in contact with earthly power, became perverted in its procedures and purposes.

Today, the confusion between government and religion can be seen clearly in many Arab countries, where this very mix has sunk their people back into the Dark Ages.

These are the behaviors that confuse the people because, logically, they are unable to distinguish between the philosophies of the religion and how monks or friars misuse it. Followers see them as representatives and strongly believe what they preach, but in the end they become frustrated by the conflict and end up losing their religious convictions, which become empty rituals that are kept more out of habit and superstition than conviction. In fact, decreasing faith increases the pomp and folklore that surround it. The religious apathy that currently exists in the West goes

hand-in-hand with the unedifying behavior of some members of the Church.

Just like in the civilization described in ***The Record***, religion belongs, and must stay, within the individual and the subjective. The duty of government is to take care of man's material and concrete needs. Christ said: "Render unto Caesar what is Caesar's and to God what is God's." With this, he clearly embodied the idea of separation of church and state. The government should be secular, yet at the same time show the greatest respect for all religions and forms of worshiping, so that they can develop in complete freedom and become a key element to facilitate coexistence between men.

Naturally, the government should intervene in compliance with the law, to control excessive fanaticism that may arise from any religious movement that seeks to make intolerance its strengthening instrument in society. All citizens of the world and all institutions, including religious ones, must be subordinated to a universal constitution and, through it, to human rights, which must be defended as a higher value.

The idea of separation of religion and state is not new and was adopted by man a long time ago. While there are previous codes, the principle of law, as we understand it today, was set by scholars in the publication of The Law of the Twelve Tables written by the Decimvir. This happened in the Third Century B.C., when, over the protests of the people, the Roman Senate found it necessary to separate the civil from the divine, thus separating the will of the citizens from the will of the fickle gods, or rather, of those who claimed to represent them. To do this, Appius Claudius and ten other legislators were commissioned to draw up a new legal regulation, which culminated in the Twelve Tables and, since then, despite delays that persist in many countries in our world, enshrined the separation between state and religion.

So it has been around for a while, and once again, we can see how many answers to what we believe are current problems are given to us by History.

## **VII**

### **Emigration**

In the Second Century AD, the Emperor Antoninus, successor of the great Hadrian, was literally besieged by ambassadors from many countries and kingdoms requesting to be annexed to the Roman Empire, which enjoyed prosperity and welfare.

Once he took over the Government, he deposited his enormous personal fortune into the State Treasury and from that moment on, he established a judicious administration of budgets. He requested the consent of the Senate for his government actions, and he made himself accountable for governmental budgets, dollar by dollar. He equalized the rights and duties of spouses, and completely abolished torture, which he declared to be a crime, even if it were performed on slaves, who at that moment became similar to what today is known as domestic service. He wanted peace at any cost, even if it encouraged the boldness of the Germans, who interpreted any pacifist gesture as a weakness — does this remind anyone of what would happen eighteen centuries later, right before the Second World War? The day he died, as always, he gave the password to his guard: "Equanimity". He could not have come up with a word of more significance. He later called his nephew, Marcus Aurelius, and said to him, "Son, it is now your turn." The State coffers were healthier than they had ever been, but his personal fortune had been reduced to zero.

This is not a fable. It is a historical reality that immerses us into a melancholic envy; it would not hurt us to find leaders of this caliber in today's world. However, despite being such a great leader, neither he nor his successors managed to avoid, and effectively resolve, the arrival of the foreign barbarians from the outlying regions of the Empire, who were fleeing from the misery of their own countries. Centuries later, when Rome came to an end, some emigrants were already officials or craftsmen and were part of the legions, including the rank of officers. However, the number was such that Antoninus and his successors would not, or could not integrate them all into the Empire. Despite the border police efforts, they managed to settle within Roman territory in large numbers, and many were taking jobs that the citizens would not take. This was so prevalent that when Rome defeated Attila at the Catalonian Fields, the general that commanded the legions was Aetius, a German. As Montanelli noted, "The



so called invasion, that which is said to have ended the Empire, was nothing more than a change of the guard among barbarians". These were already there, and in such large numbers that they ended up pushing aside the old citizens and their society, since they could not generate enough jobs for those who were arriving in uncontrolled waves.

Currently, we face difficulties that are similar to those that Rome had for centuries, and failed to solve. They even tried to install doors to the Empire and guard them, but were unsuccessful. We are now applying the same solutions, and without a doubt, will obtain the same results.

It is clear that the solution to the problem is not achieved by opening the doors to let in all of those fleeing from the wars and hunger to which their governments have lead them, because this ends up destroying the world that welcomes them. First, many people cannot become integrated with the new country, and second, the host society feels assaulted by the ghettos they form. That is what happened to Rome; although it had a very solid political and social structure that has remained to this day, many of those who came in were refractory to the civilization that was giving them shelter, just like it is happening now. Let us not make the same mistakes.

Another solution that does not work is when countries of the so called "First World" transfer to other countries part of their economic resources derived from taxes imposed to their citizens. If those resources are not controlled or distributed by the donors themselves — something that can only be achieved by the use of force, which is something that cannot be proposed —, not only do they not reach the people in need, but actually serve to finance corruption and keep the same rulers who are condemning their people to poverty, in power.

It is a widespread "fad" among western nations to blame each other for the ills of the Third World. Maybe it's a sense of guilt due to their own welfare, when confronted with the devastating images from other countries that are seen every day by way of the media. However, it is likely that the feelings of guilt would vanish by travelling to those countries and seeing how little a human life is worth to their leaders, and how their governments spend almost all of their resources in the purchase of weapons to fight their neighbors and hold on to power. For example, they would be amazed at how racist the Mauritians are and how they enslave everyone who comes to their country fleeing from the tribal wars

prevalent in the neighboring countries. They would be amazed by how, at best, the governments that direct them, do so with medieval criteria, including the "droit de seigneur" (a putative legal right allowing the lord of a medieval estate to take the virginity of his serfs' maiden daughters). They would probably be shocked to see how, in many countries in Africa, Asia and America, the ruling classes, without batting an eye, accumulate vast personal fortunes at the expense, in large part, of the dollars that come to them through the International Monetary Fund, with the intention of contributing to the development of their country. These funds, however, are not used to that end, but rather for the personal accumulation of wealth and for subsidies whose only purpose is to hide the corruption of vote purchases. However, when the time comes to repay the loans — something that, they normally don't do —, they find ways to mobilize well intentioned people from around the world, calling for the cancellation of the debt, blaming it on the misery of these countries, and not the fraudulent misuse of the money received by their governments.

The philosophy of ***The Record*** is clear on this point. As long as there are nations and governments with these characteristics, there will be no solutions for these countries. Consequently, it must be the citizens of those countries who must rebel against their leaders. The solution cannot be reached by means of some type of liberation war led by foreigners, or by way of the impoverishment of the West, which, given the size of the problem, it would be impossible to resolve the plight of those without sinking in the attempt — as it happened to Rome — or without severely affecting the welfare of its citizens, which, on the other hand, is something they are not willing to accept. The people themselves have to walk the path, led by the most restless minorities, who, from within, should start the Revolution to get their societies out of the Middle Ages, as Europe did centuries ago.

Such minorities should have all our sympathy and support, and must be able to replace the corrupt governments and systems that run them, and resolutely take the path of progress and social justice.

Human migration has always existed and will continue to exist, as long as the Earth is our common living place. People search individually for a way to survive in lands that provide the means to do it. When it is one person or several thousands that are looking for an opportunity, we find ourselves with a tolerable migration, as they usually end up being integrated within

the nation that receive them. However, when millions come in, in a disorderly way, we face an invasion, which is unacceptable by the host society and one that will generate all kinds of adverse reactions.

If universalism ever becomes a reality, such as in the story presented by ***The Record***, it would help to permanently solve this serious problem, as the system would gradually integrate all countries. For this to happen, leadership training cadres and commanders must be set up to lead the new society that the Third World nations need in order to get out of their long prostration. They would also need to replace the current leaders, as they would never be willing to promote any changes from which they cannot expect to receive any personal gain. It will have to be new men who lead their people down the path of progress and dignity.

## **VIII**

### **Science**

While abandoning the search for the great questions of life, which is the basis of philosophy, man tries to study the how, which is the role of science and its main consequence: technology.

Bones, and the carved stones cut by primitive man, as tools for hunting and cutting, are the earliest known evidence of technology. From those primitive times and the coming of the computer age along with the development of spacecraft, man has come a long way.

Science and technology have largely fulfilled their ultimate goal, which is to make man's life on Earth easier and more comfortable. Had we been capable of perfectly adapting to our environment, the development of these skills might not have been necessary. However, since we are not that type of animal, like say, a dolphin, the technological discoveries have become one of the main causes of our survival as a race. Without them, we probably would not have gone past the prehistoric stage and we might be one of the many species that have disappeared from the face of the planet.

But, man displayed a wide range of resources and technical skills to overcome hunger, cold, disease and distances. Every scientific discovery, with its inevitable advances and retreats, became the starting point for a new discovery, and in many of them effective ways were found to facilitate man's life on this planet.

It is possible that in the future we continue to be amazed by, and derive benefits from, the new discoveries and scientific advances such as anti-gravity, that will allow us to fly like birds and bring us closer to the rest of the universe, effective vaccines and drugs to fight the major plagues and diseases that continue to haunt us. This will extend our lives and allow us to develop crops that have greater production capacity, which will provide food for the ever-growing population, inexhaustible and clean energy such as hydrogen, which will replace the current contaminating fossil fuels, etc. But science must also urgently correct its dark side. We must not forget that many inventions are derived from research done for military purposes, or, more specifically, for the extermination of man. Occupying an

obvious prominent place in this category are the atomic bomb and its derivatives, the hydrogen and cobalt bombs.

One has to wonder then, if science and technology have made survival possible for man, an animal incapable of adapting to the environment, will they also end up becoming his executioner. It would be a cruel irony for History! Nature has endowed us with skills that can lead us to the stars, but has also led us to the Holocaust.

Biotechnology, which is still in its infant stage, is another area that we need to control, if we do not want our society to turn into the setting outlined by ***"Brave New World"***.

Ultimately, the way such knowledge is used is man's responsibility. However, in principle, we don't have many reasons to be optimistic. In any case, it seems logical to conclude that nuclear weapons, and the science that makes them possible, will only be useless when wars disappear, and for this to happen, countries must be eliminated. Let's start doing this.

Technology has also created a collateral effect that should not be overlooked. Although it has managed to strengthen the presence of man on Earth, it has also made the individual more vulnerable, less independent. Think about how helpless we feel when there is a simple blackout and everything stops working. This occurs because electricity (like so many things) comes of shared specialized knowledge and expertise, which no one, individually, dominates in its totality.

We have definitely created a much more complex world which appears to be the price of what we call progress. I do not know if you feel the same, but now more than ever, I miss the simplicity of freshly made bread, the conversations around the fire in the winter evenings, ample spaces and the quiet life. But this return would surely be a true utopia ... or would it?

## **IX**

### **Anti-Globalization**

Following the subject of the book, it seems logical that we stop to analyze the recent movement that we know as anti-globalization.

This movement, which takes advantage of the universalization of communications, is born chronologically after the failure of communism in the former Soviet Union and its subsequent fall, which left millions of people all over the world without a political reference point. Due to the way they had been educated, these people could not just jump into capitalism, its traditional enemy. Some did, however, and were catalogued as wild converts. The rest sought another flag that would funnel their social frustrations and concerns for the injustice and inequality that exists all over the world. They found it in anti-globalization.

This has merged different human groups, in addition to those already mentioned, that have a variety of concerns: radical nationalists, religious extremists, anti-system groups, dissatisfied farmers, pacifists, some environmentalists, and many well-meaning individuals. The result is a colorful and diverse set whose elements only have common notes in their marked activity level and the fact that they blame a currently non-existent globalization, for all earthly problems.

A brief analysis of these groups will give us some insight as to the motivations that move them to join the anti-globalization movement. The old communists see globalization as the failure of the philosophy they believe in, and the success of capitalism, which they consider an insult. This awakens in them a revanchist spirit that is manifested, among others, in an anti-Americanism that is both visceral and irrational.

Radical nationalists perceive it as the end of their dream of becoming the masters of their respective tribes.

Religious extremists are concerned about the possible loss of the power they have over the spirit and mind of their followers, if they come in contact with other values.

The anti-system groups integrate as a result of a mixture of residual movements, ranging from anarchism to fascism, with multi-faceted arguments that are contradictory within themselves.

European farmers join this current for fear of losing their privileges and welfare because of any eventual economic concessions that their politicians could give to their counterparts of the Third World.

Finally, the pacifist and environmental groups blame hunger, war and environmental degradation on globalization.

Now, do their approaches and concerns have some profound reasoning? Let's think about that. The arguments of the old communist are based primarily on emotional and visceral concepts. They grew up within a regime that educated them with the idea that their world was the best, and that capitalism was its decaying rival, and, according to the official propaganda of the time, it was about to collapse. Reality however, showed them that everything around them faded, and that paradoxically, the old enemy was still standing. Melancholy moves them to blame the failure of the system on the men who directed them, rather than analyzing the root causes leading a failure which is really the result of a political philosophy that shuts down the liberty and creativity of man as an individual.

Radical nationalists, especially the violent ones, have cause to worry about the universalistic tendency, since it represents the antithesis of the exclusivist, conservative, racist and tribal concepts that they embody. On the other hand, those who see nationalism as respect and maintenance for the culture of a nation should not see an enemy in universalization, because if they are not capable of respecting the peculiarities of each individual, their revolution is probably condemned to failure. The diversity and mixture of cultures enrich humanity as a whole.

Many religious extremists are convinced that, in a globalized world, their "truths" will be windswept by union, and they will lose their earthly power and the control over the people they subjugate. An example of this can be seen in Islamic countries, where religious leaders maximize their positions under any excuse, promoting terrorist actions whenever one of their countries starts a slight movement wanting to modernize and wanting to get out of the Middle Ages. Universalization should never involve the disappearance of religion, only its excesses. Governments must respect

religions and maintain a secular nation that constitutionally guarantees freedom of religion to all its citizens.

Without losing sight of their value as the alarm voices of our consciences, the anti-system groups show such a variety of principles and colors that they are difficult to categorize. However, we want to separate the fascist movements that blend in with them, because, in fact, they often bring together false and fanatical nationalists, far removed from the large numbers acting in good faith, that are truly sensitized by human suffering.

All in all, the positions that deserve more attention and in-depth analysis, within the anti-globalization movement are those represented by farmer associations of rich countries, pacifists and environmental groups.

The first, manifest an unfounded fear that globalization might bring negative consequences to the economies of richer countries. This is not how it should be. The countries of the world should unite gradually, and this must involve a matching of the legal framework, particularly in reference to the social and fiscal rights and obligations of the workers and employers. A legal system that will balance the production costs under equality conditions for all the regions on Earth. This way, it prevents those that, for lack of labor rights, attempt to gain economic advantages via the laws of some nations, which will go so far as to tolerate slavery. For this reason, protective import tariffs should not be lifted until the legal equality is a reality among those countries that want to be a part of universalism. In a way similar to those that want to join the European Union, every nation that wants to become a part of this must meet certain requirements, designed to prevent a negative impact to the other members. Evidently, every case must be provided a transitional period for adaptation. This is the key to avoiding unnecessary losses during the merging of nations, in the end, everyone will benefit from the implementation.

Rich nations will take advantage of opportunities provided by a borderless market, and with billions of free consumers with a rising purchasing power; this will mean a marketing field for their products beyond the imagination. Presently, just a billion citizens have a certain amount of purchasing power and a dignified living standard. In turn, universalization will create a potential market of more than six billion people, meaning that wealth would multiply six times, to satisfy the required needs. In order to meet this enormous demand, it would be essential to have the active



participation of all the citizens of the current underdeveloped nations, and also the availability of their raw materials, which would be revalued due to the dramatic increase in their demand. In turn, this would result in the creation of hundreds of millions of new jobs throughout the globe, and at the same time, an increase of the standard of living of their countries.

This is not a dream. It is the inevitable consequence of legal, financial and labor harmonization, within a universal Constitution, which would emerge after the disappearance of nations and the integration of these into a single world country. That was the Revolution of the first Authority.

The mistake made by the anti-globalization movement as well as the left-wing parties, was to ask for the distribution of existing wealth, instead of promoting the creation of more. If we do not help wealth grow, many people in the "First World" might come to feel that the poorer countries are being helped at their expense and they would feel attacked. This is the situation with farmers, who are feeling that the level of welfare and social rights that they have reached after years of struggle is being threatened. They would understand that funding of the Third World would be made through the import of raw material and agricultural commodities from the poorest countries, which can produce them at a lower cost, not having the same level of wage demands, taxes and labor. Seeing its future threatened, they engage in this war.

Given its importance, it would be interesting to dig a little deeper into this idea. The problems of the Third World nations are not due to the fact that some regions of the world are rich and others poor. The concept that wealth is a whole is dangerously wrong, as it means that if one has more, the other has less. Reality, however, is very different. The creation of wealth is only limited by the industriousness, organization, ingenuity and production capacity of the people that generate it. Just a century ago, the number of people on Earth who enjoyed a reasonable standard of living represented about 40% of the current number. The increased level of wellbeing of millions of citizens has been achieved through the generation of new wealth (GDP have multiplied in many countries) and this new wealth has not been subtracted from those who had previously achieved high levels of prosperity. We must stay on this road if we want to solve the serious poverty problems that plague the planet. This must be done without impoverishing those that are more developed; who should not be

discouraged, so as to have their cooperation, which is required to carry out this Revolution.

The governments of many underdeveloped countries blame the poverty of their people on the lack of solidarity of Western countries and on the historical pillage of colonial times. Naturally, shifting the blame is easier than self-evaluating its own deficient and corrupt administration, which is the true cause of their misery. Helping the Third World countries can only be done by gradually incorporating it into ours, as conditions of equal rights and obligations slowly set in for one and the other. It is a path that must be walked with determination. If we are capable of convincing ourselves that with alms, which is what we currently give, all we do is throw a few drops of water onto the seas of human needs, which, ironically, don't even reach those people for which they are intended. In reality, all this merely serves to ease our consciences, which have been made to feel guilty by demagoguery and propaganda. Only equal rights and the disappearance of nations will allow putting an end to this sad and tragic reality of existing inequalities once and for all.

In conclusion, the path to globalization must be gradually travelled by those nations that freely choose to do so. However, before joining and to begin receiving aid from countries that are already incorporated, they have the obligation to harmonize their legal frameworks with the most productive nations on Earth and with social demands that have been established by them to protect their citizens. In short, for countries to be equal, they must rise to meet the higher standards, not the opposite. This is what is actually meant when speaking of the distribution of wealth. Therefore, let us not fight globalization, as it is not the enemy. Let us fight, instead, to make the Earth a permanent home of free and organized people in one equalitarian Country.

More than likely, pacifists and environmentalists will agree that the only way to end wars and the deterioration of nature is through the termination of the current system of Nations, given the inability of countries to enter into global agreements regarding issues that concern them. As long as there is a piece of land that is separated from the others and a flag representing it, there will be wars, and as long as multiple governments exist, we will not be able to reach a global environmental agreement.

Universalism means no more wars, and no more armies, because once nations disappear as a political concept, territorial enemies will cease to exist, and there will be no one to fight against. The history of man during tens of thousands of years has taught us that dialogue and goodwill have never been enough to prevent wars. Universalism on the other hand, does not have to negotiate with governments the basic principles, such as environmentalism. It would be able to confer constitutional status and avoid erratic or permissive behaviors.

"For once, let us learn from history and do away with the root cause of these serious problems, which is the existence of countries as exclusive territories. To achieve this, we need the active participation of all men and women of goodwill, with the necessary determination to struggle for the dream of a better world."

This is what First Authority would say.

## X

### The World Proposed by “The Record”

The universalism we see in *The Record* does not aspire a perfect world for the simple fact that man himself is not perfect. Even so, this utopia of perfection should always remain alive in the dreams of people, but we must also maintain the necessary sense of reality to prevent non-attainment from leading to frustrations.

In the constitution approved by the Cortes of Cadiz in 1812 it said: "Everyone has the right to happiness." This beautiful principle turned out to be nothing more than a sterile statement of good intentions. However, if we rescue its ultimate intention, we could propose this to the new world: "The Government cannot provide happiness, as it is a personal and individual thing, but, it must create the framework for it to be possible, by eliminating wars and ensuring the satisfaction of man's basic needs, such as food, shelter, education, health, employment and equal justice."

The proposals for the new humanity as presented on *The Record* are based on that principle. To fully understand it, we must learn from History and not from propaganda. We must never lose sight of History because it is our best source of knowledge about how we are, and not how we think we are.

As a result of misinformation, we tend to think that present societies are more advanced than those of the past. This is totally false as the path of human evolution on Earth is dotted with continuous forward and backward steps. Just think back to the Middle Ages and the disappearance of the entire social, technical, political and even the school of thought, that had been accomplished by Greeks and Romans. You can also compare the degree of progress achieved by Islam centuries ago and the sorry state in which they find themselves today. Many societies reached a high degree of development and, later, for one reason or another, fell into the deepest decline. Perhaps the behavior of these societies is identical to that of man as an individual; you are born, you grow up, you mature and then you die.

But let's not allow this thought to plunge us into a melancholic state. History has also left us enough clues to deduce that, when man is organized in accordance with sound and coherent structures, and feeds

good values with which to grow, societies are able to transcend with time. For example, for the European society of the XV century, the Renaissance meant a big blow to the age of conformity, as they recovered the values of the classical world, which was the beginning of the end of the Dark Ages. We are still following that path of evolution, with varying degrees of success at different times. In fact, universalism should be the natural goal of this development and the beginning of a new humanity. If this were to be implanted, the effects would be deep and immediate. Wars, in particular, would disappear. In the absence of nations, there would be no flags to fly against others. This would also eliminate the risk of man disappearing from the face of the Earth due to the possible use of weapons of mass destruction. These would be entirely eliminated; including the knowledge that makes them possible.

With the elimination of wars, the hundreds of armies in the world disappear as well, as they would be completely unnecessary.

The huge amount of funds no longer used to sustain warfare will allow the world government to feed and build decent housing for all inhabitants of the planet, and help the most underdeveloped countries reach the same level as those with the most progress, without the citizens feeling that their economies are negatively affected.

As a result of this, the current migration, born by the need to survive, will disappear, and with it, any conflicts produced by the inability of the migrants to adapt to the host society. People would be free to settle in whichever place on Earth they choose and is best suited for the pursuit of their dreams, not pressured by the shortcomings of their region.

It is a beautiful dream! Don't you agree, dear reader? Well, actually, it is a simple consequence of the disappearance of borders, to be followed by the forced retirement of hundreds of governments, wars and armies. More than likely, you agree that the idea is worth fighting for.

Let's continue visualizing the new world to be born of the Revolution as proposed by ***The Record***. Since people would be free to move around the planet without being hampered by the existence of borders, with the passage of time and as a result of natural evolution, a common language would be born. This new language, a merging of many existing ones, will facilitate understanding among all citizens.

Trade would have a true global profile and, by the effect of communicating vessels, and not being subjected to border barriers, the economic levels of all people will tend to balance out. Let's see what History teaches us about this. In fact, let's look at History as it is being made in our current time. With the great effort and reluctance of many "patriots", Europe is walking the path of unity, and we can see that it is producing a steady balance between income levels in different countries. Finding no obstacles to sell their products, underdeveloped nations increase their wealth, but without negative consequences predicted by opponents of all unitary movement, who insist that it would be at the expense of the wealthiest nations. In fact, the wealthiest nations are also benefiting by participating in a much bigger free market, with increasing purchasing power and without protective barriers. But Europe must also move forward towards a political merger, overcoming their fears and historic rivalries. Despite what is heard from certain official circles, the resistance to unite does not stem from the people but rather from politicians whose greater interest is maintaining their share of power. For the most part, when, without nationalistic propaganda, the people understand the benefits of uniting, they have a high predisposition to quickly walk the path of unification. They are not quite able to understand why, if the European territory becomes one single market, should there not also be a single government which cohesions and represents different regions, as long as they respect the idiosyncrasies of the people.

In any case, it's obvious that the path is opening in this old continent, which has historically been the birthplace of almost all the ideas that move the world.

Another consequence of the Revolution would be the creation of a global currency, which would further facilitate trade between peoples, as this would do away with the cumbersome and expensive exchange rates. The European experience is also being positive in this regard, just as the U.S. has been doing for so long.

One of the great fears of the affluent and even the working class in Western countries is losing their labor rights regarding developing countries and especially, the Third World. But this does not necessarily have to be so. The current reality of the economic and legal aspects of a non-globalized world is leading many multinationals to set up their factories in countries

where those rights have so little consistency that the labor paid is comparable in conditions to those of slave societies. Their goal is simple: reduce the cost of production in order to compete with products made by these same countries in the Third World.

Let's see an example: As a result of a series of agreements with the countries of the European Union, Morocco currently sells large quantities of fruit and vegetables to Europe. The rights of the European workers are unthinkable in today's Alawite State, such as social security, unemployment benefits, health insurance, retirement funds, and so on. These rights have an impact on business costs and make the end product more expensive than if produced in Morocco. Consequently, if a European businessman who is doomed to disappear as a result of such unfair (yet legal) competition, wishes to survive, he will be forced to move production to North Africa and from there, continue to sell his products in the old continent taking advantage of existing treaties. Many criticize this position claiming patriotic reasons, while others support it, naively arguing that this is generating wealth in the Third World. What they fail to see is that, in return, they are creating unemployment in their own country. It's like the old adage, "Robbing Peter to pay Paul". Ultimately, like it or not, these individual behaviors find their logic in the very existence of the countries, which have totally different legal regulations, making these inequalities possible.

The existence of a single government in the world would require the harmonization, theoretical and practical, of the fundamental rules of coexistence, and equal rights and duties for all the citizens of the Earth. This would come forth from a single Constitution, allowing each region certain rules and regulatory capacity, as long as these are not in conflict with higher laws, as contained in the Constitution or laws passed by the World Senate.

This equality, whose effective implementation would be the responsibility of the judges, would suppress undesirable economic or personal practices. Offshore tax and labor havens would cease to exist, including slavery, which is still present in many parts of the world. Logically, companies would disperse around the globe for strategic reasons, in order to bring their processing centers to those that consume or produce raw materials, in order to save on transportation costs, rather than seeking cheap labor.

If the Southern Cone of Latin America is rich in cereals or copper, manufacturing companies would find it profitable to finalize these products in that region. If North Africa has a great capacity to produce fruit and vegetables, the interest to establish local facilities would be logical. In each case, wealth would be created in the areas of origin of the products. This would also reasonably increase the work in various impoverished regions of the world, and thus create hundreds of millions of new consumers with purchasing power. In turn, the regions that are more technologically advanced would increase the market for their products, allowing them to maintain their standard of living.

Unequivocally, History has shown that when markets and production of goods unite, wealth increases for all, and in the medium term, the living standards of the poorest, approach that of the wealthy without major trauma. Just the opposite happens when the economy is socialized: it equals, but on the low side.

Another consequence that comes with universalism is the specialization of the old countries in the production of goods. Each one of them would base its main livelihood on a certain type of industry (agriculture, livestock, technology, tourism, etc.). This is not a perverse byproduct of globalization, but quite the contrary, as it will increase and improve the means of production at lower costs, making them affordable for a greater number of consumers, thereby encouraging trade between all. In short, if we raise the income of all the inhabitants of the planet, we will face a market of over six billion consumers without money restrictions, which will benefit both the poor and rich countries of today.

The world government would develop the legal framework that would make free enterprise and trade possible, with equal working conditions for all the workers on the planet, and would be responsible for monitoring and controlling its effective compliance. The benefit would be immeasurable because it would equate the rights of men and eradicate hunger, brutal inequalities, migration trauma and the injustice that the market can generate.

It is important to emphasize that the world government must act as judge and arbitrator, and not as a business, an activity that must rely on the freedom of citizens and the good sense of the markets as they themselves demand and regulate the goods they want to produce. However, the



government and judges must strive to control all the agents involved in the economic exchange, to avoid creating groups that are so powerful that they may eventually become an anti-establishment movement without social control. This must be guaranteed with the approval a hard, clear legislation that limits the growth of the financial groups that control companies, and equally tough rules against any monopolistic situation.

Another key role of the state must be to correct, through taxes, the inequities that this globalized and liberalized economy might create, in order to protect the lower classes. However, this must be done carefully, while avoiding that they become a class of passive, selfish and endless consumers of resources from the productive classes. They must be encouraged and allowed access to dignified work.

The transition to the incorporation of all nations to universalism is quite possible, at a level that at present, we can barely imagine. With the immense economic resources that would be gradually released as hundreds of governments around the world disappeared, along with their armies. Moreover, in all likelihood, taxes would tend to decrease, so that there would be more wealth in the hands of citizens and this would increase the standard of living in all areas of the Earth. As a result, the demand for goods would grow, which would increase the number of new workers and entrepreneurs by hundreds of millions, in order to meet this demand. This would make all state expenditures more bearable for all by increasing the number of taxpayers.

Another major problem that afflicts humanity is related to the environment and so far it has been unsolvable due to the apparent inability of governments to reach agreements. If neighboring industries are destroying a country's forests, what can the current rulers do other than protest? The government of the polluting country will not stop their production companies, for the obvious consequences of unemployment and poverty this would have on its citizens. This behavior, on the other hand, is independent of whether it is a dictatorial state or a democratic one, because in today's world we have more than enough examples of both, with identical behaviors. However, it is only logical: no ruler wants to make unpopular decisions that would surely mean his political ruin.

Unfortunately, on the other hand, pollution moves faster than the decision to use existing technology to minimize it, as it makes manufacturing

processes more expensive. What does this mean in today's world? It means that if a government forces its industries to apply the technology to prevent contamination in their factories and others do not, the second will monopolize the market as they will produce goods at a lower cost, so that we will be penalizing the one that expresses concern about the environment and rewarding those that are taking no action to control pollution. Again we are faced with the need for a single legislation to address a universal problem. If the rule was the same for everyone, no one could exploit the existence of ecological "havens" for their benefit, and it would avoid the unfair competition that rewards the transgressor.

This common legal framework would have the same utility to eliminate tax havens, terrorist strongholds - which are usually rooted in religious or nationalist movements - and many other injustices and suffering that are due to the existence of countries with different laws, created for the convenience of a particular country, without the slightest concern for how it may affect the rest of humanity. These myopic and selfish behaviors that jeopardize man as a species, can only be eradicated by a broad understanding of the Earth as a unique and common place for all of us to coexist.

However, the world of universalism, organized around a strictly secular State, must be exquisitely respectful of religions and the customs of all people, provided these do not conflict with the dignity and/or life of others. Ablation, for example, cannot be practiced under any cultural pretext. Women should have the same rights and obligations as men, even if the rules or customs of a region say otherwise. No religion can advocate war as an element of imposing "their truth". All those that exhibited or promote these behaviors, by violating the human rights that the Universalist Constitution has established for all men, should be prosecuted as mere criminals. However, it is expected that, as the implementation of Universalist thought makes progress, these cultural aberrations would disappear. Obviously, the education of the people has a lot to say and do in this regard.

The science and technology that have so greatly helped to improve the quality of life for mankind should be at our service and not become an end to serve themselves. Their objective should be to combat disease and pain, improve living conditions, and not to alienate human beings from nature by creating artificial worlds that undoubtedly contribute to their

unhappiness. When man recovers his intimate relationship with nature, he will slow down and will therefore be better able to savor life. It amazes me to see how we are fascinated by speed – whether it's a car, a projectile or a computer -, and we mystify it as an indisputable value. I not only wonder why we are going so fast, I also wonder where are we going?

In conclusion, this is the world proposed by ***The Record***, which is more than just a dream. It is a necessity if we are to have a future as a species and as individuals. So each and every one of us should go back to being the protagonists of our own lives, and thus continue being the protagonists of our hopes.

THE END

***Free***editorial 