

EASTERN NOBLES ARE MUCH LESS LIKELY TO COMMIT UNETHICAL CONDUCT THAN ALMOST ANYONE IN WEST

East produced the world's earliest Civilisations, and so the Nobles of long aristocratic lines have gained various ways of deference from the crowds. They are held to be honourable and given deference by the crowds overall, and they stand to lose everything if they are considered unethical or dishonourable. The crowds in East had always been quite unbounded in their mistreatment of those fallen from grace. And this is quite frightening for Eastern Nobles. By comparison, West has been more lenient towards unethical nobles and more likely to give reverence to people with money.

It does not matter which is better. What matters is that it's a pretty good bet that Eastern Nobles will be less likely to engage in unethical activities especially in the East where the crowds can be merciless to one fallen from grace. I am Eastern Noble, so I have a clear understanding of the issues.

I want to establish organisations that are more like United Nations in its philosophy of serving the entire human race with universal ideals. These are close to my heart and I am quite serious about them. We don't have yet commercial for profit ventures with explicit UN-like universal service philosophy. This makes sense when a company does not actually serve the entire human race, but my proposal is explicitly to serve the entire human race. Thus in this case, a universalist UN-like philosophy is a need rather than a cosmetic decision.

There is space for companies of this sort in the global economy, and I think the success will be quite strong in the long run. We can fall back on the deep reasons for the justifiability of commercial exchange, which is positive reciprocity, an issue that is hidden and lost in theories of the firm in modern economic theory. You see, revenue is a shallow concept. The deeper concept is reciprocity. It is that party *A* gives something that is good for party *B* and party *B* then is willing to give up some of the valuable kiddles of his or hers to reciprocate. "Revenue" is shallow accounting. With service to eight billion people, the challenge is to ensure that party *A* actually provides something that is good and valuable for *B* and not a lot of hot air. Unlike traditional models of business, you cannot bullshit party *B* when it is the entire human race. You have to actually provide something valuable to everyone. Marketing is irrelevant. Party *B* here will know immediately and see through your 'marketing' because they can judge for themselves. We don't care about marketing beyond making sure that people know what we are offering.

1. DEEP EVOLUTIONARY GENETIC ROOTS OF MORAL STATURE IN HUMAN RACE

Human Moral Sentiments developed from millions of years of evolution till 75,000 years ago in Africa, from earlier primate ancestors, and this is still not grasped clearly today by evolutionary psychologists who do not understand clearly that

Date: July 18, 2021.

moral instincts evolved for millions of years and are significantly different for human beings with genetic basis than chimpanzees. So we are quite different from chimpanzees and gorillas in moral instincts, and it is moral instincts that have given rise to social distinctions in human race, not other sorts of things like dominance and power and possessions and physical prowess. Those things have had a strongly secondary role in development of social distinctions in human race. This is still extremely confusing for evolutionary psychology. But it's true.

Modern confusions from Marxist thought is that material things and possessions and wealth have an outsized influence on human societies. This is deeply wrong. They are window dressing to what drives human societies. They have some influence but by far the greatest influence is moral character and virtues of individuals. That is the driving force of human race. Then you have secondary effects, wealth and *deceiving others regarding your moral character*. Evolutionary scenario is that highest morally virtuous cats became considered noble, and gained wealth, but then there developed secondary effects of those who gain wealth and pretend to be noble. Bill Gates is a great example. The human intuition is deceived because the natural instincts is to hold higher virtues in higher esteem, and then wealth is associated with that and then there are imposters, those of ignoble virtues who only have wealth and no honour or virtue. This is a degenerate state for human societies. We are naturally nobility oriented in virtues and character.

Now Bill Gates is funny. He gained wealth, has zero virtues. He is morally not even the equivalent of a tadpole let alone a great human being. But he wants power and stature, so he is even more murderous and criminal to seek the stature having thrown himself to 'white superiority' as a clever rational play. He is truly a clown.