

### 3.2.2.3.2.94 Imagining the destruction of the USA

I have no sympathy for the world social order as it is propagated by the world's ideological lead nation, the United States of America, a country that has been founded and designed by Christian zealots, and that doesn't find it ridiculous to elect Christian zealots as their presidents. I am in favor of a radically different world social order one that is biologically more adequate.

I am not alone in having no sympathy for the social and moral order for which the United States of America stand, though the motives of the majority of the world's population that hates the US have different origins. They want the United States of America destroyed and its social and moral values dumped not because they would contradict a philosophy based on biological understanding.

They want the United States of America destroyed because they simply bank on change. If there is turmoil, those who are on the top will be toppled, and a new set will be washed to the top. Maybe, just maybe, this will be of benefit.

While one can encounter such hopes everywhere in the Third World, they are, of course, not realistic. There is nothing in sight that could shake, let alone topple, the global dominance (politically, militarily, economically, socially, and morally) of the United States of America. Which doesn't prevent people to silently or openly cheer Osama Bin Laden (at least he dares).

It's not just the populations in Islamic countries where Osama Bin Laden would win any popularity contest against George W. Bush. Which doesn't mean that these people would prefer the kind of social order Osama Bin Laden stands for.

Because everybody who understands the most basic rules of arithmetics knows that when two fight, the benefits are usually with the third. Or, if there is destruction all around, and one can personally stay out of harm's way, then, in a way, one is among those who will profit.

Consider a scenario in which all of the United States of America, including its people and infrastructure, were destroyed in a huge

earthquake. A radically new world would be in place the next morning. Many people in Third World countries would find this most exciting. And why not wipe Europe from the world map at the same time.

Never mind that thereafter, antibiotics, and even rice, will be in short supply. All of that would not matter in exchange for the opportunity to live in such exciting times.

Because it is inherently benefiting the poor (or those whose concerns are not represented in a status quo) if mischief befalls the rich (or those who represent the status quo) many people, even in the West, or in rich countries of the East, enjoy hearing or reading news of destruction.

That is why in any newsroom, bad news is good news. The worse, the better. Because that's what people want to read or hear about.

The yellow press lives of the problems of celebrities (serves them right, why are they so rich and famous!).

And for the news desk, it's terrorism, turmoil, and tsunamis. Because in readers and viewers, all of this keeps the flame of hope alive that there once will be the big upheaval that changes it all, and that there will be an end to frustration and boredom, and that for once, one oneself will be among the lucky ones.