

"As borders are modified, more important changes will occur inside nations, thus between them. The idea of a nation state will be significantly different from what is widely accepted today, thus assumed natural at the moment and over the course of accepted human history.

The human notion that nations can come together to cooperate holds nearly universal appeal. Almost anyone aware of nations will agree to even a limited extent, that nations coming together is a positive development, a good idea.

The challenge with this view is the same as proclaiming support for clean water; who would oppose it?

Thus mankind will come to a place in Earth history where the reality of human nature will crash into the reality of human emotional preferences.

The coming changes are best understood after a brief background of national development is examined, which all of you can do independently of our words, if you have not studied this already. None of you reading here today came to learn from us what humans already have and offer as a topic or course of study; you may do this yourself.

Human habits, thus customs, then traditions which lead to the form, manner and application of governance are what create the beginnings of a nation. Once development and growth lead to establishment of land control, differences between lands are emphasized as generations proceed. Human nature has not focused upon commonality to nearly the degree it places attention. Much attention, on differences between nations.

The obstacle of human nature which prevents closer approximation, and in fact promotes separation between peoples and even within a political group, is resistance to change. It is costly and difficult personally, to relinquish habits or come under pressure to set them aside and use temporary replacement methods or procedures.

The example of Canada in the continent of North America can be compared to a much larger and much more diverse India. How does such a larger population in the latter coordinate so many languages yet remain unified, the vast majority of citizens among all the larger and smaller groups, not only accepting of the arrangements but supportive. The nation was divided, creating a new one and this was motivated by religion, yet the same religion which dominates in Pakistan is also well represented in India.

The former example involves a much smaller population and but two languages. No religious issues cloud the matter in any way; nobody in Canada is even mildly concerned about differences in religion not involving them personally; it is voluntary, entirely a participant's choice. S/he who chooses to avoid religion, may do so. Outside of an immediate family or congregation, this matter receives scant attention.

Likewise, many other aspects of society are similar across the nation; motor vehicles, houses, commercial buildings, banking procedures. The list is not short. The issue upon which the differences turn is language, the speakers of French resisting the pressure to conform to another language as a condition of continued membership in the nation. Because many people in the smaller region voluntarily learned to use language of the larger region, pressure mounted to eliminate the less dominant language from government. This was perceived as the beginning of the erasure of the French language from daily life. The habits and customs introduced by the Europeans who brought the language would soon be homogenized into disappearance. As you will note, the use of French in Canada has not diminished, even the nation's current Prime Minister learned to use it simultaneously with English.

The idea nations should have better relations means, in practice, compromise. What is intentionally relinquished by & among humans for nothing? Thus improved relations, in practice means getting and giving, or giving to get. Individual inhabitant residents of a nation, what humans call citizens, cannot negotiate an agreement for their nation until a government is organized with consent or coercion.

How much, in the modern world as humans see the year 2020 to be, can a designated trade negotiator please every constituent without eroding some portion of voluntary support which first delegated the authority? S/he who complains is often the loudest among the few, if not the sole voice on the matter. The elected officials want voter support, not disagreement and thus complaints are examined, even if unacknowledged by them to the complainant.

This turns to governments and reach, which are fading as you these words read. The attempt in Europe to create regional government revealed the nature of a controlling organization; it naturally seeks to expand its control. This natural evolution of individual human nature, which is to control hunger, food production, temperature and so forth, defeats itself when its intrusion into areas already addressed create conflict. Because the organization's purpose is control, it naturally exerts this upon the underlying conflict.

Throughout human history, including large portions of which humans alive today are currently unaware, attempts to reel in a growing central authority have been unsuccessful. The effort either collapses from intentionally gained weight, or is attacked and brought down by outsider invaders.

When physical movement and general transportation across larger and larger distances become materially difficult, the role of centralized government will fade. The aspects discussed above will be ever less relevant. Many humans will adopt a skeptical view towards a centralized authority, versus today where the view oscillates between skeptical to approving, based on personal likeability to and observer, of the ruling group and/or leader.

Democracy will remain and even become stronger on Earth, because lesser consequences will be possible or result from creation and operation of central authorities.

The dislike of certain leaders, such the current President of the USA Donald Trump, is a manifestation of the personal control issue now being felt more strongly and which shall be felt

even more. What the observer feels is valid yet misplaced. You who dislike Mr. Trump want more control to achieve something you believe is important and you believe the central authority should either deliver it, reduce resistance or just stop prohibiting.

The reality is, a central authority only delivers to you what it has already taken from you, and carries out a charade of keeping enough distance between the forced donation —confiscation— and the recipient, in order to mask the true nature of the process. Doing so allows the government to disguise its Robin Hood role thus perpetuate its existence, growth and ever expanding authority.

The smaller a government, the less possible is this and more control remains with the citizen. Along with this enhanced citizen role comes responsibility, something political leaders have increasingly attempted to reduce for certain targeted voting blocs, the goal being the purchase of votes thus elected positions.

National governments will devolve into far smaller entities than exist currently, virtually everywhere on Earth. Curiously communications will improve, information flow and type will also be enhanced yet interactions will diminish. Fewer coordinated movements, far less human migration and/or visitation, far less trade between nations and a rapid disappearance of warlike tendencies will come to dominate government.

Humans will set aside the career politician, as will fade the family dynasty. Royalty will remain as it has become, symbolic figureheads who project national pride and the image of tradition but do little else to cause effects.

Local organization will be emphasized well ahead of the regional or national, the latter two of these shrinking as emphasis falls way from them, the cycle feeding on itself.

Human life will be forced local; a great choice awaits. How will you all seek to organize your activities with and around your newfound control and authority? An exciting phase shall it be."