Paris conference in 1919 and the “Wilsonian concept” of the League of Nations were based on a more “democratic principle” where nations should be ruled “under law,” he says. This concept Bassin traces back to “Kantian humanism, the French Enlightenment, and to 17th-century empiricism,” especially to the influence of John Locke and the French philosopher Montesquieu.

When the U.N. was created in 1945, it contained “some elements of both the aristocratic and the democratic tradition,” he states. The influence from the democratic tradition can be seen in the U.N. Charter of Human Rights, based on the concept of the social contract as the 17th-century empiricists viewed it. The influence from the aristocratic tradition can be seen in the U.N. Security Council where the Great Powers are able to influence and direct the work of the U.N.

He explains that the 1945 concept is the best concept to use in the coming U.N. reform: “While it has to continue to accommodate the interests of the Great Powers, its long-term development objectives should conform to the liberal, humanist ideals of the charter.”

The new system of “international governance” should be based on the U.N. as a “proclaimer of international rules, norms and standards,” Bassin writes. The U.N. should therefore be able to use “aristocratic” methods to “enforce” these “international rules” in the future. To this end, the U.N. should be “the world’s police force and humanitarian rescue service,” and should have the capacity to “bind member states” to its decisions, according to Bassin.

**The philosophy of evil**

The truth is that there is no difference between these two philosophies, the one represented by Hobbes and the other by Locke. These two philosophies are nothing but pure evil, and a mixture of them in the form of a new “global governance” would be worse than a disaster for mankind.

Hobbes stated that whatever a king commands is right because the king commands it, and what the king forbids is wrong just because the king forbids it, and that the individual citizen never can claim that he knows what is right or wrong because “might makes right.” In his philosophy, natural law, a higher concept of right and wrong, does not exist. Therefore, according to Hobbes, we should obey the laws of God not because they are just and good but only because God has the power and commands us to obey his laws.

The philosophy of Locke is no better. He shared Hobbes’s basic idea of God. According to his “Essays Concerning Human Understanding” from 1690, God has given us laws and rules which we should obey because “we are his