

The Brain as the Ruler of the Body: A Model for Centralized Governance

Abstract

This paper delves into the concept that collective decision-making and participatory democracy are, in fact, an illusion orchestrated by powerful elites. These elites manipulate media and foster a specific ideological narrative that turns people into modern-day slaves. The paper argues that the ideals of "democracy" and "collective decision-making" are merely deceptive dreams imposed upon the public, making them bear the responsibility for societal flaws and inefficiencies, while the true power remains in the hands of small, unaccountable groups who govern from the shadows.

Through a philosophical and scientific lens, the paper explores how the presence of a centralized monarch or ruler—symbolizing order, unity, and power—could offer a viable solution to escape this collective illusion. By drawing upon philosophical, historical, and psychological principles, the paper demonstrates that collective decision-making is not only ineffective but, due to the inherent complexity of human societies, is easily manipulated by powerful factions. In contrast, centralized governance with a singular authority—ensuring transparency and accountability—can prevent corruption and hidden abuses, steering society toward higher, more achievable goals.

By examining historical, philosophical, and social science examples, the paper illustrates how media control and ideological manipulation trap the masses in false narratives, keeping them distanced from the true nature of power. Ultimately, the paper concludes that a return to the traditional concept of centralized rule—coupled with necessary reforms—could be a path to liberating society from this collective illusion, fostering true order and progress.

Introduction

Since the dawn of human civilization, humanity has continually sought the best means of governance and societal management. This quest is rooted in humanity's innate need for order, security, and progress. However, an essential question has always arisen along this journey: Can collective decision-making and public participation serve as an effective solution for governing the complex societies of today, or is this idea merely an illusion fabricated by the powerful elites who, behind the scenes, control media and create specific ideological narratives, transforming people into modern-day slaves?

This paper, adopting both a philosophical and scientific approach, seeks to examine this question and argues that the concepts of "democracy" and "collective decision-making" are, in

fact, illusions imposed upon society by powerful groups. These illusions not only obscure the inherent inefficiencies of collective decision-making, but they also shift the responsibility for societal failures onto the public, while the true power remains in the hands of small, unaccountable factions who govern from the shadows.

Philosophically, this idea can be traced back to the works of thinkers like Nietzsche and Foucault. Nietzsche, in *Thus Spoke Zarathustra*, introduces the concept of the "will to power," arguing that power always resides in the hands of a few individuals who strive to shape the values and beliefs of society. Foucault, in his theory of "power and knowledge," illustrates how power constructs social realities through the control of discourse and media, ensnaring the public in collective illusions.

From a scientific perspective, psychological and sociological research reveals that collective decision-making is often influenced by invisible forces, such as social pressures, cognitive biases, and media manipulation. For instance, the theory of "herd behavior" in social psychology demonstrates how individuals in groups tend to follow collective decisions without critical thought, even when those decisions may be misguided or harmful. This phenomenon starkly shows how collective decision-making can easily be exploited by powerful groups.

This paper examines historical, philosophical, and social science examples to illustrate how media control and the creation of specific ideological frameworks trap the masses in false narratives, keeping them distant from the true realities of power. In contrast, the paper argues that a return to the traditional concept of centralized rule—with the necessary reforms—could be a solution to liberate society from this collective illusion and restore real order.

The following sections will delve deeper into this idea, drawing upon historical, philosophical, and scientific evidence to demonstrate how the presence of a monarch or centralized ruler could serve as an efficient solution for establishing order, preventing corruption, and guiding society toward higher, more noble goals.

Section 1: The Brain as the Ruler of the Body; A Model for Centralized Governance

To better understand the necessity of a centralized ruler in society, we can look at the human body as a complex and organized system. The human body serves as a prime example of a system where all organs and limbs operate under the guidance and control of a single central power—the brain. As the ruler of the body, the brain is not only responsible for coordinating between the various parts, but it also makes vital decisions. This centralized system ensures that the body functions efficiently and harmoniously, responding appropriately to both internal and external threats.

If any part of the body were to act independently without the guidance of the brain, the result would be nothing short of chaos and destruction. For example, if the heart decided to beat irregularly without regard to the body's needs, or if the immune system, acting autonomously and without coordination with the brain, attacked healthy cells, the body would experience severe disturbances. This simple yet profound example shows that in a complex system, the presence of a centralized, unquestionable center of power is not only necessary but vital.

This model can be applied to society as well. A human society, as a complex and multi-layered system, requires a centralized power that can create order and coordination between its various components. In the absence of such a central authority, society would inevitably descend into chaos and disorder. While collective decision-making may appear democratic and participatory on the surface, in practice, it can lead to inefficiency and instability due to disagreements, personal interests, and cognitive biases. In such a scenario, a centralized ruler—much like the brain in the body—could serve as an effective solution to establish order and coordination.

Philosophically, this idea can be traced in the works of thinkers like Aristotle and Hobbes. In *Politics*, Aristotle argues that human society, like the body, requires a centralized leader who can establish order and coordination. Hobbes, in *Leviathan*, introduces the concept of the "social contract," asserting that humans, in order to escape the "state of war of all against all," must surrender their power to a centralized sovereign.

From a scientific perspective, research in the field of complex systems demonstrates that systems governed by a central authority are more efficient and stable. For example, in computer science, distributed systems governed by a central server are much more reliable and efficient than systems where decision-making is entirely decentralized.

Thus, the human body, as a complex and orderly system, provides a strong analogy for the necessity of a centralized ruler in society. Just as the brain, as the ruler of the body, creates order and coordination, a king or centralized ruler could serve as the key figure in bringing order to society and guiding it toward higher goals.

Section 2: The Order of the Galaxy and the Role of the Sun; Inspiration for Centralized Governance

Just as the human body, as a complex system, requires a centralized source of power, the natural world also provides numerous examples of systems in which order and coordination are only possible through the presence of a singular central authority. One of the most striking examples of this is the solar system, with the Sun serving as its center. The Sun, with its immense gravitational force, keeps the planets and celestial bodies in organized, stable orbits. Without

the Sun, the solar system would quickly descend into chaos, and the planets would drift aimlessly through the infinite void.

This natural example clearly illustrates that, in a complex system, the existence of a centralized center of power is not only necessary but is the foundational element for order and coordination. The Sun, as the ruler of the solar system, not only keeps the planets in their orbits but also provides energy and sustains life on Earth. This dual role—as both the source of order and the source of life—underscores the critical importance of a centralized authority in any complex system.

This model can be extended to human society. Just as the Sun functions as the center of the solar system, a king or centralized ruler could serve as the central authority in society, ensuring the creation of order and coordination. In the absence of such a central authority, society would inevitably move toward chaos and disorder. While collective decision-making may seem democratic and participatory on the surface, in practice, it can lead to inefficiency and instability due to disagreements, personal interests, and cognitive biases. In such a scenario, the presence of a centralized ruler—much like the Sun in the solar system—could serve as an effective solution for establishing order and coordination.

Philosophically, this concept can be traced in the works of thinkers like Plato and Nietzsche. In *The Republic*, Plato speaks of the concept of the "philosopher-king" and argues that only a wise, centralized ruler can bring order and justice to society. Nietzsche, in *The Will to Power*, discusses the concept of the "Übermensch" (Overman) and asserts that only a powerful, centralized leader can guide society toward higher, more noble goals.

From a scientific perspective, research in the fields of physics and planetary sciences shows that systems governed by a central power are more stable and efficient. For example, in astrophysics, binary star systems, in which one star serves as the central authority, are much more stable than systems where power is evenly distributed.

Thus, the solar system and the role of the Sun as its center provide a strong analogy for the necessity of a centralized ruler in society. Just as the Sun, as the ruler of the solar system, creates order and coordination, a king or centralized ruler can serve as the central force for organizing society, leading it toward higher and more meaningful goals.

Section 3: The Inefficiency of Collective Decision-Making; A Delusion in the Service of Hidden Powers

One of the greatest illusions of the modern era is the idea that collective and democratic decision-making can serve as an effective solution for governing complex societies. This

concept, often promoted under the banner of "democracy" or "government by the people," is, in reality, a delusion created by those in power who, behind the scenes, manipulate the media and shape specific ideological narratives to turn the masses into modern-day slaves. This section of the paper explores the inherent inefficiencies of collective decision-making and its role in serving the interests of hidden powers.

1. Inherent Inefficiency of Collective Decision-Making

Despite its seemingly democratic and participatory nature, collective decision-making is often inefficient and time-consuming. In such systems, differences of opinion, personal interests, and cognitive biases can rapidly disrupt the decision-making process. For instance, in a collective decision-making system, individuals may withhold their true opinions due to social pressures or fear of rejection. This phenomenon, known in social psychology as the "Spiral of Silence," demonstrates how collective decisions are often influenced by invisible and irrational forces.

Moreover, research in political science and behavioral economics suggests that collective decisions can lead to the "Tragedy of the Commons." In this phenomenon, individuals, motivated by personal gain, overuse shared resources, ultimately depleting them. This example clearly shows that in the absence of a centralized power, collective decision-making can result in social and economic disasters.

2. Collective Decision-Making as a Tool for Hidden Powers

Collective decisions are not only inefficient, but they can also easily be exploited by powerful groups. In fact, the idea that "the people decide" is often a falsehood created by those in power, who manipulate the media and create specific ideological frameworks to trap the masses in collective delusions.

For example, in the present era, mass media serves as a powerful tool in the hands of small, unaccountable groups. These media outlets, through the construction of specific discourses and the manipulation of information, shape social realities and entrap people in collective illusions. In such circumstances, collective decision-making becomes not only inefficient but also an instrument used to serve the interests of hidden powers.

3. Accountability and Responsiveness

One of the greatest issues with collective decision-making is the lack of accountability and responsiveness. In such systems, the responsibility for mistakes and inefficiencies is shifted onto "the people," while in reality, true power lies in the hands of small, unaccountable groups that quietly manage affairs. This phenomenon, known in political science as the "Diffusion of Responsibility," demonstrates how collective decision-making often leads to irresponsibility and corruption.

In contrast, the existence of a centralized ruler—such as a king—can increase accountability and responsiveness. In such systems, the ruler, as the primary representative of power, takes responsibility for all decisions and actions and can easily be held accountable for mistakes. This system not only prevents corruption and hidden abuses of power but also enhances efficiency and order.

Conclusion

Collective decision-making, despite its seemingly democratic and participatory appearance, is a delusion created by powerful groups who, behind the scenes, manipulate the media and shape specific ideological narratives to turn the masses into modern slaves. These systems are not only inefficient but are also easily exploited by hidden powers. In contrast, the presence of a centralized ruler—such as a king—can serve as an effective solution for establishing order, preventing corruption, and increasing accountability.

Section 4: The Role of the King in Establishing Order and Advancing Societal Goals; Returning to the Traditional Concept of Kingship

Throughout history, many societies under the rule of centralized kings and rulers have achieved great successes. The king, as a symbol of unity and power, not only creates order and coordination within society but also acts as a strong leader, making swift and effective decisions to guide the society on the right path. This section of the paper examines the role of the king in establishing order and advancing societal goals and argues that a return to the traditional concept of kingship—along with necessary reforms—can be a solution to escape the illusions of collective decision-making and create real order within society.

1. The King as a Symbol of Unity and Power

One of the most important roles of a king is to establish unity and cohesion within society. In complex and multicultural societies, the presence of a singular symbol—like the king—can serve as a unifying force, fostering collective identity and reinforcing a sense of belonging. The king, as the representative of all people, can reduce ethnic, religious, and cultural divisions, bringing the society together around a common cause.

For instance, in Iran's history, great kings such as Cyrus the Great and Shah Abbas I, through fostering national unity and strengthening Iranian identity, were able to lead the society toward progress and prosperity. These examples show that the presence of a centralized ruler—such as a king—can act as a catalyst for unity and cohesion within society.

2. Swift and Efficient Decision-Making

One of the greatest advantages of having a king is his ability to make quick and efficient decisions. In times of crisis—such as wars, natural disasters, or economic crises—swift and decisive decisions can save many lives and preserve the stability of the society. In such circumstances, the presence of a centralized ruler—like a king—can be an effective solution for quick and firm decision-making.

For example, throughout history, many kings—such as Napoleon Bonaparte in France or Queen Elizabeth I in England—were able to rescue their countries from major crises through swift and resolute decisions. These examples show that a centralized ruler—such as a king—can act as a source of swift and efficient decision-making.

3. Preventing Corruption and Hidden Exploitation

One of the greatest problems with collective decision-making systems is corruption and hidden exploitation. In such systems, real power often lies in the hands of small, unaccountable groups who, behind the scenes, manage affairs. These groups, by controlling the media and shaping specific ideological narratives, trap the masses in collective illusions and exploit their power for personal gain.

In contrast, the presence of a centralized ruler—such as a king—can prevent corruption and hidden exploitation. In such systems, the king, as the primary representative of power, assumes responsibility for all decisions and actions and can easily be held accountable for any mistakes. This system not only prevents corruption and hidden abuses of power but also increases efficiency and order.

4. The King as the Central Axis of Order

Ultimately, the king acts as the central axis of order in society. Just as the brain governs the body and the sun governs the solar system, the king, as the ruler of society, creates order and coordination and leads the society toward higher goals.

For example, in European history, great kings such as Louis XIV of France and Frederick the Great of Prussia, by establishing order and cohesion within their societies, were able to guide their countries toward progress and prosperity. These examples show that the presence of a centralized ruler—such as a king—can serve as a means to create order and coordination in society.

Conclusion:

The king, as a symbol of unity and power, a swift and efficient decision-maker, and the central axis of order in society, can be an effective solution to escape the illusions of collective decision-making and create real order within society. A return to the traditional concept of

kingship—along with necessary reforms—can be a way to free society from corruption, hidden exploitation, and guide it toward higher goals.

Section 5: Critique and Examination of Opposing Views; Responding to Challenges of Centralized Governance

While this paper emphasizes the necessity of a centralized ruler—like a king—to create order and advance societal goals, this idea faces significant criticisms and challenges. This section addresses the key criticisms against centralized governance and provides responses to these challenges. This examination not only strengthens the arguments presented in the paper but also illustrates how, with necessary reforms, centralized governance can be an effective solution for managing society.

1. The Danger of Despotism and Abuse of Power

One of the greatest concerns about centralized governance is the risk of despotism and abuse of power. History is full of examples where centralized rulers—such as kings or dictators—have misused their power, oppressing the people. This concern has led many societies to lean toward democratic and decentralized systems, particularly in the modern era.

Response:

This concern is valid; however, it is important to note that the danger of despotism and abuse of power is not inherently tied to the structure of centralized governance but rather to the mechanisms of control and oversight over power. In a reformed centralized system, independent oversight bodies, transparency in decision-making, and accountability of the ruler can prevent the abuse of power. For instance, in constitutional monarchies—such as those in Britain or Sweden—the king serves as a symbol of national unity while executive power resides in democratic and accountable institutions.

2. Lack of Popular Participation

Another criticism of centralized governance is the lack of popular participation in decision-making. In such systems, people may feel that they have no role in governing the society, leading to political apathy and diminished legitimacy of the government.

Response:

This criticism is also valid, but it must be noted that popular participation does not necessarily mean collective decision-making. In a reformed centralized system, public participation can be

increased by establishing consultative bodies—such as local councils or advisory assemblies. These bodies can act as intermediaries between the people and the ruler, ensuring that the voices of the populace are heard in decision-making.

3. Inflexibility in Responding to Changes

Another criticism of centralized governance is its inflexibility in responding to rapid social, economic, and political changes. In such systems, decision-making is often concentrated in the hands of one individual or a small group, which may lack sufficient awareness or be resistant to change, making it difficult to respond in a timely manner to the needs of society.

Response:

This criticism is important, but it is important to note that flexibility does not necessarily depend on the structure of the government but rather on the quality of leadership and decision-making mechanisms. In a reformed centralized system, specialized bodies—such as scientific or economic councils—can be established to ensure that decisions are based on accurate data and analyses. Furthermore, the ruler can consult with experts and elites to increase the system's flexibility in responding to change.

4. The Risk of Power Monopolization by an Individual or Group

Another criticism of centralized governance is the risk of power being monopolized by an individual or group. In such systems, the ruler or their close associates might use their power for personal gain, leading to corruption and social inequality.

Response:

This concern is also valid; however, it must be noted that monopolization of power is not inherently tied to centralized governance but rather to the mechanisms of power distribution and control. In a reformed centralized system, independent oversight bodies, financial and administrative transparency, and accountability of the ruler can prevent the monopolization of power.

Conclusion

While centralized governance faces significant criticisms and challenges, these challenges are not necessarily related to the structure of centralized governance but to the mechanisms of control and oversight over power. By establishing independent oversight bodies, ensuring transparency in decision-making, and holding the ruler accountable, the risks of despotism, corruption, and monopolization of power can be mitigated. Ultimately, with necessary reforms,

centralized governance can serve as an effective solution for creating order and advancing societal goals.

Final Conclusion: Returning to Centralized Governance; A Solution to Collective Illusions

This paper, through a comprehensive and in-depth examination of the view that a centralized ruler—like a king—is essential for creating order and advancing societal goals, concludes that collective decision-making and participatory democracies are often inefficient and illusory. These systems, due to disagreements, personal interests, and cognitive biases, lead to inefficiency and instability, and can easily be exploited by powerful groups. In contrast, a centralized ruler—when reformed—can serve as an efficient solution to create order, prevent corruption, and guide society toward higher goals.

By drawing on examples from nature—such as the brain as the ruler of the body and the sun as the ruler of the solar system—as well as historical and philosophical evidence, this paper shows that in complex systems, the presence of a central power is not only necessary but also the foundation of order and coordination. The king, as a symbol of unity and power, a swift and efficient decision-maker, and the central axis of order in society, can be an effective solution to escape collective illusions and create real order in society.

Of course, this view faces significant criticisms and challenges—ranging from the risk of despotism and abuse of power to the lack of popular participation and flexibility. However, as shown in Section 5, these challenges are not necessarily tied to the structure of centralized governance, but rather to the mechanisms of power control and oversight. By establishing independent oversight bodies, ensuring transparency in decision-making, and holding the ruler accountable, the risks of despotism, corruption, and monopolization of power can be prevented.

Ultimately, this paper concludes that a return to the traditional concept of centralized kingship—with necessary reforms—can be a solution to escape collective illusions and create real order in society. In such systems, the king not only serves as a symbol of unity and power but, with accountability and transparency, can earn the trust of the people and guide society toward higher goals.

References:

- Hobbes, T. (1651). *Leviathan*.
- Plato. (380 BC). *The Republic*.
- Machiavelli, N. (1532). *The Prince*.

- Arendt, H. (1958). The Human Condition.
- Fukuyama, F. (2011). The Origins of Political Order.
- Diamond, J. (1997). Guns, Germs, and Steel.
- Weber, M. (1922). Economy and Society.

Written by Pourya Omidian - 2025