

Strategikon

Cepiaglobal

Vol. 4, No. 1

www.cepiaclub.com

Spring 2020

Selections from the Critique of Politics

The Future Yet Has Arrived: Reflections on COVID-19

The Cepia Club LLC P.O. Box 60 Osceola WI 54020-0060

Table of Contents

All materials copyrighted The Cepia Club LLC (c) 2020. All rights reserved.

All views and opinions expressed remain the sole responsibility of the author(s).

Publisher and Editor: Tim Krenz. Published by The Cepia Club LLC, P.O. Box 60, Osceola, WI 54020.

Strategos Procurator	P. 3
Critique of Politics	
#2 The Transfer of Property	P. 4
#3 Political-Economy and the Relationship of Power and Money	P. 5
#4 Voting as a Privilege But Power of Consent as the Future of Freedom	P. 6
#5 War and Peace in the Epoch of Conflicts	P. 10
#6 War and Peace Toward an Age of Liberty	P. 13
#7 The Personal Narrative and A New Participation in Civil Political Society	P. 17
The Future Yet Has Arrived	P. 18

Available NOW! Apply NOW! Cepiaglobal Subscriptions

Cepiaglobal, The Cepia Club LLC's premiere Subscriber service, now accepts applications for association members. \$40.00 for new entrant dues for 2020, based on a market rate and subject to change. Benefits of subscribing: Emailed, online and/or print copies of all Cepiaclub publications, updates, and discounts, including Strategikon, NormalcyMag, and Ubet Gazette. Join our inside information and activist network. Times have changed. We help, in peace, to keep it good change. We would like others to join and help all.

Contact Tim Krenz, Cepiaclub Director, at: hq@cepiaclub.com for more info, or call 715-553-2226.

Visit www.cepiaclub.com/cepiaglobal-associated for more updates and application materials.

Strategos Procurator

By Tim Krenz

During the COVID-19 shutdown emergency this spring, I thought it an opportune time to issue another, long-delayed, issue of this views and opinions, and policy journal, Strategikon. While for our exclusive subscribers of Cegiaglobal, we will make this issue, like the others, available for public consumption at a later date, in print and on our website, www.cepiacclub.com.

In this issue, readers will find some writings from the past two years for my regular column in Clayton, Wisconsin's Hometown Gazette, where I have written regularly for all but two of the past 16 years. These recycled articles come from a ten-part series, on the "Critique of Politics." Since Critique #1 appeared in a previous issue of Strategikon, I present them starting with Critique #2. I present the bulk of the articles here, numbers 2 to 7, as they first appeared with no revision to the main bodies of the essays. Since I wrote them as a serial release, please bear with their style and organization, and with some repetition, and with any unforced errors. Each article stands alone, and unless noted, each contains a wholly separate topic and theme, but in an overall unity of purpose. The purpose aims at the main reason for the existence of Cegiacclub, "ending public ignorance and apathy." I, and others involved in Cegiacclub, have long maintained that beyond the political parties, and far, far higher than the nasty dope of partisan poison, politics, and political relationships, in the affairs of humanity have a fundamental reality beyond any numbed perceptions of the general public's vision or attention span. I personally believe that this reality of the true nature of politics and political relationships permeates any historical circumstances and any social science modeling. That as such, as both an art of practice and a science of results, we can understand contemporary politics and its immense dangers to people if we can unclutter the idea and see it clearly at its base, brutal, and wicked nature. Only in that way, can the activist have any practical starting point. And by using the term activist, I meaning anyone inspired to act on their knowledge and understanding, using peaceful methods, to positively change how civilization functions—in their own community! As the heart of this issue, at least I hope the critiques will inform and challenge critical thinking.

As far other Strategikon business, since we support its publication and printing and e-postings with sales of individual issues and with subscription renewals for Cegiaglobal associates, we ask all associates to please consider renewing their 2020 dues. Set a market-determined rates, and always a voluntary act with Cegiaglobal, associates may refer to the information section at the bottom of the Table of Contents on page 2. Contact us at hq@cepiacclub.com if associates have questions about their subscription status, or to inquire more about Cegiaglobal. For aspiring subscribers, contact us at the same address for an application packet, or visit www.cepiacclub.com/cepiaglobal-associated. Meanwhile, stay tuned to our website www.cepiacclub.com as the weeks and months pass along this spring and summer, during and after the COVID-19 emergency. We have updated our website and will continue to do so. Stay informed. Take action.

Critique of Politics #2 The Transfer of Property (August 6, 2018)

How do governments maintain themselves as authorities ruling over the peoples under its laws? Simply. Governments function at all times as organized monopolies of legitimacy and ultimate controller of all property within reach. Governments keep their position to govern by exercising force over citizens when all else fails. Ideally, governments should serve common aims under the unqualified consent of all those subject to it. Yet, some favor and some oppose government policy, and the disagreement has created political divisions, very strong and vocal differences, indeed. The facts?

Controlling all forms of property, governments claim the money it needs for purposes defined by themselves, without higher appeal. Governments rule for the reasons they create, such as to “form of more perfect Union” for “general welfare” or “common defense.” As self-maintaining powers, governments exercise two primary functions to ensure their power, thus enabling their mission statements.

First a ruling power collects money from people. Second, it pays people. Words in politics only serve to reinforce a belief that governments have powers to fix any problem by speaking of it. If a government policy action does not involve collecting and paying money, in other words transferring property, then it really has taken little effort to change much of anything.

Most often, government policy helps the fewer at the expense of the greater. Groups not favored by the ruling power usually pay the greater costs, in all ways. In short, someone has to pay, and someone has to collect, for government to have impact. Rhetorical politics solve nothing. On the other hand, governments create useful institutions, otherwise vast numbers of people would starve, remain ignorant, or suffer violence and lawlessness without protection.

Governments cannot exist without revenues. They cannot survive unless people support them, and people only support government for two reasons: They benefit from their government or they fear it. Whether one calls the transactions “tax and spend,” a transfer of wealth, or a theft and a bribe, it does not matter; it all amounts to the same, the collection and giving of property from one to another. Someone pays; someone gets paid. Understanding this, perhaps a reasoned discussion of politics in the United States will allow citizens to evaluate what government really costs, even morally; and whether we need more or less government, or what type of government, in the 21st Century.

Critique of Politics #3

Political-Economy and the Relationship of Power and Money

(October 5, 2018)

We cannot separate the relationship of politics and economics any more than we can separate a head from a body and still have a whole living person as a remainder. Politics and economics exist in a fusion of interests and control, in a mutually integrated system of influence and resources. Actions in one part will react in the other, and in a system of gain and loss, the impact works to increase the control of wealth and the uses of that wealth for the desired end. Politics controls and economics responds. One or the other seeks to increase its power to control or exercise the other.

In a simple model of understanding: Politics determines the answer to “who gets what and why do they get it?” Economics answers the question of “when, where and how do they get it.” The variable of reference to “they” becomes all important and critical to the success and endurance of power and the resources behind it. This model, and the nature of a political-economy in both pure or base forms, transcends any sense of partisanship. No party acts any differently when in power.

Academics insist that both politics and economics operate within a domain of social sciences, sciences subject to research and statistics, abstract theories and models of decision-making, and even to the study of preferences and replacement variables. Politics and economics work partly this way, according what the idea presented in this paper. But in many ways, taken as a whole in the union of a political-economy, politics and decision-making have more of a social scientific bent of psychology, and the motivations behind fear and greed, which fear and greed often make up the significant factors in any type of conflict of interest.

Leaders, like average people, fear for losing what they have or want opportunities for more of it. They often enter into competition for the very greed of wanting more or something that belongs to others. In politics, psychologies respond to many situations, and can act in realistic and even rational ways in the sense of protection, but they still base decisions on the fear of losing or the greed more more (in whatever terms sought, like security, life, liberty or property). Yet, political leaders will succeed or fail in their efforts to direct others toward personal or common goals based on a type of genius, like those of great artists, who can give others the interpretations they want to represent. In political leadership, artistry and originality can make differences. Simply, politics depends mostly on what people want to believe as their own interest in an act of decision-making. Deciding who gets what and why results as the payoff for support, or as its punishment for opposition (in “Who gets less,” etc.).

Economics has less the nature of social science, where numbers would matter on the perception of decision-making, and it acts more like the science of physics. Starting with the premise of economics delivering the benefits or detriments of “when, where and why,” wealth—ultimately defined as the sum of resources in its many forms—follows

a path of gravity towards the least resistance to politically-directed programs. Like light in space or water downhill, capital—the liquid form of wealth—will flow to an eventual stable dynamic or state of productivity and consumption. Furthermore, like the hard science of physics, engineering can manipulate the flow and direction of wealth/energy (i.e. resources) to its desired direction and end uses. Finally, like all physical energy, wealth never gets created nor destroyed: it merely changes form into something else or into other hands of ownership. Economics mostly works these ways, invariably, and almost predictably.

Government as the political form of decision-making over the structure, or the engineering, of its economy determines how the resources get used. The exception to these loose rules of political-economy usually come into play where economics has its own uncertainty principle, or the uncertainty of the value or ownership of a particular resource. Where in doubt, governments as political agents will decide to make the value or ownership of a resource some one's or some entity's property. They can do so arbitrarily, but will do so to benefit the prevailing framework of “who gets what and why?”

On other levels, too, the symbiotic connection of political power and economic wealth reinforce each other. Political power controls the economy; economics will often dictate political power. Political decision-making will direct wealth to desired outputs—where the wealth (i.e. resources) will most benefit the political agenda. Whether wealth benefits a narrow or broad interest almost seems immaterial at this point. It does not involve parties but only interests. Wealth can go to taxpayers in structured ways. It can go to areas of the population or to business interests in the forms of subsidies. It can go into broad areas of investment for reasons only directly related to political choices—to national defense, industrial production, roads, education, public services, etc. The politics determine the uses of wealth, and does so for political reasons.

At the base, the type of government matters on how resources get used. The philosophy, theory, and practice of political leaders serve the ends of their legitimacy and to help the system maintain its power over the ruled. And either the willing acceptance or brutal repression of subjects to the sovereign law allow political leaders its dominion and control of the resources, that wealth that provides the security, comfort, the consumption or the want of goods and services.

As mentioned, the psychological factor of politics, the very genius and artistry of leaders to remain ahead of their competitors and remain in power, ultimately depend on the use of economic resources in a way that complements their power. No rational system of politics can work against its own interest and remain in power. Living conditions and the demand for shares of the national wealth help balance the system between the needs and wants of competitive interest, keeping everyone with a willing interest to continue to live under the conditions which prevail.

Governments, sovereign political entities within their domain of territory and that subject to its will, have remained

throughout history the kings of their lands and the resources which stem from it—from the land itself, from the creative impulse of its citizens, from its capital gains, or from the labor of physical force. Politics will continue to decide on the broad features of how it accumulates and distributes wealth. It will always do so, as long as politics has the force to back up its claim to legitimate power, whether through ballots or bayonets. Until political power becomes less an imposition in the free lives of property owning people of a land and time, economics will continue to serve as means for some group to control others. Thus, it behooves citizens to keep their knowledge increasing, to build private property, and to limit the reach of government that does not serve their interest.

Critique of Politics #4

Voting as a Privilege But Power of Consent as the Future of Freedom (December 3, 2018)

In this fourth part of the critique of politics, we must first dismiss the absurd view that every person has an inalienable, natural right to vote in elections. None can claim the right by any definition other than as human-made and therefore a legally transient, even temporary privilege, when using ballots cast by qualified electors. No right given by nature, and therefore above the laws made by men and women who can revoke them, guarantees the exercise of voting in a democracy, or in a republic, or in any type of government. Partly for this reason, voting itself will not make a better future. Why?

Voting simply comes by way of extended privileges, granted by an authority seeking the approval of those it governs for the actions it takes. Those entities extend a franchise to electors so that it can narrowly define and limit the question of “who gets to choose.” By doing so, the system limits choices by default. On the other hand, the natural right of consent of the governed for its government exists outside of the human-made laws, and the act of giving or withdrawal of that consent remains a pure and inalienable right of citizens. This distinction of natural versus human-made laws and rights looms large in implication for the future of freedom everywhere, and also for continuing the republic of the United States of America, specifically.

Why does voting not exist as a pure and natural right? First, the entity, whether a government or a private body, may set the terms and limits of an election. Doing so, that corporate body (public or private) can by its own laws—and even sometimes by quite arbitrary decisions—decide who can vote, where, when and how. That decision-making body can also enfranchise OR disenfranchise voters by the same means. For example, it can set the following: age limits,

property requirements (not only for stockholders in private enterprises), proper permits to vote (“voter identification” laws), race, gender, levels of literacy, criminal record, etc.

All of these limits and disqualifications to vote at one time existed under the Federal constitution within U.S. territory. Most of the otherwise limiting restrictions for keeping voters disenfranchised, particularly age, race, gender, and literacy and property requirements, got fixed or redefined by amendments to the Federal constitution or via Federal statutes. (For example, the “Voting Rights Act,” first passed in 1965, came over 100 years after the ratification of the 15th Amendment supposedly removing voter discrimination related to race, etc.).

Still, why a legal privilege and not a pure, natural right? Statutory codes, ordinances, even constitutions, come by way of political compromises between men and women. Where voting in the U.S. mostly, and correctly, expanded the limits of citizens qualifying as electors who can cast ballots in elections, men and woman can also undo those laws and constitutions. Everything in the United States Constitution (ratified in 1788-89) and all amendments remain temporary and may one day get revised or voted out of existence. We shudder to think of that, but it still remains entirely possible, even if improbable.

Where humans agree to create something, humans can agree to destroy the same. The same logic applies to voting. Having made democratic elections part of the Federal system, as a compromise system of government, the rights of the Constitution made the privilege of voting a norm. Sometimes people take norms for granted, in an act of misplaced complacency about politics. The compromise that created the Constitution may one day compromise the end of itself and of the voting privilege. No natural law or natural right, above a human ability to allow something to replace it, protects the Constitution as a permanent feature of government in the United States. In this sense, as in the Civil War from 1861-1865, only the force of armed force would ultimately determine its fate.

Opposing this stark reality, citizens in the United States have another means to exercise control over those they elect to conduct government over them, a means based on the pure natural right of the consent of the governed. As implied above, a natural right exists above and beyond the ability of human-made law to disqualify, suppress, oppress, or destroy. A natural right survives all attempts at compromise and it exists in perpetual form, not as a privilege but as a fundamental right of human existence.

Natural rights transcend everything. And consent or withdrawal of consent comes as a choice, a duty, a service, and an obligation. This demands more than group action at election time. The right of consent or its withdrawal demands an extremely personal vigilance and a very personal action. It means the oath to defend for all each and everyone's freedom from fear, from want, and for speech and for worship. These freedoms that would not harm others or steal from anyone make up the essence of peace and liberty for the world.

Consent of the governed comes in many ways, not just in voting but it involves voting. In this commitment, the moral

consent of the ethically governed stands as the greatest tool, or the best weapon (in a non-violent sense), that can protect the body politic. That body, the whole of a citizenry, needs constant protection from the diseases of power which infect the powerful people who may govern. To prevent compromises from overwhelming the delicate balance between individual liberty and the needs of the community as whole, everyone must make this personal commitment. In this singular and most serious act, people everywhere--every citizen, anywhere—has to defend the high moral of rights for all and the ethics of freedom for all against any enemies who would subvert these.

How to make consent a practical way of change? First, each person individually must make the voting count. Do not perpetuate an evil or a corrupt system, or ill-defined choices within it. Vote on the extreme merit of conscience—for any candidate or cause that makes sense to a person's reason, and for ones that advance their consent for right and against wrong.

Second, protect the system of voting by voting at every opportunity. Never let anything steal a person's voice in the casting of ballots, through ignorance of choices or by apathy of means. Keep the privilege alive by exercising it.

Third, and importantly, without harming others or destroying their property, take every action within the limit of human-made law to call fraud a fraud and then support good with good. Exert the moral force of peace and non-violence in all manners of resisting an evil or a corrupt system. Stay creative.

Fourth, demand better choices, in and outside of elections, by voting with feet, money, and consent, or its withdrawal—at any time and any place—for the public actions of public servants and public persons. Work to create alternatives and then exercise the choice of them.

With enough people doing these things, all of the time, the future of freedom prevails, but only if people make the ultimate commitment of their conscience.

Critique of Politics #5 War and Peace in the Epoch of Conflicts (February 4, 2019)

Wars can start for many causes, even sometimes for very flimsy excuses, or by pure accidents and perfect political storms. Whatever the causes, wars bring serious, deadly consequences. Even if a nation or groups of people find themselves in technical conditions of peace—if the world ever can find a state of balance for a peaceful international and domestic order—the delicate fringe of terror will still overhang it. The existence and constant proliferation, and the viable use policies, of nuclear weapons threaten a self-destruction of the human species if, by deliberate act or accident, such weapons ever get used.

One miscalculation in political thinking, one willful and irresponsible decision by a leader, or one murderous urge by a maniac with a grudge that unleashes the nuclear genie from its bottle could end all human civilization. In the extreme use and massive uses of them, almost every single living plant and animal as we know them could cease to exist. With this ultimate and terminal end-state in an escalation of nuclear combat—by any combinations of those who possess them—the risk of war in our age of conflict eventually concerns every woman, man and child living and yet to come. Therefore, knowing this risk of catastrophe, this fifth critique of politics focuses on war and peace, and the nature of these dark and elusive monsters and angels of horrible fears and false hopes. We should know and talk about modern conflict intelligently because we have nothing at stake except everything on earth.

Author Graham Allison coined a catchy phrase two years ago with something known as the “Thucydides Trap,” whereby a rising power challenges a declining power. Allison, though, has only reinvented a strategic and historic wheel discovered 2,400 years ago by the ancient Greek writer and soldier, Thucydides. That writer, Thucydides, the father of strategy, summed up the reasons by which ancient Greece found itself in a war that lasted three decades, changing Greece's history in disastrous ways. It comes down to a simple thesis that because Athens grew ambitious to extend its power over others, Sparta became fearful of its competitor. Underlying the ambition and fear factors, we find a combination of both jealousy and greed.

If we examine motives throughout history since that war in late 5th Century B.C.E., the cause of most conflicts fall within this greed, ambition, jealousy, and fear cycle of human nature. Conflict and war itself goes beyond the nice categories of national interests and so-called “strategic calculus” (a non-sense buzz word of the self-appointed thinkers of strategy—like me!). Conflict, armed and otherwise, comes out of the very base human instincts, that when some player(s) on the political-economic scene become(s) ambitious and/or greedy, the others become fearful and/or jealous. This syndrome in a political-economic system stems from the deeply rooted flaws in the psyche of decision-makers. We cannot eliminate these defects. But, we can understand them and limit the damage they do to ourselves and others.

Consider the following example in the current war of a Western civilization with the extremists leaders of the radical Islamic states and para-military movements. Think about this, seriously. If looked at in the ambition-greed vs. jealousy-fear model, it fits as well as in almost every other armed conflict. Understanding the war in this way can sort through the propaganda, lies, distortions and half-truths of all sides. The Western nations (and China, Russia, and Japan, and now India) rely on oil to fuel their economies, and to maintain the comforts and securities provided by their civilization. Those nations have a greed for keeping what they have got and do not want to lose it and go backward. Oil, in large measure, provided the convenience of living better the past one hundred years.

To secure that oil, Western nations co-opted the elite rulers of the oil-producing nations to continue to supply that oil or maintain the security of its won (i.e. Soviet Union/Russia). That co-optation includes allowing them to suppress their poor people and the poor immigrants seeking employment. The West, etc. provides the money for the elites and for the security of their rule for Western access to the oil. Many of the co-opted oil-producing nations have Muslim majority populations, primarily in Southwest, Central and Southeast Asia. It also concerns regions on the periphery, like Syria, and Russia (which itself has a large Muslim population). Virtually none allow democracy or other basic human or natural rights or follow patterns of Western-like rule of law institutions. Because of the greed for the oil, the oil money, the security, and the ambition for power, we must admit that the West has imposed on a billion humans in Islamic countries a very oppressive condition. Few citizens or leaders in the West will admit this point publicly. Yet, the West needs the oil out of a greedy sense of securing their way of life, to the detriment of a whole lot of people.

Enter the leaders of the extremist, para-military Islamic organizations. For whatever other reasons they fight the West in a global campaign of guerrilla-terrorism, they use the claim of Western exploitation, past and present colonialism, and Western political and military policies as their primary weapon to recruit and deploy their followers in acts of violence. Do they hate the West for things other than economic—whether religious or social, or cultural reasons? Only they can answer that. However, we cannot deny their statements that they jealously guard their land, people, resources, and beliefs from the ambitions of the West who have thwarted their nationalist-like religious goals.

Those goals? To overthrow the elite overlords empowered by the West, and to drive the Western countries out of their area. Since this global conflict between the Western civilization and the Islamic radicals started in Iran in 1978-79 (and the taking of US diplomatic hostages), it has consumed far more lives, property, money and safety than ever expected. People can try to look farther back into history to try and believe that it somehow means a war of good vs. evil since the advent of Islam in 622 A.C.E. Realistically, the current conflict has waged now for around four decades—between the West and revisionist Islam.

This sword, however, has two edges and it cuts both ways. Looked at from its opposite side, the radical Islamic paramilitaries and states challenge the Western interests in its own security, moral and physical. The enemies of the West act with an amount of greed and ambition in their own right, to deprive the Western powers of their personal and

material civilization. Without judgment on either side, where both legitimately protect themselves, the West reacts with its own brand of fear and jealousy.

Both sides use greed, ambition, jealousy and fear to wage the open and hidden wars between them.. Unless we look at it intelligently, logically, in order to find solutions, it could go on for a much longer time. This war will inevitably draw in more of the world, and it could escalate. With eight of the nine nuclear powers now directly or indirectly involved in the Indian Ocean Basin, it could end badly. Enter China as a rising power with the same competitive interests, and the greed-ambition, jealousy-fear model engages another tripwire. We live in the epoch of modern conflict: A world divided by people's greed for more or fear of losing what they have. But we may have common point for conflict resolution to get beyond this epoch, and to survive as a species here on the planet and a home we call Earth.

The next critique of politics will examine this point of departure, and explain more how understanding and acting beyond these human instincts for these self-destructive attitudes can lead to a better peace. If we do not, in the end, we will only destroy all of the future, not just an enemy, but ourselves as well.

Critique of Politics #6

War and Peace Toward an Age of Liberty

(April 4, 2019)

As many definitions exist for the terms “war” and “peace” as for the concept of liberty. In this follow up to the “Critique of Politics #5: War and Peace in the Epoch of Conflicts,” it seems proper to begin with a definition of our terms of reference.

In the first decades of the 19th Century, a brilliant Prussian political theorist, Carl von Clausewitz, a general who fought against Napoleon, declared in his book *On War*, that “war is a continuation of politics [or, elsewhere, “policy”] by other means.” In that unfinished book, he also described war as “an act of violence” that compels one enemy to abide by the will of the other one. Almost all modern political scientists and leaders use these definitions as a chapter and verse recitation in their writing and thinking on strategy and armed conflict. By contrast, in some lack of intrinsic value, and a poor imagination, these same type of commentators use a default definition of peace as only the absence of wars, or the intervals between them.

Restricted or outmoded definitions can block proper decision-making and/or, by implication, eliminate rationality from the policies used to achieve the goals of nation-states. Limited, or outdated, terms can lead to poor choices; those choices getting made between a narrower range of options. In situations where war and peace tense in balance one way or another, in the age of nuclear weapons (or other mass destructive technologies), a bad choice could lead to the extinction of civilization. History orders that a better strategy at anything, politics or business included, comes with a range of options wider and greater than the choices allowed an opponent.

With all the modern acceptance of Clausewitz's definitions, thinkers and leaders should remember that he died before he thoroughly edited and finished his monumental work, which he wanted to do in extensive revisions. As a result, *On War* itself has very little refinement throughout most of it, contains superlative ambiguities, and some disquieting contradictions. Even so, it rightly stands as a work of some brilliance on the philosophy and logic of politics, policy, strategy, and warfare. In the context of its modern analysis, the book applies mostly to the Pre-Nuclear Age, to his time of the French Revolution and Napoleonic Era. At that time, war had become the creature of the state, used for reasons of state, and benefiting or endangering the nation-states as they existed. In that horrible era of continuous upheaval and war, weapons consisted of gunpowder, steel, flesh (both men and animals), and intellect.

For the past century to our own time, two world conflicts and the frigid distrust of Cold War enmity had made war a “total” proposition, as foreseen by Clausewitz, when nation-states put absolutely ALL of their resources and efforts into fighting it. And much of what Clausewitz said of warfare in the early Industrial Age applies fundamentally to the doctrine and strategy of nuclear weapons. The logic of politics, the reasons of policy, his observations on human nature, and the philosophies on conflict—mostly remained relevant and will inform every generation of strategists and

for the emerging and undiscovered technologies. Used twice in combat, in August 1945, nuclear weapons added a restraining horror to the use of war for reasons of nation-state policies. Social scientists added a new concept when they realized that using nuclear weapons would destroy both the aggressor and the responding party in what they termed Mutually Assured Destruction (M.A.D.).

In deciding on war as a political tool to compel an opponent to submit, leaders since the invention of nuclear weapons keep wars small, limited, marginal in gains, but heavy in innocent victims who do not care about theory but suffer the reality of state-endorsed killing and destruction. On the other hand, since no one can win a modern, total war, nation-states use the ambiguities around “less than total war” as a way to increase their advantage over opponents, in ever more subtle and deceptive ways. In the realms of Cyber Warfare, bio-weapons, or Artificially Intelligent weapons, nation-states might fight wars and end them before the other side even knew it fought or lost key battles. In these cases, war as defined by the continuation of politics by others means holds increasing relevance. And still, as a definition of policy, goals, objectives, and even actors, this definition limits thinking. All of this, of course, will only benefit nation-states endanger common people. The victims of war do not care about definitions unless it lessens the sufferings and moral and human cost of conflict.

When the world has traditional nation-state wars, civil wars, and even the propaganda wars (against drugs, crime, poverty, terrorism, culture, climate change, etc., etc.)—all creatures of the nation-state—the new and updated definition of war becomes more necessary. From here, we can proceed. As emphasized in Critique #5, almost all human conflict (wars) come(s) from some wicked natures of human greed, fear, ambition, or jealousy. Period. How does the conflict interact? Whether battling for land, food, fuel, water, ideology, philosophies/religion, or pride—all described as “interests”—war happens when powers compete with each other for dominance. For only by dominance can one side serve itself and force the other to choose to continue or quit. These interested powers, from nation-states to gangs to networks to terrorist to freedom fighters, all face in the end the stark choice: annihilation in resistance or slavery by submission. And since governments of nation-states hold the monopoly on the use of violence and coercion, in essence the nation-state determines these choices and results.

In the age of weapons that would, could, and might wipe out human civilization as we know it, the concept of war, total war, or escalating conflict, or even accidents of the instinct (by fear, greed, ambition or jealousy), ALL needs to end. No one person has ever made this work, because, sadly, they relied on the nation-state to make it happen. The result of their efforts ended only with larger, more monopolized nation-states and their arbitrary use of violence and coercion. What can we do?

To lessen the incidence and results of war in the Nuclear Age, we must wither away and end the powers of the nation-state. If nation-states, and the wealthy who rule them for their own gain, benefit from conflict then we must not have them anymore. A tall order? Yes. Feasible? Absolutely. How?

First, we can keep our patriotism and our concept of countries intact. On the other hand, we must curtail the absolute power of the nation-state and its monopoly of money and violent coercion against the interest of its own citizens. Second, democracy and the power to rule and apply laws must devolve and decentralized to the common denominator where people live. Smaller political units, based on grounded consent and assent to shared interest at local areas allows civilization to function, without chaos, but without the harming effects of nation-state coercion and violence. Third, self-responsibility for the body politic and to take personal action to guarantee the peaceful actions of society (including contracts, safety-nets, etc.) must permeate the spirit of everyone: Only we can prevent conflict by our thought and actions for right and against wrongs. Fourth, a true free-market of ideas and commerce, without the coercion of the nation-state for the benefit of the super-wealthy, protect peace and common interests. It does so by the assertion and consent of those allowed to govern themselves where possible. It also governs the group's interest when such group decision-making becomes necessary.

With this process of withering the powers of the nation-state, war becomes less likely. Sadly, few people have the imagination or the courage to face the work of liberty. If so, we have little hope.

Critique of Politics 7

The Personal Narrative and A New Participation in Civil Political Society

(June 5, 2019)

Do you have power? Do you have REAL political power? Absolutely, yes you do.

Social norms can mistake the act of voting as the last obligation and last resort for an average individual to express opinion and preferences in political affairs. Outside of the professional or volunteer in the aptly named political industry, we little understand the vast, latent, and unexplored potential of the average citizen's impact beyond voting. Individual votes, sought by a candidate and their supporting lobbies and committees, do eventually add up to the entire turn out of voters, and one side wins and everyone else loses.

Voting itself gets lost in the collective, where a sole and single person may think their vote means either less by not following the conventional viewpoint; or that the single vote means more by voting with everyone else. In the end, for many who vote, voting ends as the passive-aggressive frustration of casting a ballot to choose between the same evils—the evils we have always had when people abdicate their participation except on election day. We can no longer allow such passive practices by the majority of the population, not just those who decline to vote. Neither can we continue the elite domination of the system by the fewer and the wealthier. Look where the two-party system has taken the country, and the world. The result of the damage to government and policy by only passively participating every year, two years, four years or six, has increased. The house divides, more. It will not stand. It must change, or we will suffer the consequences. Instead of arbitrary choices of evil and evil, we can change the norm. How do we make the change? We first must change the minds of more people, the ones heretofore not participating in solutions and the ones propping up the political institutions which cause the problem in the first place. Then, we must unleash the sleeping social power of everyone to effect the political and social changes. We have no other course to saving the government of the American people or the world at large. Again, to repeat and repeat and repeat, things must change, or we WILL suffer the consequences.

How can we change minds, to recognize our personal power over politics—beyond merely voting? It starts with the most important act of regaining control of our own personal narratives, in our lives, our civil society, and about our political-economy. Too often, we as a society, our huge collective mass, falls prey to the sound bytes, ideas, policies, advertising, public relations, “spin,” and all the other propaganda which accompanies the noise in our daily lives. For whether one thinks of political advertising and media campaigns, or commercial and business advertising, or anything designed to instill an idea or persuade someone to vote or buy in a certain way, it amounts to nothing more than organized and targeted manipulation—i.e. some type of propaganda. Furthermore, modern society has fallen prey to the phenomena of social media, a new primary source of news, opinion-sharing, and personal interaction. We need to call it by a proper name of “anti-social media,” and nothing more than a collectivist attempt to manipulate the opinions and preferences of disconnected people separated from physical contact to each other. Social media as tools has good uses. When used to influence people's choices, it has done damage to civil society. We can only deny its impact on the politics of division and personal isolation to our long-term peril.

Things brings us back to regaining control of our personal narratives, and critically, control over our stories, beliefs, values, morals, principles, and the ethics by which we can live in good conscience. In the age of political systems defined by an increasing conformity to the popular line, a personal narrative can better filter the lies of leaders and followers. A political system—possibly now or shortly in the future—based on corruption, coercion, violent enforcement, and conflict to divide and rule people can only survive by propagating the lies that create collective conformity.

What lies? We can find some glaring ones, for example: that countries need to wage aggressive wars of prevention; that children and other innocent people killed and wounded in conflict only count as “collateral damage,” and not human victims of a moral crime; that we have no responsibility to help and/or feed the hungry poor of the world; that having extravagant amounts of more money, more property, more toys leads us toward happy spiritual fulfillment, and that we should emulate the rich by stealing our own self-respect to become one of them; that capitalism and socialism differ in that both do not eventually create and operate a systemic state welfare for the elite and wealthy; that the country have only two viable options in politics, the left and the right, instead of the correct, ethical and moral side; that individuals cannot make a difference where they live for a better neighborhood or a better earth. These lies have germinated into the national dialog and we have reached the point of their almost permanent deception.

As for the personal narrative, how does one begin? Think of yourself. Have any readers ever written—actually put pen to paper—a statement of personal ethics and principles by which they can live a good, honest and conscientious life? I challenge readers to start with that. State those things that you can do that will help. State things by which you will always stand, in the moral imperative of doing and protecting right and opposing wrong. What will you endorse and support that meaningfully helps change the world in your mind and your neighborhood for the better? What wrongs must you ethically not support and even oppose with every asset and fiber of your conscience and body? Then go on to further refine these questions: “Who am I, really? Where am I in life? What do I do? When do I need to do more and make hard choices? How can I become a better neighbor, and in turn create a better world? Why must I help create a peaceful, positive change?”

Start the personal narrative with those. Stick to them as best as you can. Obey those laws that you must, especially the Natural Law that you must withdraw consent from the fraud and the lies the world and its leaders want to impose. Take seriously your responsibility to your family and your employment. Change begins at home. But if enough readers do this personal narrative only once, it can translate into some rather important accomplishments. However, unless we understand our own personal narratives, we would only remain part of the deceptions.

Use this personal narrative as your starting point and guide-post in all your personal actions and efforts with others. The action can extend to unlimited ways and means of creating some fairly powerful effects. For, in all seriousness, we live on earth for two reasons: To love our fellow humans and to help them if we can. (If we cannot do those, we should not make things worse). If we apply this narrative and guidelines, and our supreme purpose in life to politics, the world has some chance of surviving the lies and conflicts resulting from them. We would do so only to our great benefit. The change begins with us.

Future Yet Has Arrived

By Tim Krenz

COVID-19 and the emergency measures around it have accelerated the transitions started by the Information Age decades ago. With the world wired-in and logged-on, the soft quarantine in most states of the Union and other parts of the globe have forced the world to adapt using technology as it exists today. The quarantine, and the social isolation and distancing to prevent COVID-19's spread have also pointed the way for new and upcoming, and much needed, technologies to fill the spaces and gaps not now covered in the technology architecture. Future technology and how humans use it will continue to evolve.

As we always must say, "Change remains the only true constant in the universe." Most people working, if at all, remotely, at home, or in more isolated work spaces; school terms shifting to remote, online coursework; home entertainment via digital streaming; and more expansive on-line shopping and home delivery; all these point the way to the future of work, education, amusement, and commerce—toward the direction information technology has always pointed us. If the COVID-19 emergency has done anything, it makes the opportunity presented by the danger into the necessity of innovation. Nonetheless, some choices remain, and a necessity for decision-making exists, in how we use these opportunities to adapt to the technology, both current and future. We must set some priorities for these new tools and techniques.

Despite how things have changed due to COVID-19, even temporarily in some respects, some things have remained, like food supply, as important as before the emergency. People will still have to work, or labor, to create and distribute food and even all other household necessities. How digital means, including its use in the biological sciences, will assist feeding civilization brings both promises and dangers. Where we see that technology and its tools and applications can increase, secure, and facilitate feeding people, it will happen. This includes everything from creating better genetic strains of crops to more efficient storage and transportation processes via digital tools. Where the emergency shows shortcomings in these supply chains, technology and those who innovate with it will fill those gaps.

Energy, and by implication transportation, and even household machine controls, all can benefit from increased efficiency, utility, and cost-to-benefit advantages. The trend in business and engineering already point the way forward. The necessities of filling the gaps and improving energy exploitation and use as seen in the emergency will spur the innovations in untold, and perhaps unexpected ways. COVID-19 influenced areas where energy production, storage, price-point supports, and reduced pollution had noticeable impacts. Again, long-term trends pointed the direction for decades. COVID-19 merely gives impetus to rapidly advance technology's uses to cover the exposed shortcomings. If nothing else, the new ways and means of energy in this civilization will help prepare for new emergencies.

COVID-19 also created a direct line in the new way employment can function in dispersed physical locations and in on-line virtual networks. This, too, has profound implications in commercial business, industrial production, urban development, public transportation, and even the community design and construction industries. Not only does COVID-19's effects impact the nature of work and household types, locations, design and construction, it also, as we clearly see, accelerated the trending changes in how society educates its people. Everything associated with the education industry—school construction, learning materials and equipment, staffing expenses, and the very budgets, tuition, and taxes that support schools, colleges, and universities can undergo refinement, innovation, redesign, and rethinking. For education and employment, the very topics and subjects, and the way of teaching itself, may change after

assessing the course and impact on education of the emergency quarantine. As far as the general economy of the United States and the world, the products, services, training, and uses of employment and education will move faster toward the trend lines have pointed the way for decades. COVID-19 now shows people how, in this recent socially scientific mass experiment, it can work and we can improve much in the future.

In the social-economic changes to come inevitable with or without COVID-19 ever happening, we arrive at perhaps the most critical changes that we can foresee, and the ones with the most dangers and opportunities, in the cultural-political areas of society.

First, in the cultural sense, during COVID-19, a new phrase entered the lexicon, called “social distancing.” By separation in public, and keeping apart, we use social distancing to stop or slow the spread of that virus by limiting person-to-person contact and physical transmission. A necessary measure, the social distancing must never become a cultural distortioning, a human civilization whereby we limit physical contact and disconnect ourselves emotionally, or withdraw fellowship, friendship, concern or empathy, from others. Such a distortioning could disengage people from mutual aid to others, stop recognizing their political, economic, social and other lawful natural rights, and cause even more division in society. At this stage of the reopening of society after the quarantine, if we have learned anything about the isolation, we should have learned that no matter what technology or tools we have to maintain digital or even just informational connection, people need human contact with each other. We exist as social animals, and our civilization with whatever peace it has cannot stand any more cultural disconnection than it already has endured. Hopefully, COVID-19 teaches us a lesson that technology cannot successfully cure everything in and by itself. Only by working together, and recognizing that we need to work together, and reconcile face-to-face, can the world survive future emergencies, even far more deadly or catastrophic ones than COVID-19.

Finally, in the political realm, we arrive at what could become the most important and critical of the effects of the pandemic. This potential phenomenon draws a straight line from the danger of cultural distortioning. Technology and its tools and innovations will always advance and evolve. We will have faster computing, more machine learning, near-sentient artificial intelligence, more autonomous machines, more dispersed and even more powerful and hyper-timed networks and connections. We can see it happening now. We know it will happen faster and faster. But we must use these things safely, and with foresight, in building them. Have we installed safeguards and trapdoors to turn off or unplug connections to preserve human dignity and natural rights? Furthermore, do these materials and processes serve us or will they or their controllers use us to serve them? We see the advantages of having technology and new ways of adapting and innovating them to the needs of civilization. Even if they present dangers of political corruption or tyranny, we must ensure that the opportunities they present at the edifice of a new era remain for the use of all, equally, in liberty and dignity for the culture of humanity.

The COVID-19 emergency points to how civilization can do things, if not better then more efficiently in the coming years and decades. New things and new ways can add to the collective safety, the survival envelope, and even the extensive comfort of life on earth. Unless we know the “why?” we want to change before we build the “what?” we would make a fatal error. Many questions remain, even questions we do not know yet. But life during COVID-19 at least can force us to ask, “What don't we know about the consequences of what we plan to do?” Answering this should assume the highest priority.

The first part of the document discusses the importance of maintaining accurate records of all transactions. It emphasizes that every sale, purchase, and payment must be properly documented to ensure the integrity of the financial statements. This includes recording the date, amount, and purpose of each transaction, as well as the names of the parties involved.

In addition, the document highlights the need for regular reconciliation of accounts. This process involves comparing the company's internal records with the bank statements to identify any discrepancies. By doing so, the company can catch errors early and prevent them from becoming more significant.

Another key aspect of financial management is the timely payment of bills and invoices. The document advises that the company should establish a clear policy for how long it will take to pay its suppliers and service providers. This helps to maintain good relationships and avoid late fees or penalties.

Finally, the document stresses the importance of having a clear understanding of the company's overall financial health. This involves regularly reviewing the profit and loss statement, the balance sheet, and the cash flow statement. By doing so, the company can identify areas where it is spending too much money and make adjustments to its budget accordingly.