Climatology, Technocracy, and Sovereignty

Anab Whitehouse

Table of Contents

Part 1 - Climatology

Over the last several months, I've read a number of works concerning the issue of so-called artificial intelligence. The term: "so-called," is used in the opening sentence of this paragraph because the "intelligence" which is manifested in – or, better, through -- automated systems is a combinatoric function of the network of heuristic algorithms with which such systems have been equipped by human beings, and, therefore, whatever 'intelligence' is present in such automated systems is derivative from what has been made possible – knowingly or unknowingly (think 'Move 37' displayed by AlphaGo against world champion Lee Sedol in March of 2016) – by human creators.

However, as the bartender character 'Moustache' used to say in Billy Wilder's *Irma la Douce* movie: "… but that's another story." Moreover, by making such a film reference, I have dated myself as having lived through times in which climate was just climate and automated machines were just machines.

Returning to the opening paragraph of this publication, among the books I have read which deal, in one way or another, with – allegedly – "AI" (or which deal with phenomena that are referred to as giving expression to something called: "artificial intelligence") are: *The Coming Wave* by Mustafa Suleyman; *Technofeudalism* by Yanis Varoufakis; *The AI Con* by Emily M. Bender & Alex Hanna, as well as *Empire of AI* by Karen Hao. In addition, I have read: *If Anyone Builds it, Everyone Dies: Why Superhuman AI would Kill Us All*, by Eliezer Yudkowsky & Nate Soares, and a 1950 article by Alan Turing entitled "*Computing Machinery and Intelligence*" in which the world is introduced to the 'Imitation Game' that points (problematically I believe) to a test that, supposedly, is able to establish a way of identifying conditions in which machines might be considered to be intelligent (For a number of reasons, the Turing demonstration seems

unsuccessful and rather artificial, but details concerning the foregoing claims can be found in the essay: "*Turing's Folly*" which, on occasion, has appeared in some of my books as: "SAD-SAP-SOS-Entities").

Although the latter two literary entries do have relevance to other sections of the present book, I have decided, for a variety of reasons, to put them aside during the current section. One of the reasons for doing this is because, unlike the aforementioned Turing article or the book by Eliezer Yudkowsky & Nate Soares which don't touch on the issue of climate change, the first four books that were mentioned in the previous paragraph are quite clear that the notion of global warming – now called (in an exercise of misdirection) "climate change" – is (for rather questionable considerations that are critically explored during this section of the present book) part of the paradigm out of which many people working in the realm of "artificial intelligence" operate. In other words, apparently, many people in the field of AI seem to believe that CO_2 can be shown to be a primary cause of temperature increases in the atmosphere and that, more to the point, anthropogenic generation of that gas is pushing the world toward some sort of climate-based Armageddon.

For example, Emily M Bander and Alex Hanna have devoted a number of pages in their aforementioned book which are dedicated to the climate change issue. To their credit (although the result seems to be more like an exercise of moving chairs around on the Titanic), they do point out the disconnect in the thinking of people who, on the one hand, claim to support the notion of an anthropogenic, CO_2-caused climate crisis, and, yet, on the other hand, also vigorously advocate for the construction of an increasing number of very large AI server farms which will entail a substantial release of CO_2 into the atmosphere in order to keep such server farms running.

Nonetheless, in a number of places scattered throughout: *The AI Con* by Bander/Hanna, the two authors

indicate that the notion of an anthropogenic caused climate crisis is a real thing. Indeed, the alleged 'reality' of climate change is why they have pointed out the foregoing disconnect in the thinking of some individuals who believe both in AI as well as in the issue of climate change and, yet, do not seem to understand the role which AI server farms might play – according to the authors – in exacerbating the presumed climate problem.

Mustafa Suleyman (*The Coming Wave*) and Yanis Varoufakis (*Technofeudalism*) both genuflect, from time to time, at the altar of anthropogenic climate change in their respective books. Yet, neither author provides anything (consisting of even a few paragraphs or pages) which would justify their claims concerning the anthropogenic nature of the climate issue and, instead, they just give expression to their contentions as if the notion of global warming or global warming constituted an unquestionable set of truths that do not require empirical support.

Furthermore, Karen Hao stipulates in *Empire of AI* that climate change is something of a dogma within much of the artificial general intelligence (AGI) community of researchers. Among other things, this dogma appears to be rooted in the belief that AGI will be able to solve that sort of conundrum through a form of intelligence which allegedly transcends human capabilities and, therefore, will be able – supposedly -- to successfully deal with problems such as "climate change" that, to date, have eluded – according to the climate change narrative – the limitations of human intelligence.

The foregoing considerations concerning the place which the climate change issue appears to hold within research communities that are focusing on developing facility with AI and AGI is surprising, if not somewhat disconcerting. On the one hand, individuals from the foregoing communities are extremely intelligent, with considerable competence in mathematics and computer coding, and, yet, on the other hand, one has to wonder how

they arrived at their conceptual position on climate change because whatever their arguments might be (and the word "whatever" is used because they often seem to make declarative statements concerning the alleged anthropogenically caused climate crisis rather than put forth evidence-based, rigorously parsed positions), their conceptual orientation concerning climate doesn't seem to be based in actual evidence or even rooted in an understanding concerning the most basic of principles involving issues of climatology.

What follows will be an attempt to provide an overview of certain key aspects of climatology. However, in order to place the ensuing discussion in an appropriate context, I should indicate that while: (a) I believe various contentions are untenable that are committed to the idea that the alleged invasion of the atmosphere by anthropogenically generated CO_2 emissions that, supposedly, are pushing the world and its various life forms into a climate crisis of a possibly irreversible nature (and the following commentary will address the underpinnings of the foregoing claim), nonetheless, the previous acknowledgment does not commit me, in any way, to adopting: (b) A position which requires me to dismiss the idea that there aren't a diverse set of anthropogenic-generated problems which are threatening human existence as well as the ecological niches in which humans reside.

The problems being alluded to in the foregoing paragraph range from: (1) The multiplicity of toxicities that are flowing into those ecological niches through the manufacture and release of some 50,000 improperly tested and regulated chemicals; to: (2) Fracking dynamics which are not only leading to the leeching and leaking of toxic materials into the water table (and, eventually, into human beings as well) but those fracking dynamics also are creating geological instabilities which render a variety of areas vulnerable to forces (earthquakes, mudslides, and sink holes) that under the right conditions can bring about

catastrophic events; (3) non-ionizing forms of energy that are irradiating the Earth on a 24/7 - 365 days-a-year schedule via more and more cell towers, satellites, and fiber optical systems which, among other things, have been implicated in helping to bring about an epidemic of adrenal insufficiency that is leading to biological breakdown in human beings, and that, also, are having debilitating, if not lethal, consequences for many other species of life; (4) the constant dumping of heavy metals into the atmosphere and onto the Earth via chemtrails which are terraforming the Earth in problematic, increasingly unlivable ways; (5) the willfully blind release of endocrine disrupting biological agents into the environment which are threatening sperm counts, undermining reproductive development, and muddying the process of distinguishing between male and female; (6) the utterly irresponsible manner in which many oil (remember Deep Horizon), gas, coal, lithium, and other mining activities (e.g., coltan, a metallic ore which when refined becomes tantalum and is used in many kinds of electronic devices because of its capacity to hold a high electrical charge) that ruin communities and ecosystems (just ask people in the alleged Democratic Republic of the Congo); (7) the way in which all too many pharmaceutical products are undermining the health and mental well-being of human beings despite the fact that the manufacturers of those products have so little confidence in their "goods" that twice (1986, when Reagan signed into law the National Childhood Vaccine Act and, again, in 2005 during the George W. Bush administration in conjunction with the PREP Act) pharmaceutical and vaccine manufacturers have lobbied for and, shamelessly, have been given substantial freedom from legal liability that might arise from their products; (8) the discovery of the Great Pacific Garbage Patch between California and Hawaii, as well as the North Atlantic Garbage Patch (and there are three other lesser flotillas of plastic waste bobbing about various oceans) which are adversely

affecting the viability of food-chains in those waterways, together with the increasing evidence indicating that substantial concentrations of microplastics are being found in drinking water; and (9) the mountains of toxic e-wastes which are associated with the manufacture, use, and disposal of electronic devices, as well as the tremendous consumption of water and energy which makes possible AI server farms possible and which are being built at an increasing rate, not to mention the sound, heat, and electrical-smog pollution that is generated by those server farms and which is inducing illness in increasing numbers of people.

More items could have been added to the foregoing list of anthropogenically generated problems. For example, one could explore the concerns outlined in the aforementioned book: *If Anyone Builds it, Everyone Dies: Why Superhuman AI would Kill Us All*, by Eliezer Yudkowsky & Nate Soares, and one might even exacerbate the problem which the two authors outline in relation to the extinction level event that could be set in motion by the advent of some form of AGI technology which transcends human cognitive capabilities and, instead, proceed to raise the possibility (as is being done now) that automated, algorithmically-driven heuristic networks that are computationally combinatoric in nature don't have to reach the level of an AGI (artificial general intelligence) to bring about an extinction level event for human beings but, rather, such systems merely would have to have the capacity to operate according to forms of agency that are opaque to human understanding and, therefore, cannot be countered by human intervention.

Thermostats have agency in the sense that they have been programmed to automatically set in motion certain events (such as the raising or lowering of environmental temperature) given the detection of certain conditions. Agency doesn't have to be rooted in consciousness and exotic forms of intelligence in order to be able to set in motion a set of events that can affect human existence.

Indeed, if one were to build a sufficiently complex form of "thermometer" – and this is coming closer to being realized with each passing day – that was able to regulate (for example, in the form of a "smart" city): Heat, light, communication, transportation, finances, manufacturing, as well as supply chains and, then, if the foregoing complex "thermometer-like" system were to direct those capabilities to shape the behavior of human beings by raising or lowering different kinds of functionality that were dependent on the detection of certain conditions of human forms of compliance or non-compliance with various sorts of political expectations, then, there is a fairly good chance that human beings might soon be staring into the abyss of their demise – all without any form of superintelligence being present ... the only feature which would be needed is a technology that had been brought into existence by human beings which had unintended consequences as a result of functioning in a way that was opaque to human understanding (again, think of 'Move 37 by AlphaGo versus Lee Sedol in 2016).

Notwithstanding the foregoing possibilities, enough has been said to grasp the general tenor of the perspective being put forth. Human beings are polluting the Earth in an increasingly diverse number of deeply problematic ways.

However, anthropogenically-caused CO_2 is not necessarily one of those ways. So, let us begin to reflect on why this might be the case.

When I was an undergraduate and rummaging about for a major (at one point, or another, I explored: Theology, physical sciences, philosophy, and, finally, social relations), I took a philosophy course with Morton White who had taught at Harvard for many years before moving on to the Institute of Advanced Studies which is associated with, but independent of, Princeton University.

One of the aspects of the foregoing course that stuck with me, lo' these many years, had to do with an extended

discussion concerning the notion of causation. For instance, consider the example of lighting a match.

If one strikes the match on a hard surface, and it lights, can one necessarily say that the striking of the match is what caused a flame to occur. Although one's tendency might be to say: "Well, yes, the striking of the match is what causes the match to light up," this is not actually correct.

For instance, if there were an insufficient supply of oxygen surrounding the striking process, then, the match would not light. If the match head were wet, then, the match is not likely to light.

If the composition of the match head had been improperly manufactured so that incorrect proportions of the chemicals (e.g., potassium chloride, sulfur, glass powder, and various fillers) that are needed to make a functional match-head were not present, then, the match likely would not light. If the match stick on which the match head is placed had been made incorrectly, then, the stick might be likely to break before match head ignition speed had been reached.

If the surface across which the match were drawn did not possess the necessary properties (say, a certain degree of roughness), then, the match is not likely to ignite. If the force with which a match was drawn across that kind of a surface were not sufficiently forceful, the match might not be able to ignite.

If the surrounding conditions were too windy, the match might not light when struck. If the match head were struck against a surface at a problematic angle, then, once again, the match might not ignite.

If a person were, for whatever reason, to decide against lighting a given match, then, obviously, the match will not ignite – unless this should occur through some sort of spontaneous combustion phenomenon, and if this latter kind of event were to happen, then, this would raise a whole set of additional questions concerning the nature of

causality. Moreover, there might be many thoughts, ideas, memories, emotions, sensations, or physical conditions which could lead to a match either being struck or not being struck, and, then, one would have to investigate the nature of consciousness, intelligence, understanding, neuronal processing, glial cellular dynamics, bioelectrical phenomena, neurotransmitter activity, hormonal functioning, and so on, to try to figure what might have caused an individual to either strike or not strike a match at a given point in time.

One also could ask about what role might be played by the mining and/or manufacture of the chemicals and components that are used in the making of a match with respect to establishing the full-context of causality in relation to the ignition of a given match. Additionally, what role do the people involved in the making, transporting, and selling of matches have in a given match being lit?

We often tend to simplify the conditions of causality in order to make such a dynamic more understandable or convenient for usage during social discourse, and, as a result, we have short-handed ways of talking with one another about causality. For instance, we contend that a match lights because it was struck, and, for the most part, this "causal" account might provide what is needed for a discussion to be able to continue, but, nevertheless, such an account would, causally speaking, be superficial.

Even in seemingly relatively simple cases, causality tends to be a complex process. As was the case in the previously discussed match-lighting example, many factors need to come together with the right kind of: Sequences, combinations, quantities, qualities, properties, conditions, components, and forces in order for things to happen.

Unlike the example of match-lighting, the dynamics of climate are not so simple. Yet, all too many individuals appear to be intent on stripping climate of its complexity – such as when people say that anthropogenic-generated increases in CO_2 are causing global warming.

To begin with, theories about an alleged greenhouse effect as well as the associated notion of a greenhouse gas are misnomers in relation to the issue of climate. The greenhouse effect refers to the tendency of certain kinds of structures (e.g., glass greenhouses) to allow visible sunlight to pass into the interior of that kind of a structure while also trapping a certain amount of the infrared radiation associated with sunlight and, thereby, prevent infrared radiation from the interior of the structure to escape and, in the process, help to warm whatever contents (say, plants) that might be present in the interior of those structures.

However, the foregoing dynamic does not necessarily accurately reflect the nature of the relationship among the Sun, solar radiation, the Earth, and the latter's atmosphere. If the foregoing possibility turns out to be true, then, to speak of a greenhouse effect in context of climate is problematic, and, by way of implication and inference, if there is no greenhouse effect associated with the Earth, then, there are no greenhouse gasses involved in climate even if there are atmospheric gasses that are capable of absorbing infrared radiation.

Gases such as: CO_2, water vapor and methane, are capable of absorbing and retaining photons with infrared frequencies when the dipole moments of those gases (the way in which electrical charges of opposite sign interact with one another to create polar contexts of electronegativity due to an unequal sharing of electrons) undergo a change in atomic or molecular conformation as a result of engaging with solar radiation that is passing through the atmosphere, and, in the process, a certain amount of CO_2 absorbs some amount of energy. Such infrared-affected molecules will become energetic, and, under certain circumstances, the motion of those molecules might become associated with thermal phenomena … in other words, heat.

However, the aforementioned energy is not necessarily trapped in perpetuity. Such infrared-energized gas molecules proceed to engage in interactions with other molecules, and during the latter sorts of dynamics, energy could be transferred to other molecules, and/or, alternatively, molecules such as CO_2 might emit a certain amount of energy while interacting with other molecules.

Looked at from one perspective, climate is a function of the dynamics of energy transfer that takes place in relation to Earth and its atmosphere. In other words, climate gives expression to the phenomena which emerge due to the manner in which energy is induced, by a number of factors, to flow in and around Earth and its atmosphere.

Consequently, in order to acquire some appreciation for the role which CO_2 might play in climate, one has to understand something about the prevalence of that molecule in Earth's atmosphere. For instance, the total weight of Earth's atmosphere is estimated to be about five quadrillion tons which can be also be expressed as a 1 followed by 15 zeroes worth of molecular tonnage.

The amount of CO_2 that is emitted into the atmosphere each year is estimated to be approximately 30 billion tons. So, when one divides the latter figure by the total number of molecular tons present in the Earth's atmosphere, one finds that emitted CO_2 constitutes, by weight, 0.00003 or three hundred-thousands of one percent of the Earth's atmosphere.

One also should try to keep in mind with respect to the foregoing considerations that industrial activity is not the only source of CO_2 emissions on Earth. More specifically, under various conditions, chemical dynamics taking place in the ocean, as well as when the ocean interacts with the atmosphere, can lead to the generation of CO_2.

In addition, CO_2 is one of the principle gases released through volcanic activity. Moreover, the decomposition of wood and other decaying vegetation also releases varying amounts of CO_2 into the atmosphere.

Aside from the issue of calculating the prevalence of CO_2 – in terms of weight percentage – relative to the rest of the Earth's atmosphere, an alternative way of talking about the prevalence of CO_2 in the Earth's atmosphere is in terms of parts per million. The number of parts per million of CO_2 present in the atmosphere at any given time varies as a function of a variety of conditions and factors.

Presently, the number of parts per million of CO_2 that are present in the atmosphere are in the vicinity of between 400 and 420 parts per million amidst a collective of other kinds of molecules such as oxygen, nitrogen, water vapor, methane, and trace amounts of other sorts of molecules depending on what is happening in, on, and around Earth. This means that for every 100,000 molecules in the atmosphere, then, a little under 40 of them consist of CO_2.

How many CO_2 molecules does it take to screw in a light bulb? How many CO_2 molecules are necessary to create a greenhouse effect in Earth's atmosphere?

The answer is the same in both cases. Just as CO_2 molecules can't screw in light bulbs on Earth, so too, CO_2 molecules can't establish structural conditions on Earth capable of creating at atmospheric dynamic that is capable of serving as a greenhouse-like structure through which a greenhouse effect could become manifest in a sustained fashion.

How do 400 to 420 parts of CO_2 amidst 9,999,580 to 9,999,600 other molecules create a greenhouse effect? Among other things, those 400-420 parts of CO_2 molecules that are present among nearly a million other molecules are interacting with different aspects of their environment -- such as water vapor (e.g., during cloud formation), vegetation (CO_2 plays a vital role in photosynthesis), oceans (which are carbon sinks for CO_2, methane, and water vapor), as well as other kinds of molecules which might be released into the atmosphere according to

whatever forms of chemistry and physics are taking place in different parts of the world.

Given the foregoing considerations, how does CO_2 -- which is interacting with nearly 5 quadrillion tons (a 1 followed by 15 zeroes) of other kinds of molecules -- form any kind of barrier (allegedly like a glass greenhouse) which would be capable of preventing thermal phenomena -- that is being fueled by solar-induced energetic forms of CO_2 –- from dissipating in one way or another? Such interactions certainly contribute, according to prevailing conditions, to the dynamics of energy transfer to different regions of the Earth , but it is difficult (if not impossible) to envision, or grasp, how so few – relatively speaking – CO_2 molecules would be capable of creating a world-wide greenhouse-like barrier at some level in the atmosphere that, like plastic garbage patches in the oceans, would allow thermal activity to pool about in a sustained fashion and, as well, be able to accumulate over time.

Can CO_2 absorb photons with infrared frequencies? Yes, it can.

Can CO_2 engage, and be engaged, by other molecules (in plants, oceans, and the atmosphere) during the course of events? Yes, it can.

Is CO_2 involved in the transfer of energy that helps to shape climate in any given region? Yes, it is.

Does CO_2 play a role in the thermal regulation of the Earth's atmosphere, oceans, and continents? Yes, it does.

Do any of the foregoing concessions force one to acknowledge that CO_2 – like the glass components of a greenhouse – traps energetic infrared photon frequencies, and, as a result, leads to increasing temperatures which cannot be dissipated in any fashion? No, none of the foregoing concessions – taken individually or collectively – requires one to conclude that CO_2 must be considered to be a gas that cumulatively and continuously traps solar infrared frequencies for an extended period of time and, in the process, creates conditions that give rise to a

greenhouse effect that causes constantly rising temperatures as more and more such gases supposedly trap solar energy.

Even if one were to suppose that each and every molecule of atmospheric CO_2 trapped photonic infrared frequencies for extended periods of time, how would such an admission demonstrate that the three hundred-thousands of one percent of the atmosphere which is attributable to CO_2 emissions is capable of creating, or forming, an impenetrable, molecular roof (allegedly like a greenhouse) over the Earth's atmosphere, and, thereby, prevent any radiation – in the form of infrared frequencies – from escaping from Earth? Moreover, given the foregoing considerations, why would anyone suppose that photonic infrared energies will continue to stay trapped in CO_2 molecules rather than enter into interactions with nearly a quadrillion atmospheric molecules, not to mention the quadrillion tons of molecules of vegetation, oceans, and land masses which might be encountered by any given CO_2 molecule during its journeys above, on, and within the land masses and oceans of Earth?

CO_2, water vapor, and methane are all capable of having their molecular dipole moments affected by the presence of photonic infrared frequencies from the Sun and, in the process, becoming energized through those sorts of interactions. Nonetheless, while one can show that such interactions do shape the way in which energy flows in and around Earth, no one has shown how those interactions give rise to an Earth that would be encased in a greenhouse-like molecular structure or edifice which is vulnerable to some sort of run-away, trapped, infrared-based, greenhouse effect, and, consequently, one cannot defensibly treat CO_2, water vapor, or methane as greenhouse gases because there appears to be no intelligible account for how such a greenhouse effect involving Earth would emerge.

Unfortunately, both critics of, as well as proponents of, the global warming issue refer to the aforementioned molecules as greenhouse gases, and this is simply not the case. The discussion would become much less obfuscated if people talked in terms of the way in which energy transfer phenomena are involved in climate dynamics rather than being spoken of as being a function of the greenhouse effect and/or greenhouse gases since the latter terms are arbitrary, hermeneutical mumblings of an untenable theory concerning climate in conjunction with the Earth and its atmosphere.

During the early days of Earth's existence, there was believed to be a high concentration of CO_2 molecules in the atmosphere -- possibly as high as 900,000, or more, molecules of CO_2 per million molecules. As indicated earlier, the current number of CO_2 molecules is between 400 and 420 parts per million of any given set of one million atmospheric molecules.

Obviously, given the foregoing, then, over millions of years, there has been a decline in the relative numbers of CO_2 molecules per million atmospheric molecules. For example, approximately 500 million years ago, the atmospheric content of CO_2 was believed to be about 7,500 parts per million.

The Cambrian explosion of life took place around 500 million years ago. This was well before industrialization took place, and, yet, the concentration of CO_2 in the atmosphere was nearly 19 times the levels which are associated with all of the "sky is falling" consternation which has occurred over the last 40, or so, years.

Moreover, between nine million and 25 million years ago, the concentration of CO_2 in the atmosphere tended to vary between 180 and 290 parts per million atmospheric molecules. Again, although industrialization hadn't quite begun yet, the foregoing concentration of CO_2 bordered on giving expression to a near-famine set of conditions as far as photosynthesis is concerned, and, yet, life continued on

as, among other things, gorillas were believed to have branched off from the ponginae (great apes, including orangutans) around 7 million years ago, and the ponginae were believed to have split off from other great apes approximately 15 million years ago, and the great apes were believed to have risen following the appearance of the lesser apes, such as the gibbons, some 17 million years ago, and apes were believed to have split from the monkeys about 25 million years ago.

Over the course of those millions of years the concentration of CO_2 ranged from 7,500 parts per million to somewhere between 180 to 290 parts per million. There were periods of warming during those 500 million years and there were periods of glaciation during some of those years, but nowhere is there any evidence that those shifts in atmospheric concentrations of CO_2 caused either the periods of warming or the periods of glaciation, or indicated that either high concentration or low concentrations of CO_2 were tied to extinction level events for life.

In other words, CO_2 concentrations do not appear to be a driving force for conditions of warming, glaciation or the development of life. Instead, CO_2 seems to be a dependent variable that responds to a variety of other factors that had been generating conditions of warming and glaciation through which, somehow, life survived -- if not flourished -- and, as a result, changes in concentrations of CO_2 often only followed, or emerged, as a function of such driving forces in climate dynamics.

For example, Nicolas Callion was part of a French Atomic Energy Commission research team that had an article published in a 2003 edition of *Science*. The foregoing researchers analyzed air bubbles in Vostok ice core samples which had been drilled in Antarctic.

The foregoing team established that increases in CO_2 concentration lagged behind periods of deglaciation by between 800 and 1,000 years. They proposed that the

subsequent increase in CO_2 concentrations that arose some 8-10 centuries following a period of deglaciation might well have been a reflection of out-gassing dynamics which had occurred in the oceans of the Southern Hemisphere as a result of the warming periods that resulted during a period of deglaciation.

Besides CO_2, there is considerable evidence to indicate that the following factors are implicated in climate dynamics or the way in which energy and various physical/chemical processes transfer energy in, on and around the Earth: (1) The Sun's maximum and minimum cycles of activity; (2) ocean dynamics, including the amount of carbon that is being sequestered or released by the ocean; (3) hydrological cycles; (4) volcanism; (5) Earth's magnetosphere; (6) cosmic rays (which among other things, help to bring about the generation of sulfuric acid when interacting with various atmospheric molecules, which, in turn, leads to the formation of aerosols, nucleation activity, and, finally, cloud formation); (7) albedo or surface reflective effects; (8) transpiration or vegetative consumption of CO_2; (9) Milankovitch cycles involving changes in the Earth's orbital shape (100,000 year cycle), axis angle (40,000 year cycle) and the precession relationship between the Sun's orbit and the Earth's orbit (25,878 year cycle) as a result of, among other things, the gravitational effects on Earth as Saturn and Jupiter move through their orbital pathways around the Sun; (10) atmospheric dynamics which depend on water vapor activity, as well as the amount of iron that is present in the atmosphere; (11) tectonics; (12) glaciation; (13) the decomposition of wood, as well as (14) the way in which the abiotic generation of hydrocarbons in deep ocean vents that, eventually, reach the surface and react with atmospheric oxygen to produce CO_2. All of the foregoing dynamics are caught up in various kinds of positive and negative feedback processes with one another, and, in addition, there are elements of chaotic, non-linear dynamics involved in many of the foregoing

processes in which what ensues is often sensitive to starting conditions as well as characterized by tipping points or phase transitions that can induce climate to change very quickly and with varying degrees of intensity.

Yet, if one is to believe the proponents of what used to be called global warming (but was changed into "climate change" when in the late 1900's and early 2000's there were 17-19 straight years of average global cooling despite hysterical prognostications that the Earth's atmosphere was burning up), somehow – according to the proponents of climate warming – CO_2 was, is, and will continue to be the master key with respect to all of the foregoing considerations. Apparently, CO_2 is capable of overwhelming and dampening all other climate factors despite the absence of any evidence that this is the case – either in the past or in the present.

In contradistinction to the earlier discussion concerning Morton White's notion that even the striking of a match is – causally speaking – very complex, nonetheless, somehow, the extraordinary complexities of climate and the way in which energy is transferred about the Earth in a manner that both affects, and is affected by, local conditions that shape, as well as give expression to, the properties of climate in those regions as a function of the nature of the interactions between the flow of energy and the physics and chemistry of various regions of Earth through which such energy flows can -- according to the evidentially-challenged perspective of proponents of global warming/climate change -- be reduced to one single factor – namely, the amount of CO_2 (in the form of parts per million) that is present in the atmosphere.

One often hears the term "climate models" during discussions of alleged global warming. Models are believed to offer purported ways to employ mathematical tools to build a network or system that – hopefully – is capable of accurately describing, and predicting, how some given phenomena will unfold over time.

Climate models were developed in the 1960s and 1970's indicating that an ice age was imminent. Climate models were forthcoming in the late 1980's, and have continued to bubble to the surface until today, which indicated that an extinction-level heat death was, supposedly, enveloping the people of Earth even as actual evidence indicated that, on average, the Earth had been going through a period of cooling.

The foregoing models often rely on Navier-Stokes-like equations which seek to chart the flow of dynamics in the atmosphere. These are mathematical tools that involve the use of partial differential equations, but there often is no guarantee that the "solutions" generated by those equations will be able to uniquely capture the properties of a given set of dynamics or that such mathematical "solutions" even exist for whatever questions one might ask about climate dynamics.

Furthermore, whatever measurements are fed into those sorts of equations, those measurements are often subject to processes which require one to round them off in various arbitrary ways. As a result, over time, those rounding measures can lead calculations astray to such an extent that, sooner or later, the results of one's computations tend to become quite distant from what one is observing as was discovered some time ago in relation to the three-body problem.

Climate is not a three-body problem. Instead, it is a much more complicated n-body problem, and current models have no reliable way of accurately tracking the chaotic ramifications of the dynamics that are transpiring in such a diversity of interacting attractor basins which constitute, and give expression to, the flow of climate phenomena.

Weather forecast projections tend to become less than fifty percent accurate within about ten days, and one might like to keep in mind that from a certain perspective climate is just weather averaged for a given period of time.

Consequently, as one extends the number of days which is to encompass the climate phenomena that are to be studied, the prediction of such models become less and less reliable, and, yet, current climate models tend to claim that they can accurately predict what role CO_2 will be playing over the next 20, 30, 50, or 75 years with respect to those sorts of dynamics.

Where are the global warming equations that are capable of definitively capturing such complex dynamics? Where is the evidence which demonstrates that such equations are capable of providing accurate descriptions of climate phenomena when those sorts of offerings have been so problematic and unreliable in the past (and you can't be more problematic and unreliable than to predict that human beings are on the cusp of an unprecedented period of high temperatures, only to encounter 17-19, or so, straight years following such predictions in which there was no average increase in global temperatures but, instead, there was an average cooling of world temperatures?

Where are the global warming algorithms which purportedly reflect the dynamics in which CO_2 dominates all other climate-related factors and which will inexorably lead the world into a period of warming which will melt most, if not all, of the glaciers and polar caps (this might be an inconvenient truth, but isn't that what you said Al?), and kill most of, if not all of, the coral reefs (which sometimes experience bleaching as a result of climatic stress but which also often are able to recover), as well as flood most of, if not all, ocean-front properties (which explains why Obama bought beach-front property in Martha's Vineyard), as well as will lead to the extinction of most of, if not all, of the polar bears (somewhat perplexing in this regard is that recent counts appear to indicate that polar bear numbers are increasing and not declining), as well as generate storms of unprecedented numbers and ferocity (how many meteorologists have been saying words to the foregoing effect when talking about each

passing hurricane despite the evidence that such storms are, on average, no more frequent or fierce than has historically been the case ... and, of course, none of the foregoing considerations explores the issue concerning the extent to which weather is being intentionally manipulated by state-sponsors of climate terrorism via H.A.A.R.P-like and NexRad facilities which are capable of heterodyning weather systems using cooling tower emissions from thousands of industrial plants and the heavy metals being released through chemtrails? Where is the evidence which indicates that all of the foregoing events will constitute inevitable aspects of the future unless we repent our CO_2 sins?

To be sure, all too many of we human beings are committing sins galore with respect to the environment. However, as indicated previously, none of those sins is a function of anthropogenic generation of CO_2.

The perspective of the global warming crowd (a.k.a., the climate change cohort) appears to be nothing more than a page torn from the playbook of the Wimpy character in the Popeye comic strip. More specifically, Wimpy would gladly pay a person back on Tuesday in exchange for a hamburger today and, yet, the promised Tuesday pay date never materialized.

The global warming people seem to be akin to a collection of Wimpy-like individuals who have been quite assertive in their promises concerning what will happen in the future. However, when the discussion turns to seeking concrete indications – in the form of actual evidence – that real-world payment will be forthcoming, the Wimpys of the world, tend to disappear while they, presumably, seek to secure hamburgers (in the form of carbon futures) from some other source accompanied by an additional array of prognostications concerning what will unfold in the future.

In 1998, Michael Mann (along with two other researchers, Hughes and Bradley) put forth a perspective that purported to indicate that the Earth was encountering

a warming period which was spiraling out of control. The graph that gave visual representation to his "research." looked like a hockey stick in which the bottom portion traced out a hockey shaft-like set of squiggles that referred to a longish period of relatively steady temperature (characterized by a certain amount of variation), but just a short distance to the right of that hockey shaft-like section along the temporal axis, the graph exhibited a line which indicated that atmospheric temperatures would, supposedly, be shooting up like the blade of a hockey stick (and the nature of the graph is such that the foregoing description easily could have been reversed with respect to whether the hockey shaft portion or the blade was indicated to be running along the temporal or temperature axis).

The Michael Mann hockey stick graph became emblematic of the conceptual position of those who maintained that the steep temperature incline being depicted by the graph was a function of increases in the concentration, or parts per million, of CO_2 in the atmosphere. The seemingly unending, upward temperature trend of the hockey stick graph supposedly represented the way in which the present was merging into a catastrophic future.

Two researchers – Ross McKitrick and Steve McIntyre – decided to take a closer look at the methods and data which purportedly served as the foundations for Mann's graph. What they found was a form of conceptual rot which rendered the undergirding of Mann's hockey stick edifice completely unstable, unreliable, and problematically constructed.

Mann's graph was a depiction of the interpretations that had been made and conclusions to which he and his co-workers had come as a result of their study of a fairly large data set involving both Siberian tree rings as well as bristlecone pine trees (the latter are found in elevated mountain regions in the southwestern United States –

regions that tend to be quite arid). The research materials concerning bristlecone pine cores (and these measurements constituted the largest part of the data set that were being studied by Mann and his fellow researchers) came with a cautionary warning which had been provided by the two scientists -- Donald Graybill and Sherwood Idso, who had compiled a series of measurements concerning the width of the bristlecone pine cores -- who stipulated that their measurements could not necessarily be considered to be an accurate proxy indicator for atmospheric temperatures.

Bristlecone pine trees tend to have long lives. However, the bristlecone pine core data which had been collected was not consistent with what was known about the character of the climate in the surrounding region, and, in addition, there were a number of factors, besides temperature, which could affect the size of the tree ring width. Therefore, Graybill and Idso were warning anyone who might be engaging their findings that the ring widths of the pinecone cores were not necessarily a reliable proxy for temperature.

For unknown, "methodological" reasons, Mann decided to ignore the warnings which accompanied the data subset involving the aforementioned bristlecone pine core measurements. In addition -- and again for unknown "methodological" reasons -- Mann also proceeded to propose that the ring width measurements that had been made in conjunction with bristlecone pine cores that were located in various mountains which were present in southwestern United States actually could be used as a reliable proxy marker for the nature of climate everywhere else on Earth, and this is like saying that if someone had some iffy evidence suggesting that it might be raining in the mountains of southwestern United States, then, this means that rain also must be falling everywhere in the world rather than just locally.

In addition to the foregoing form of questionable treatment of the underlying proxy data, Mann also downplayed the many uncertainties and unanswered questions concerning the alleged capacity of bristlecone pines to serve as an accurate proxy for issues of climate given the inconsistencies between the proxy data for climate that was drawn from bristlecone pine cores and the proxy evidence concerning climate which was available from the region surrounding the foregoing bristlecone pines. Instead, notwithstanding an absence of evidence capable of supporting the following contention, Mann claimed that the bristlecone pine cores clearly indicated, supposedly, that 1998 had been the hottest year on record for the last five hundred years or more.

During the last five hundred years, or so, there had been a medieval warming period as well as a cooling period (the latter was referred to as a little ice age), which took place between the 14th and 19th centuries. Even if one were to assume that the analysis of Mann and his colleagues concerning the bristlecone pine cores had been rigorous and reliable – which it wasn't – nonetheless, rather than entertain the possibility that whatever might have been the case with respect to temperatures in 1998, nevertheless, this might just be part of a cycle of warming and cooling that could be shown to have been taking place for more than five hundred years and which exhibited a certain amount of temperature variation with respect to the extent of the warming and cooling that might have been manifested at certain points in a given region (and not the whole Earth) over the course of those five centuries.

Mann and his fellow researchers decided to use their analysis of the problematic data from the bristlecone pine cores as indicative of what had been happening climatically for five hundred years in conjunction with the ring width as evidence to claim that 1998 purportedly had set a record – according to Mann and his colleagues – for the hottest year in a thousand years. They did this despite

the fact that such an interpretation could not be reconciled with other proxy data concerning climate that were present in the general region of those bristlecone pines and, perhaps, just as importantly – and was indicated previously -- that there was considerable evidence to indicate that bristlecone pine trees tend to be sensitive to a variety of conditions and factors other than temperature which can affect the width of the rings that are found in the core samples.

The paper by Mann and his colleagues containing the hockey stick graph appeared in the April 1998 issue of *Nature*. However, when other researchers sought to gain access to the data which Mann had used to anchor his conclusions so that those researchers might determine whether or not the findings of Mann and his fellow researchers could be replicated (a crucial part of scientific methodology), Mann resisted those efforts.

Six years were required to induce Mann to release the proxy data from the bristlecone pine core research, and there were times during this lengthy period of time when Mann, seemingly, attempted to "pervert the course" of science (a tweak of the British way of speaking about certain kinds of illicit activity) that were marked by substantial pressure being applied to Mann to bring about the release of that data. The pressure was exerted not only be investigators acting at the behest of the United States Congress but, as well, pressure to release the data on which Mann and his fellow researchers had based their conclusions was exerted by the editors of the very journal – namely, *Nature* – which originally had published the article containing the hockey stick-like graph.

In an attempt to demonstrate that his findings were valid, Mann subsequently reanalyzed his data sans the material from the bristlecone pine cores (and one should keep in mind that the bulk of the data set which was being analyzed by Mann involved the bristlecone pine research which had been conducted earlier by two other, previously

mentioned scientists. The results or the reworked analysis proved to be disastrous for the claims concerning the nature of climate over the last thousand years which had been advanced by Mann and his research colleagues.

On the one hand, the iconic Hockey Stick-like image which had characterized the previous round of data analysis and which came to problematically frame the understanding of millions of people around the world had gone missing in action during the second round of analysis. On the other hand, the aforementioned second analysis – sans the bristlecone pine core research – displayed no discernible pattern with respect to possible temperature increases in the twenty-first century, and, therefore, Mann's notion that 1998 was the hottest year for five hundred to a thousand years was reduced to being little more than a manifestation of statistical noise rather than a significant portent of things to come.

Mann, then, did what no individual who values and honors the methods of science should do. He buried the findings concerning his reanalysis of proxy data from which the bristlecone pine core research had been removed and, consequently, he had hidden his more recent analytic results from other researchers as well as the general public.

At one point, Mann claimed that his research successfully satisfied the requirements entailed by an r^2 statistical check. This sort of test is carried out in order to provide evidence that a given methodological treatment of data can be shown to have statistical significance and, therefore, might have some degree of scientific credibility.

Yet, when the foregoing r^2 results were subsequently released, they did not show what Mann previously had claimed was the case – namely, that his analysis of the data showed statistical significance. Despite evidence to the contrary concerning what he previously had stipulated, Mann later tried to argue that he had never performed the

r^2 statistical significance test but had, instead, relied on other considerations.

The algorithm which Mann and his colleagues used to probe the tree ring data sets in their search for whatever patterns might be present in that data was predisposed to find hockey-stick-like patterns … it was designed with that capability. Moreover, that algorithm also tended to not only downplay whatever uncertainties might be associated with their analysis of the data but, as well, tended to attribute a dominating sort of dynamic influence to such data points even when those influences might have been relatively minor in nature.

As a result, given random events that were not independent of one another, but, instead, were autocorrelated in some fashion, hockey-stick-like patterns could be detected by the Mann-algorithm being alluded to under a variety of conditions which didn't necessarily have anything to do with the world. In short, the algorithm which Mann and his research colleagues used to analyze data was biased in several ways and, as a result, it could provide them with the sorts of patterns for which they were looking irrespective of whether those patterns actually reflected realities of climate as opposed to patterns that were artificially generated and merely reflected the structural and logical inclinations or tendencies of the algorithmic methods being used.

Mann was not alone in pursuing activities that seemed designed to "pervert the course" of science. He had considerable company in this regard from some of his global warming colleagues.

In fact, one of the secondary authors – namely, Malcolm Hughes – who was part of the aforementioned 1998 *Nature* paper that contained the Hockey-Stick-like graph was co-author of a 1994 article which sought to overturn a perspective that had considerable support and acceptance among climatologists. More specifically, the foregoing 1994 article put forth the theoretical possibility that the

warming period which had taken place in Medieval times (beginning around 950 CE and continuing on through 1250 CE) was limited to Europe instead of giving expression to a much broader and more extensive atmospheric warming phenomena trend that was believed by many climatologists to have taken place in the aforementioned three-hundred year period. In addition, the 1994 Hughes paper attempted to lessen the severity of the cooling period which was believed to have occurred during the so-called "Little Ice Age" that transpired during the later Medieval period.

According to a 2010 book entitled *The Hockey Stick Illusion* which had been written by A.W. Montford, the author put forth the following thesis: By claiming that the Medieval Warming Period was restricted to Europe rather being more extensive in its impact and also by claiming that, perhaps, the temperatures associated with the "Little Ice Age" were not as severe as generally believed, the conceptual stage had been set for Mann to come along with his Hockey-Stick-like graph and indicate that the temperatures being recorded in the latter part of the twentieth century (especially 1990, 1995, 1997, and 1998) were the hottest temperatures that had taken place in more than a thousand years.

By claiming that the Medieval Warming Period had not been as geographically extensive and as warm as previously had been believed, Mann believed he was in conceptual position to be able to argue that the average global temperatures reached in 1998 could be put forward as constituting an atmospheric temperature that hadn't occurred for a millennia, and, consequently (or, so, the narrative went), such increasingly hotter atmospheric temperatures couldn't be attributed to anything other than the climatological elephant in the room – namely, the manner in which CO_2 emissions were generating higher and higher levels of concentrations – as measured in parts per million – in the atmosphere.

Even if Hughes had been right with respect to: (a) his claims that the Medieval Warming Period was restricted to Europe and (b) that the cooling in the "Little Ice Age" was not as severe as climatologists tended to believe, nonetheless, neither Mann nor Hughes offered any evidence or proof that anthropogenic CO_2 emissions – even if increasing – were the cause of the warming being depicted in the Hockey Stick-like graph rather than entertaining the possibility that whatever changes in CO_2 atmospheric concentration which were being measured were <u>dependent on</u>, rather than <u>the cause of</u>, whatever changes in temperature might have been occurring.

Furthermore, even if Hughes had been right with respect to the possibilities being advanced in his 1994 article about the nature of the Medieval Warming Period as well as the character of the "Little Ice Age," nonetheless, Mann's Hockey Stick-like graph could not be used to depict the idea that temperature readings in the latter part of the 20th century constituted a run away, upward temperature spiral. This is because Ross McKitrick and Steve McIntyre had demonstrated during their critical review of the methods and data underlying Mann's Hockey Stick-like graph that the article written by Mann, Hughes, and Bradley in 1998 was relatively worthless.

Finally, the article on the Medieval Warming Period and the "Little Ice Age" which Hughes had co-authored in 1994 suggested possibilities rather than proved that those possibilities were, in fact, true. The proffered perspective involving allegedly credible research concerning the downgraded nature of the Medieval Warming Period followed by a "Little Ice Age" that was littler, supposedly, than advertised which had been set in motion by Hughes in 1994, and, then, followed up four years later with the article by Mann, Hughes, and Bradley was nothing more than a false positive, and, as a result, the propagandistic value of the Hockey Stick-like graph-meme collapsed, and, yet, members of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (the IPCC) continued to push that false narrative

despite the existence of considerable evidence that the theoretical edifice being built by Hughes, Bradley, and Mann was not tenable.

In 1990 -- four years prior to Hughes' 1994 article and eight years prior to the 1998 article by Mann, Hughes, and Bradley – the IPCC released its initial publication concerning the issue of climate change. The report put forth by the UN-related organization (i.e. IPCC) put forth a perspective which, at that time, might have been considered to be a mainstream conceptual framework through which to study climatology.

In other words, among other things, the foregoing 1990-perspective indicated that the IPCC acknowledged the occurrence of a Medieval Warming Period which was believed to have gone on for approximately three centuries between roughly 950 and 1250 CE. Moreover, this period of warming was considered to have extended well beyond the geographical boundaries of Europe and, as well, was believed to have been hotter than the average temperatures which had been measured in the latter part of the twentieth century.

In addition, the 1990 IPCC report stipulated that approximately three centuries ago there had been a "Little Ice Age" which took place between 150 to 450 ago. During that "age", there was considerable evidence to indicate that extensive glaciation had taken place in alpine areas distributed throughout many parts of the world and consequently, while little relative to other, more extensive ice ages that had occurred in the past, nonetheless, the "Little Ice Age" exhibited temperatures which were much colder than the sort of merely 'moderately harsh-winter-type' of narrative that was being spun by Hughes and Mann.

The 1990 IPCC report also indicated that cycles of glaciation seemed to have taken place roughly every 100,000 years for the last several million years. According to the IPCC at that time, the temperature differential

between periods of glaciation and deglaciation were believed to run between 5-7° Centigrade.

Quite apart from the foregoing considerations, members of the IPCC – even in the early 1990's -- were of the opinion that anthropogenic generation of CO_2 was causing global warming. The IPCC had no evidence to indicate that CO_2 was capable of causing global warming, and, moreover, the IPCC could not provide a plausible mechanism or system of physical and chemical dynamics through which CO_2 supposedly would lead to global warming.

In other words, global warming was never about the physics and chemistry of climatology. It was an exercise in social engineering and a money-making scheme which would use carbon emissions as a way to leverage control of human beings and generate substantial sums of money for people dealing in carbon swaps and so-called green energy technology.

Consequently, when Mann, Hughes, and Bradley came along with their 1998 paper which claimed that temperatures were spiraling out of control in a way that supposedly had never taken place previously, their article coincided with the vested interests of the IPCC concerning the issue of the anthropogenic cause of global warming via CO_2. After all, if global atmospheric temperatures were trending upward in an unprecedented manner, and given that processes of industrialization could be correlated with such alleged atmospheric temperature increases, then, "obviously" (???) the latter dynamics "must be" (???) the reason why Mann, Hughes, and Bradley had made the research discoveries that were published in 1998 and which gave expression to the Hockey-Stick-like graph that apparently showed global temperatures rising and bringing about a global crisis.

The foregoing account is nothing more than a narrative being barked out to the marks or citizens of a carnival-invented world. The foregoing statement is the case

because in order for the IPCC to be able to turn their narrative into a defensible scientific explanation, they would have to be able to provide both credible, validated evidence for, as well as a defensible, plausible mechanism for, the role of CO_2 in global warming.

The Mann, Hughes, Bradley 1998 paper fell apart as a source of evidence capable of lending support to the IPCC's desire to make CO_2 the patsy in the global warming con because, as previously indicated, Ross McKitrick and Steve McIntyre, among others, had revealed that the former article was nothing but dodgy, if not just bad, science. Moreover, since no one in the IPCC, on anywhere else, could provide a tenable, concrete account concerning the nature of the physics and chemistry of how CO_2 constituted 'a', or 'the', cause of global warming, the IPCC was left with nothing but a social engineering narrative being flogged as a scientific theory.

However, not wishing to give up the power and money which were being fueled by the meme that "CO_2 causes global warming," the IPCC doubled and tripled down on pushing the meme as an expression of science rather than as an expression of a Machiavellian strategy for controlling human beings and the Earth's resources. As a result, the IPCC went in search of evidence – or anything remotely resembling alleged evidence – that might be able to be used to "show" that the Medieval Warming Period was either a very limited, regional climate phenomenon and/or that the MWP did not really give expression to higher atmospheric temperatures than the atmospheric temperatures which were supposedly being recorded in the 1990's, and if this could be accomplished, then, "surely" (???) the significance of the Hockey-Stick-like graph was "demonstrating" (???) that CO_2 was the culprit with respect to the way in which atmospheric temperatures were allegedly spiraling out of control as the Earth headed into the twenty-first century.

For the sake of argument, let's suppose that the IPCC – or someone else – found substantial, undeniable evidence that the Medieval Warming Period was limited to Europe, or that the atmospheric temperatures which occurred during that period were less than the temperatures that were being recorded in the 1990's, or let us entertain the idea that the Medieval Warming Period never occurred at all. Even in the event that one, or more, of the foregoing possibilities were capable of being evidentially established beyond a reasonable doubt, none of those discoveries would provide the IPCC with what it needs to lend scientific support to its social-engineering narrative concerning CO_2.

More specifically, the IPCC must be able to provide an account of the specific physical and chemical dynamics through which CO_2 causes global warming or causes atmospheric temperatures to rise globally. The IPCC has not done this in a rigorous and defensible scientific manner, and, consequently, its claims that global warming is an anthropogenically caused phenomenon which can be traced to CO_2, and the generation of CO_2 by processes of industrialization, are scientifically empty statements.

To be sure, as previously noted, one can show that CO_2 is capable of absorbing, emitting, transferring, sharing, and helping to shape the flow of energy in, on, and around the Earth. Nonetheless, what the IPCC, Mann, Hughes, and any other climatologist one cares to mention have been unable to demonstrate is how CO_2 is able to create a relatively stable barrier system that extends around the Earth which not only has the capacity to accumulate and retain IR radiation but, subsequently, is able to transduce such absorbed energy into thermal activity that does not dissipate and, as a result, leads to increases in atmospheric temperatures as the level of CO_2 parts per million rises and that such increases in CO_2 concentration are a function of only, or substantially due to, anthropogenic activities.

The IPCC has no tenable scientific hypothesis concerning the manner in which CO_2 causes global warming. The IPCC has no tenable scientific theory concerning the manner in which CO_2 allegedly causes global atmospheric temperatures to increase.

The IPCC has no evidence that CO_2 causes atmospheric temperatures to rise. The IPCC has no evidence that atmospheric temperatures are spiraling out of control or that to whatever extent global atmospheric temperatures are, on average, increasing, then, this is due to CO_2 rather than being a function of diverse set of forces which interact with one another through non-linear forms of dynamics and complex feedback loops which have not been accurately captured by any of the climatology models that are being used by the IPCC – and others – to try to accurately describe climate phenomena.

A bastion of the perspective that anthropogenically generated CO_2 is the primary cause of global warming is the Climatic Research Unit which is housed at the University of East Anglia located in Norwich England. Among other things, the CRU was involved in organizing and analyzing HadCRUT.

HadCRUT is a dataset which combines sea surface temperature measurements compiled by the Hadley Center at the United Kingdom's Met Office (thus lending the "Had" part to the foregoing term) with land surface temperatures collected by the Climatic Research Unit (CRU, and, therefore, providing the CRU aspect of the term with which this paragraph began) at the University of East Anglia, and one might suppose that the "T" at the end of "HadCRU" might have something to do with temperature. This compilation of data gives expression to an on-going, monthly account of temperatures that have been measured in different parts of the world.

An unidentified hacker – or whistleblower – began releasing thousands of documents and e-mails on November 17, 2009 that were being stored at the

aforementioned Climatic Research Unit. The released documents and e-mails constituted a treasure trove of evidence which seemed to indicate that individuals at the University of East Anglia who were affiliated with the IPCC had been engaging in a variety of very unscientific and unethical forms of behavior with other IPCC affiliated individuals in various parts of the world in an attempt to promote or advance the idea that: Anthropogenically generated CO_2 is the cause of global warming.

One of the hacked/whistle-blown e-mails was written on November 16, 1999 by Phil Jones, the director of the CRU at the University of East Anglia. It described the way in which research conducted by the assistant director at the CRU – namely, Keith Briffa -- had been altered (apparently by the director of the CRU) in order to hide a problematic decline that was collected, compiled, analyzed, and subsequently published in article form by Keith Briffa and his fellow researchers.

The foregoing article described how, beginning in 1961, there was evidence that the growth of tree rings had shown decline. This was of significance because despite increases in the level of atmospheric CO_2 concentrations during the period being studied, nonetheless, the decline in tree ring growth indicated that temperatures had been going down and this was reflected in the declining size of tree ring growth.

If CO_2 was increasing in parts per million, and, yet, the atmospheric temperature in the region being studied was declining (as evidenced by the smaller size of measured tree ring growth), then, clearly, this suggested -- in contradistinction to the contention of advocates of global warming -- that CO_2 is not necessarily a primary cause capable of inducing atmospheric temperatures to rise. The foregoing anomaly is known as the "divergence problem" because it indicated that there appeared to be disconnect (as far as the anthropogenic theory of global warming is

concerned) between the presence of rising levels of CO_2 and declining atmospheric temperatures.

At some point, Michael Mann (who is referenced in the aforementioned November 16, 1999 e-mail that had been hacked/whistle-blown) concocted a methodological trick of conceptual prestidigitation which made the foregoing sort of divergence seem to disappear. More specifically, apparently, Mann had suggested that one should leave out the tree ring measures all together and just use thermometer readings.

The problem with the foregoing suggestion is that when done correctly, tree ring growth patterns have proven themselves to be, a very accurate way of determining whether atmospheric temperatures go up or down in any given year. The suggestion that the foregoing ring growth data should be discarded was not done for defensible scientific reasons (as Donald Graybill and Sherwood Idso had done in conjunction with their measurements of the cores in pinecone trees that grew in the southwestern United States) but, instead, what Mann did appeared to be an attempt to not only eliminate legitimate data and evidence that was inconvenient to a conceptual perspective (i.e., the anthropogenic theory of global warming) but, as well, was, actually, in direct opposition to a theory concerning the alleged anthropogenic cause of global warming that was being used as a means to socially engineer the world as well as to manufacture markets for green technology and carbon swaps that were worth hundreds of billions of dollars each and every year and, yet, were all based on a false, evidence-challenged theory concerning the nature of climate in relation to what role CO_2 played in both shaping and being shaped by the complexities of climatic forces.

The thousands of hacked/whistle-blown e-mails alluded to previously provided substantial evidence that many IPCC-affiliated climatologists – not only at the University of East Anglia but elsewhere around the world –

had been busily engaged in falsifying data as well as trying to hide and dismiss data which went contrary to the narrative that anthropogenically generated CO_2 was primarily responsible for the alleged global warming which supposedly was taking place. In addition those IPCC-affiliated individuals took steps to block research from being published or tried to prevent individuals being hired that were giving expression to evidence and arguments which brought into question the notion that anthropogenically generated CO_2 was responsible for alleged global warming.

Those same hacked/whistle-blown e-mails and documents indicated that various editors of climatological-related journals were being threatened by IPCC-affiliated individuals with the possibility of being fired if those editors did not serve the interests of the narrative that anthropogenically generated CO_2 was the cause of "global warming". In addition, the aforementioned cache of e-mails and documents disclosed many of the underhanded machinations being that were being pursued by IPCC-affiliated individuals who wanted to destroy the reputation and credibility of researchers who had the temerity to call into question, or speak out against, the narrative that anthropogenically generated CO_2 was the primary cause of global warming.

Anyone who opposed the foregoing "anthropogenically generated CO_2 causes global warming narrative" was a threat to the the UN-based source of power which was leveraging the foregoing narrative to spin its web of control across the entire world. Governments, academic institutions, the media, research careers, and average citizens were all targets to be induced, if not forced, to bend the knee to the evidence-less narrative that anthropogenically generated CO_2 was destroying the world.

Agenda 21, Agenda 30, the Kyoto Protocol, the Paris Accords, the Rio Summit, smart meters, sustainable

development, carbon swaps, green technology, public-private partnerships, AI, so-called smart cities, and biodigital convergence are among the many arms of the leviathan-like entity which is seeking to force oppressive, self-serving, manipulative, surveillance obsessed, militaristic, drone controlled, one world government on all human beings. So, given the foregoing considerations, let us return to a question which was raised in the opening pages of this book: Namely, why do so many individuals working in the areas of AI and AGI seem to be in agreement with the idea that anthropogenically generated CO_2 supposedly causes global warming?

The foregoing question appears to be especially pertinent in view of the considerable evidence which is available that the phenomenon of global warming has not been a real phenomenon in the recent past, nor is it a real phenomenon at the present time, nor is there any credible evidence to indicate that global warming will emerge in the near future. Consequently, there is a real "divergence" problem between the evidence and what many workers in the fields of AI and AGI are claiming about the "reality" of global warming due to (allegedly) anthropogenically-generated CO_2 emissions.

Furthermore, even if one were to concede that global warming has been, is, and will be an actual reality rather than just a narrative of vested interests seeking control over resources, human beings, and financial wealth, then, why have so many people associated with AI or AGI missed the evidential and scientific considerations which are capable of demonstrating that the global warming crowd has no tenable, scientific method which enables them to plausibly account for how anthropogenically generated CO_2 in the form of 40 molecules (the present level) per hundred thousand of other kinds of atmospheric molecules or, possibly, to the tune of 80 molecules per hundred thousand of other kinds of atmospheric molecules (the "80" figure allows for substantial increases

in CO_2 concentrations in the near future) will be capable of establishing an actual global greenhouse effect.

The contention that CO_2 molecules are capable of absorbing infrared radiation and, then, transducing such energy into forms of dynamic emission, sharing, or transference that helps shape the flow of energy in, on, and around the world is a claim that is rooted in a great deal of scientific evidence. However, claims that CO_2 molecules which absorb infrared radiation from, say, the Sun <u>must necessarily</u> lead to the emergence of thermal systems which persist over time and are cumulative in nature (i.e., the notion of global warming) have, yet, to be scientifically demonstrated.

Consequently, one can't help but wonder about why there appear to be so many individuals that are working in the fields of AI and AGI who don't seem to understand, or grasp, the nature of what is actually the case. Furthermore, why such a substantial disconnect is tolerated by so many in the AI/AGI crowd in relation to the seemingly unbridgeable chasm between evidence and belief with respect to the idea of global warming being caused by CO_2 is quite puzzling ... in fact, one might wonder if they can miss something so seemingly simple and straightforward, then, what else could have been, and might be being missed, among such individuals with respect to AI/AGI issues independent of the global warming fiasco.

Of course, one possibility is that the sorts of individuals being alluded to in the foregoing paragraph believe that such postulated systems of AI or AGI will be so intelligent that global warming – whatever it might be – will be a problem that is easily resolvable by such heuristically enabled and algorithmically driven systems that one won't need to understand the details of such allegedly anthropogenically generated CO_2 caused forms of global warming, and, as a result, while giving lip service to the idea of global warming, they haven't bothered to look into the matter very closely because they believed that AI and

AIG systems will come to the rescue irrespective of the nature of the problem being considered. Nonetheless, even if one were willing to concede the foregoing point, one still wonders how any given AGI system -- should it ever arise – will be able to provide a solution for a non-existent problem since being able to solve a non-existent problem seems beyond whatever the capabilities might be of even a super-intelligent automated systems, and, actually, the global warming narrative has elements that resonate with some of the logic-bending statements that can be found in either *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland* as well as its sequel *Through the Looking Glass.*

For instance, all of the following excerpts seem to have relevance to the global warming narrative. For example, what about Alice's words: "Why, sometimes I've believed as many as six impossible things before breakfast." Or, the Mad Hatter's observation: "It takes all the running you can do, to keep in the same place. If you want to get somewhere else, you must run twice as fast at that." Or, the Cheshire Cat's helpful advice: "If you don't know where you are going, any road can take you there." Or, the Queen of Heart's constant refrain in *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland* (which seems somewhat reminiscent of what global warming advocates tend to imply when talking about critics of the global warming narrative): "Off with her head" and "Off with his head" or "Off with their head".

Part 2 - Technocracy

On the first page of the Introduction to his 2018 book: *Technocracy: The Hard Road to World Order*, Patrick Wood suggests that issues of barbarism and violence cannot be limited to Islamic terrorists. This is a curious way of initiating his book because he easily could have said that barbarism and violence cannot be limited to Christian terrorists, and/or Jewish Terrorists, and/or Hindu terrorists, and/or Buddhist terrorists, and/or Sikh terrorists, and/or atheist terrorists, and/or indigenous terrorists -- since one can find numerous examples among each of those categories of individuals who engage in terrorist activities -- but he didn't mention any of those possibilities, and, instead, limited himself to the term "Islamic terrorism."

There is, I believe, a reason why he proceeded in the foregoing way. This issue will be revisited when, later in this second section of the current book, some critical reflections will be put forth concerning comments which Wood, along with his co-author Courtenay Turner, made toward the latter part of their 2025 offering: *The Final Betrayal: How Technocracy Destroyed America.*

Are there individuals who claim to be Muslims who have committed terrorist acts? Yes, there are, but what might, or might not, be done by an individual who refers to himself or herself as a Muslim doesn't necessarily have anything to do with Islam, and, therefore, to talk about Islamic terrorists rather than terrorists who call themselves Muslim is to engage in a round of sophistry in which the acts of individuals are used as a way of trying to discredit a perspective in which those individuals claim to believe but to which their actions operate in contradistinction.

The unfortunate reality is that there are individuals from virtually every walk of life who might be inclined toward acts of terrorism – including various members of the military, government, intelligence services, the media,

medicine, education, science, and the police – but one cannot legitimately leverage such a dismal reality as a way of trying to paint everyone else in a given group as being oriented toward terrorism. For example, Meyer Lansky, Benjamin "Bugsy" Siegel, Mickey Cohen, Arnold Rothstein, Vach Lewis, Abe Reles, Jack Zelig, and Arthur "Dutch Schultz" Flegenheimer were all alleged to have been involved in terrorist acts of one kind or another (and terrorism involves the use of violence or threats of violence to achieve desired economic and political ends).

Nevertheless, whatever acts of violence or barbarism which might have been committed by those individuals, such possible actions cannot be used as justification for claiming that all Jewish individuals must, therefore, be terrorists. One must proceed on a case by case basis.

Wood sought to use the term "Islamic terrorism" as a launching pad for introducing the idea that, now, there are other individuals and groups which also have chosen the way of violence and barbarism, as if violence and barbarism haven't been on-going since the days of Cain, thousands of years ago. Be this as it may, Wood transitions from alleged "Islamic terrorism" to another group of individuals, as if the transition being implied fully coincides with what history, supposedly, can confirm (which it can't, because Wood has made a category mistake in his assessment of things).

This latter group being alluded to in the last paragraph is The Trilateral Commission. This organization was brought into existence in 1973 through the efforts of Zbigniew Brzezinski and David Rockefeller.

According to Wood, the raison d'état for the formation of The Trilateral Commission was as a vehicle for bringing a New International Economic Order (NIEO) to the world. There are various places in *Technocracy: The Hard Road to World Order* when Wood contends that, in essence, technocracy is an economic system, but, the notion of technocracy might be more accurately described as a

system of control in which economics can be one of the tools that is used to wield or exercise that control.

One might say, to paraphrase Clausewitz, that economics is merely politics by other means. Similarly, technology is merely politics by other means.

Technocracy, government, economics, and technology all give expression to systems of geoengineering in which individuals seek to terraform their environments in ways that enable them to control the flow of: People, resources, energy, political power, behavior, money, and information in ways that are to the liking to the ones doing the controlling. Capitalism, socialism, communism, mercantilism, corporatism, and military dictatorships are all intended as systems for controlling the flow of the foregoing dynamics.

Among the tools which can be used in the aforementioned terraforming process are: Education, policing, the legal system, medicine, banking, science, the media, theology, artificial intelligence, philosophy, and eugenics. For instance, as pointed out during Part 1 of this book, climatological narratives – such as the notion that anthropogenic generated increases in CO_2 cause global warming – have the capacity to give expression to agendas that seek to establish systems of control which entangle: Resources, people, political power, energy, behavior, money, and information within webs of commodification and quantification that can be reduced to data points that give rise to structured networks which are imposed on the lives of people and induce the latter individuals to become more – if not completely -- compliant and subservient to a given system of control.

The notions of green technology, climate treaties, and sustainable development are all narratives of control. They also are all exercises in misdirection entailed by games of existential three-card-monte in which citizen-marks are led to believe that a sovereignty card is present among the options with which they are being presented, only to

discover that after the cards have been moved about by the con man in obfuscating ways, control is the sole card which will be turned over when a citizen-mark makes his, her, or their choice .

With respect to the 1970 book, *Between Two Ages: America's Role in the Technetronic Era*, which was written by Brzezinski and served as a exercise that helped prepare the conceptual path for the birth of the forthcoming Trilateral Commission that Brzezinski helped found three years later, Patrick Wood observes that the aforementioned author maintained that socialism Marxism, and communism were just conceptual systems which were paving the way for the arrival of the Technetronic Era.

One wonders why Brzezinski left capitalism out of the foregoing list of economic/political systems of thought which, supposedly, had helped to pave the way to a modern Technetronic Era. One also wonders why Wood did not draw attention to the rather strange circumstance that the term "capitalism" was absent from Brzezinski's list.

Perhaps, Brzezinski and Wood, each in his own way, wanted to create the impression that, somehow, capitalism is beyond such considerations. Yet, capitalism – like socialism, Marxism, and communism (each in its own way) – tends to reduce humans to being nothing more than entities that are intended to further a system of control which serves the interests of a few overlords, and, in fact, capitalism, socialism, Marxism, communism, corporatism, and technocracy are just different editions or models of an underlying inclination for control that is present in each of those systems.

Wood indicates that China still has some of the trappings of communism but he asserts that many commentators in academia maintain that China has graduated to a full-fledged system of technocracy. One might equally well contend that the West in general, and

America in particular, still have some of the trappings of capitalism but, nonetheless, America is in the process of transitioning into a full-fledged technocracy as evidenced, among other things, by the fact that the United States (which are actually anything but united) actually has more surveillance cameras per capita than does China and as also evidenced by the fact that the military-industrial complex about which Eisenhower warned Americans some 65 years ago has been siphoning of hundreds of billions of dollars each and every year to generate a constantly changing cavalcade of technologically-rooted systems that are being used as instruments of control for human beings both within the United States as well as without that country (via some 800 military bases world wide together with an unknown number of black sites run by the military and the CIA, and, of course, via the Internet).

The dynamics of control play a central role in the thinking and behavior of at least two groups of individuals. Moreover, the nature of these groups should give one pause because the ways in which they seek and wield control tends to be pathogenic.

One group consists of psychopaths. The other group involves individuals who are known as sociopaths.

There is often a tendency to conflate sociopaths with psychopaths. However, there are important differences between the two types of individuals.

On the one hand, psychopaths: Tend to be indifferent to the feelings or concerns of other individuals; tend to be incapable of developing lasting relationships with other human beings; tend to exhibit a reckless disregard for the safety of anyone who might be affected by their decisions; tend to engage in deceitfulness; are prone to lying to, and manipulating, others; tend to exercise forms of seductive and ingratiating, but insincere, charm to achieve their goals; tend to have an inability to learn from their past mistakes; are often impulsive in their actions, and, finally, psychopaths tend to experience little, or no, sense of

remorse for whatever difficulties and pain they might bring into the lives of the people with whom they interact.

Unlike psychopaths, sociopaths can experience remorse – although they might not – for people they hurt, but they tend to believe that such harm is necessary to protect the interests of people to whom they are committed (their social group). Consequently, unlike psychopaths, sociopaths are capable of establishing lasting relationships with at least some other individuals who have become part of their in-group but might well remain emotionally removed and detached from individuals who are outside of their in-group.

Like psychopaths, sociopaths can exhibit a callous disregard for the feelings of others, but this disregard tends to be directed toward people who are outside of their in-group. Moreover, like psychopaths, sociopaths will engage in processes of lying to, and manipulating, other people, but, the people to whom sociopaths tend to lie or manipulate often are not considered to be members of their own in-group.

Like psychopaths, sociopaths can exhibit a willingness to disregard, if not be in opposition to, general social norms or legal boundaries. However, unlike psychopaths, there are norms which tend to be characteristic of life in the group to which sociopaths belong that are considered sacrosanct and inviolable.

Unlike psychopaths, sociopaths tend to have the capacity to learn from their mistakes. Moreover, unlike many (but not all) psychopaths, many sociopaths (but not all) are not necessarily inclined toward impulsive behavior, but, instead, they might be quite methodical in the manner in which they go about their activities.

Unlike psychopaths, sociopaths may care about the safety of others. Yet, such concerns might be limited to just members of their in-group.

In general, one could say that most psychopaths are born whereas most sociopaths become what they are

through a complex interaction among genetic givens, environmental contingencies, and choices that are made during the course of life. However, there are properties which enable one to distinguish between natural psychopaths (born psychopaths) and developmental psychopaths who, in a sense, choose their way to becoming ideological and/or transactional psychopaths.

Ideological and transactional psychopaths tend to exhibit all of the qualities of a natural or born psychopath. In other words, all three of the foregoing categories of psychopath tend to exhibit: A disregard for the feelings and safety of other individuals; an inability to learn from past mistakes; an absence of remorse, guilt, or shame in relation to whatever damage might have accrued to other people as a result of choices made by any of the three kinds of psychopaths; a willingness to lie to, manipulate, and deceive individuals in general for purely self-serving purposes; an inclination toward impulsive behavior; an inability to form lasting relationships, and an inclination not to feel bound by, or be inclined to conform to, social norms or legal requirements.

The behaviors, tendencies, and inclinations of ideological psychopaths are a function of choices which have led to, and resulted in, a inflexible, closed adherence to some political, economic, theological, philosophical, scientific, technological, and/or cultural set of ideas which frames, filters, colors, shapes, and orients all experiences as well as judgments and decisions which are made by those individuals in conjunction with those experiences. The behaviors, tendencies, and inclinations of transactional psychopaths are a function of choices which have led to, and resulted in, rigid commitments concerning, if not addictions to, the outcome of transactions with the environment and which tend to be oriented around, and driven by: Money, power, and/or pleasure (involving violence, pain, excitement, sex, drugs, and/or cruelty), and as such, anything and everything

becomes capable of being sacrificed on the altar of such transactional outcomes.

There is another form of psychopathy. This might be referred to as institutional psychopathy.

Corporations are a good example of this. If one considers the qualities and properties of corporations, one will be able to detect the presence of all of the characteristics of a psychopath.

For example, corporations tend to be indifferent to the concerns or feelings of other individuals. Moreover, whatever relationships corporations forge tend to be transitory, transactional   parasitic, strategic, and/or superficial in nature.

Corporations, like many psychopaths, often exhibit a reckless disregard for the safety of people who could be affected by their decisions. For example, time and time again, many pharmaceutical companies have been fined billions of dollars for their recklessness in relation to the hazards which they injected into or doctored into the lives of others through their products and marketing strategies.

Corporations are inclined toward deceitfulness – even with respect to their own shareholders – in order to advance their agendas or to place themselves in a position which will be able to leverage a situation in a manner that will help to enhance their power or increase their bottom line. Furthermore, they are masters in the art of manipulating governments and other institutions.

In addition, corporations will behave in an ingratiating, seductive, and seemingly pro-social manner – such as in the case of various acts of so-called philanthropy – but that behavior gives expression to strategies of misdirection which are intended to secure various kinds of advantages for the corporation. In other words, philanthropy is merely part of a strategy that is intended to ingratiate a corporation so that it will be considered to be a well-meaning, trustworthy actor in the community, but such philanthropy will always lead to a return on investment

and, therefore, is a form of disingenuous acting ... a classic characteristic of psychopaths.

Corporations often display a seeming inability to learn from past mistakes. For example, companies will get caught pulling the same unethical and illegal actions again and again, and for them, getting caught sometimes is just the cost of doing business the rest of the time, and, moreover, such behavior also indicates their inherent lack of concern about how their actions affect other individuals.

Last, but not least, corporations are devoid of remorse for the death, injury, destruction, disabilities, or tragedies which they bring into people's lives. Public statements of regret are just that – statements which are empty of real, genuine emotions – and merely considered to be a necessary step of public relations which is designed to help a corporation to be able to get back to doing similar sorts of problematic activities in the future.

People connected with the judicial system have intentionally manipulated the fabric of rationality and morality in order to give artificial and constitutionally untenable life to the notion of corporations as being equivalent – if not more so – to human beings who also are considered to be persons. Chief Justice John Marshall did this in the 1819 'Dartmouth College versus Woodward Case', when he used the notion of a legal fiction to induce companies to come alive in a Pinocchio-like manner (perhaps Frankenstein's monster might be the better simile) and, in the process, inappropriately conflated the ideas of a charter and contracts, and, furthermore, J. C. Bancroft Davis, a court reporter during the Supreme Court hearings involving the case between Santa Clara County and the Southern Pacific Railroad aided and abetted Marshall when the former individual claimed (and adjusted the head notes for the case accordingly) that he had overheard Morrison Waite, the Chief Justice, maintain prior to the Court's ruling concerning the foregoing case – which entailed a tax lien issue and not the issue of

personhood – that corporations were persons, and the former two individuals were further aided and abetted by the five Supreme Court jurists who voted in favor of Citizens United in 2010 which ruled that laws restricting or preventing corporations from spending money during political campaigns was inconsistent with the idea of free speech, once again, treating corporations as persons who should be extended the same rights and freedoms as human beings.

The vast majority of colonists and framers during the period leading up to, and including, the writing of the Constitution in 1787 considered corporations, such as the East India Company, to be repugnant, but powerful, entities that were undermining and corrupting the quality of life in America and, as a result, corporations were institutions which needed to be opposed and rendered as powerless as possible. Corporations were antithetical to the whole orientation of both the Declaration of Independence and the 1787 Constitution and subsequent ten amendments that made up the Bill of Rights which were being extended to human beings as individual citizens and not to corporations as a specially protected expression of chartered non-citizens that were being permitted, in limited and temporary ways, to participate in certain kinds of commercial/public service activities.

Estimates concerning the prevalence of natural forms of psychopathy tend to run anywhere between 1 and 4 %. That means there might be anywhere between 3 and 12 million natural psychopaths in the United States alone.

Some of the foregoing individuals are quite intelligent. Some of those individuals are less intelligent, but irrespective of their level of intelligence, such individuals tend to be present in all strata of society and are engaged in an array of occupations with a variety of skills.

There are millions more ideological, transactional, and institutional psychopaths in just the United States. There also are millions of sociopaths roaming about the country.

The four aforementioned kinds of psychopaths, as well as the different groups of sociopaths are all seeking modalities of control. They are using: Economics, politics, technology, education, the media, the legal system, science, policing, medicine, banking, corporations, theology, the military, and various kinds of eugenics programs to acquire and exercise such control.

To be sure, as Patrick Wood suggests in his books, technocracy might constitute a set of dynamics which tends to employ different ideas about economics and technology to give expression to a system of control. However, technocracy in the foregoing sense is just one way of giving expression to the dynamics of control.

Furthermore, given the different categories of psychopathic and sociopathic existential orientations which have been briefly outlined in the foregoing discussion, then, irrespective of the particular characteristics of the form of technocracy which is being used there is no guarantee that such a system will be rational in nature (whatever "rational" might mean). Moreover, while there could be a few degrees of freedom within the potential of any given form of technocracy which might allow for some sort of constructive, maybe even utopian, set of outcomes, unfortunately, the existence in the world today of so many millions of psychopaths and sociopaths who all are seeking to acquire and exercise control so that the latter can be used to geoengineer the environment and humanity according to the likes and dislikes of the foregoing groups of individuals, one must also be realistic and realize that barring some fundamental change in the dynamics which are currently operating in society, then, seemingly, the possibility that some sort of dystopian reality will become manifest appears to be a much more likely possibility concerning the way in which the potential of technocracy might unfold in the future.

There also are some inertial-like properties which exacerbate the foregoing problems. The livelihoods of a

great many relatively "normal" individuals are often entangled in the machinations of such psychopaths and sociopaths. Just as the military-industrial complex (which has its own share of psychopaths and sociopaths) goes about ensuring that lucrative contracts are awarded to businesses in most, if not all, 50 states in order to thwart efforts to decouple America from the military-industrial complex, so too, there are a great many jobs and careers which are tied to the activities of psychopaths and sociopaths who exercise various kinds of control over what transpires in government, corporations, education, the media, medical establishments, and various kinds of institutions.

Consequently, even if the aforementioned "normal" individuals understand and are disturbed by what is taking place, they might not have a lot of options for being able to resist or remove themselves from what is taking place. Such individuals constitute a sort of inertial set of forces which help to keep psychopaths and sociopaths in control.

In addition, there is another kind of inertial force that is in play which is used by psychopaths and sociopaths as a defense of sorts. This comes in the form of the millions of people who might not have much awareness concerning the nature of the dynamics which are actively shaping their lives, as is clearly the case in the issue of alleged global warming.

The foregoing individuals are like the herds of cows that would be stampeded at the appropriate time in various western movies in order to create difficulties for those who might be opposed to the control-oriented individuals that use herds of susceptible beings to slow down, if not eliminate, any attempt to resist the psychopaths and sociopaths who are abusing whatever access to control the latter individuals might have. If one can induce people to believe in that which is false, then, such people become an asset which can be weaponized when desired.

Another source of inertial drag which tends to undermine any attempt to be able to resist the machinations of the psychopaths and sociopaths who have access to the machinery of power and the reins of control can be found among the millions of people who have become induced to consume pharmaceuticals which entail all manner of side effects. However, such so-called side-effects are actually primary effects of chemicals that are synthetic in nature and, therefore, tend to be incompatible with the biological systems into which they are introduced and, as a result, often disrupt normal functioning in certain ways (i.e., the so-called side-effect phenomena).

In the case of psycho-active pharmaceuticals, use of those drugs can interfere with a person's ability to appreciate the extent to which those kinds of drugs control their emotions, moods, motivations, ideas, and perceptions. Moreover, when a person tries to go off such drugs, those individuals often experience what is known as "discontinuation syndrome" during which they are beset with an array of physical, cognitive, and emotional problems (as the body tries to reset itself) which makes life very difficult to navigate in any constructively functional manner.

The foregoing pharmaceuticals and psycho-active drugs are ubiquitous for a reason. More specifically, the inventors, manufacturers, distributors, and prescribers of such drugs are promoted so intensively by means of the media

On the one hand, pharmaceuticals are heavily promoted (at least in the United States) because of the billions of dollars which can be earned through promoting, and, then, catering to, pharmaceutical usage. On the other hand, intense marketing campaigns also help to infest society with the debilitating manner in which many of those drugs affect the lives of so many people and, consequently, make it difficult for the latter individuals to

resist the other forms of control which are being imposed on them.

According to Patrick Wood, technocracy can be considered to be an economic system because of the way that term came into existence. More specifically, Wood recounts how, in 1932, Nicholas Butler, who at the time was President of Columbia University, made an announcement that the Ivy League educational institution was lending its support to a new form of economic system which had been created by various scientists and engineers and which was known as "technocracy."

Supposedly, the foregoing system would replace free enterprise and capitalism. Given that capitalism already was being shaped by the work of scientists and engineers, the possible differences between the alleged free enterprise of capitalism and the methods of technocracy were not readily apparent.

One consideration concerning possible differences between the two systems is that rather than being a function of the way in which allegedly free markets supposedly give autonomous, unbiased expression to capitalistic dynamics, technocracy would be run by scientists and engineers who were concerned with matters such as efficiency and, therefore, would take steps to make sure that their economic system would operate in accordance with that quantitative property. If the foregoing possibility were the sort of theme which might enable one to distinguish technocracy and capitalism, then, this might make sense if one were to describe capitalism as giving expression to the sort of liberty which was believed to be consonant with the principles in which the American republic was supposedly rooted, whereas, technocracy appeared to be rather authoritarian in nature.

However, when one considers how banks, governments, the media, police, and the courts often play favorites and, in the process, rig the so-called market system so that it operates in ways that are to the liking of

those in control, then, one can see how the term: "Free market capitalism" is quite misleading since, in all manner of ways, capitalism is no less authoritarian than technocracy is. One can acquire a bit of the taste that is entailed by the corruption which is permeates a great deal of what is considered to constitute alleged free enterprise capitalism by reading works of Upton Sinclair such as his work: *The Brass Check*, which catalogues the sorts of corruption which he encountered dealing with various aspects of a capitalist system prior to 1919.

One doesn't have to accept Sinclair's socialist sensibilities to appreciate the insightfulness of his critique concerning the extent of the corruption and moral rot which often characterizes the economic system that frequently operates in America as well as elsewhere in the West. In a variety of ways, Sinclair demonstrates in his works that there is nothing free about the enterprise of capitalism, and this includes the way in which power, money, government, the media, education, policing, information, the military, resources, and people are forced to flow through, be shaped by, and be controlled by, such a system.

In 1938, the printed mouthpiece for the idea of technocracy – namely, *The Technocrat* – specified that the term "technocracy" constituted a form of social engineering in which all goods and services were manufactured, delivered, and sold to the general population in accord with the principles of science and engineering. However, nothing was said about the nature of the criteria which were to be used to assess the quality of those goods and services or what the nature of the moral values and principles would be that would help to guide the way that scientists and engineers were overseeing the dynamics of such a technocratic system.

Moreover, no discussion ensued about what sorts of environmental degradation might ensue from the production, distribution, sale, usage, and discard of the

goods and services being manifested through technocracy? In addition, perhaps one would like to understand what kinds of health problems might emerge as a result of those goods and services that are being consumed?

Or, perhaps, one should ask about what wars of destruction, lethality, and injury might be required to be fought in order to secure the resources and supply routes necessary for the production and distribution of the goods or services within a given system of technocracy? Alternatively, one could raise questions about the nature of the hazards and safety issues to which workers might be exposed during the production, distribution, and, sale, and disposal of the goods and services which were generated through technocracy?

To what degree would workers have to be exploited in order to operate in accordance with the way in which scientists and engineers wanted to organize the operation of a technocracy? What would the criteria be that would be used to make judgments about the issue of exploitation, and what would the justification be for the use of one set of criteria rather than another?

What if scientists and engineers disagreed about how technocracy should operate? What are the scientific and engineering principles which would be used to settle those sorts of disputes?

What about using principles that might emerge from philosophical, spiritual, or other kinds of conceptual considerations? Why should principles of science and engineering necessarily be given priority over other kinds of methods, ideas, values, and principles?

Will the engineers who are to be responsible for the sort of technocracy which is to be imposed on people without the consent of the latter individuals be like the engineers who were responsible for using rubber rings that would not seal joints in cold weather and, as a result, enable disasters like the Challenger space shuttle to occur. Or, would the engineers running a given technocracy be

like the individuals who calibrated measurements involving the failed Mars Climate Orbiter and provided such data in inches, feet, and pounds while the engineering group to which such data was being sent was interpreting the data as if it were in the form of metric measurements? Or, maybe the engineers of technocracy will be like the individuals who fashioned the initial version of the Hubble telescope with a lens distortion which, subsequently, had to be repaired at a cost of millions of dollars, not to mention all the time and resources which were lost trying to get useful data from a flawed telescope.

Will the scientists who are to fashion a future form of technocracy be like the global warming crowd that doesn't appear to understand their discipline all that well and who seem to be more influenced by the flow of money than the flow of empirical data? Or, maybe, those scientists will be like the champions of string theory who have entangled physics in a wealth of intriguing mathematics that – despite the innovative, creative genius of such mathematics -- nonetheless, such innovation can't seem to establish that anything in the theory is true.

On the other hand, there is some good news associated with the foregoing observations concerning string theory. More specifically, scientists have managed to narrow down questions concerning the origins of the universe to being a function of one of 10^{500} possible vacuum states, and, so one can hope that scientists will be hired to create just the kind of technocracy which is needed by human beings for such a possible vacuum state.

All of the foregoing questions and problems can be directed at capitalism or socialism as well. In addition, once one gets to begin to critically reflect on the nature of capitalism, one might also ask why capital is preoccupied with, say, the flow of money rather than, say, the flow of self-realization in human beings.

One also could confront communism with a similar set of questions. After all, among other things, we have never

seen the establishment of a truly classless society that proponents contend will be one of the hall marks of a fully realized communist system.

History has shown again and again how the communist party was always a class that was self-serving, self-absorbed, and dedicated to its own perpetuation. As a result, it never transitioned -- or was never prepared to transition -- into anything of a much more egalitarian nature such that the average, non-communist party member would no longer have to live in constant fear of members of the secret police or members of the Politburo attempting to pursue brutal and authoritarian methods of control over the lives of citizens according to the constantly shifting goal-posts of dialectical materialism that made sense only to the individuals who were constantly building, and, then, rebuilding such goal-posts to fit with the party-line whims of the day.

Consequently, asking questions concerning the issue of a classless society would seem to be a relevant issue to explore since individuals who claimed superior class consciousness tend to undergird their sense of entitlement concerning their membership in the communist party through arbitrary, tautological forms of defense. Meanwhile, the rest of the population naively waits for the promised classless utopia to emerge as an inevitable expression of historical materialism that was never as necessary (or even as likely) as it was claimed to be by Marx, Engels, Lenin, and others.

A person who was inclined toward a communistic way of thinking and understanding once uttered a basic meme of communism during a small, informal discussion, apparently feeling that the words which he spoke addressed and encompassed all issues in a definitive manner. The meme was: 'From each according to his ability, to each according to his needs.'

Leaving aside the masculine-bias inherent in the meme, someone present asked: Who gets to decide about ability

or need and on what basis? After a brief, awkward silence, the conversation proceeded to move in other directions as if the meme had never been uttered.

Capitalism, socialism, communism, mercantilism, feudalism, corporatism, and militarism all give expression to technocracy. This is because technocracy is not so much an economic system – as Patrick Wood tends to claim -- as technocracy constitutes a set of tools which can be used to engineer society in its entirety – including all: Values, ideas, principles, goals institutions, or methods – and, as such, this set of tools is used for purposes that extend beyond the issue of goods and services.

Technocracy is intended to be a system of full-spectrum dominance. If capitalism, socialism, communism, mercantilism, feudalism, and militarism seek to employ the social engineering methods of technocracy, this is because each of those systems wishes to achieve full-spectrum dominance over all people, resources, methods, information, goals, or values, and economics is just one of the accounting systems that could be used for keeping score in conjunction with respect to those kinds of systems of control.

 At the beginning of the current section of the present book, a few critical comments were advanced with respect to the manner in which during the Introduction to *Technocracy: The Hard Road to World Order*, Patrick Wood launched his exploration concerning the idea of technocracy by indicating that issues of barbarism and violence could no longer be restricted to "Islamic terrorism." During the course of critically reflecting upon the foregoing perspective, a claim was made – and supported with various considerations -- which stated that the notion of "Islamic terrorism" gave expression to an exercise in sophistry rather than being in any way conceptually helpful for, or providing any manner of constructive insight into, the discussion which was beginning to unfold in Wood's book on technocracy.

Toward the end of his most recent book – namely, *The Final Betrayal: How Technology Destroyed America* – Wood and his co-author Courtenay Turner dust off the above noted technique of sophistry which was employed in the aforementioned, earlier book. They wish to apply that sort of sophistry to their commentary concerning technocracy.

In a section of their book labeled: 'Islamic Finance and Banking Takes a Seat', Wood and Turner begin to talk about Shari'ah law in a way that is intended to convey to the reader that the two authors allegedly understand the topic of discussion. The problem is that neither individual appears to have any appreciation for the nature of the issues concerning Shari'ah to which they believe they are alluding in their book.

Once again, as was also true in the opening pages of *Technocracy: The Hard Road to World Order*, there is a failure to draw a distinction between what Islam is and how some Muslims seek to engage it. For instance, Wood and Turner begin to talk about Islamic banking as if there were some set of specific principles to which everyone would agree and which could be identified as unquestionably constituting an Islamic approach to the process of banking.

The Prophet Muhammad (peace be upon him) is once reported to have said that: "There are 71 sects among Jews, and only one of them is correct. There are 72 sects among Christians, and only one of them is correct. There are 73 sects among Muslims, and only one of them is correct." Given the foregoing considerations, the question naturally arises: Why should one suppose that a given Muslim or set of Muslims who are engaging in banking, financial, and/or commercial activities has or have successfully identified the approach that correctly reflects the principles that are present in the one sect of Muslims to which the Prophet alluded in the earlier quote who

were, are, and will be right with respect to the nature of Islam?

Wood and Turner go on to indicate that there is a dark side to the processes of Islamic financing and banking which supposedly operates in a manner that is fully consonant with Shari'ah. More specifically, Wood and Turner contend that all Muslims are required embrace Shari'ah with total submission and that barring such a complete form of commitment, miscreants will be dealt with in a brutal and tyrannical manner as is exemplified by what might, or might not be, done by Iranian mullahs, as well as by Saudi devotees of the rigid form of religious law which is pursued by the Wahhabis in Saudi Arabia, or observed via the authoritarian beliefs and practices that tend to be followed by the Taliban in Afghanistan.

However, in the Qur'an one finds in Surah 2, ayat, or verse, 256 the following: "There is no compulsion is religion." So, whatever various mullahs, or Wahhabi-influenced clerics, or Taliban leaders are doing which is seeking to compel or to force individuals to comply with that which such alleged authorities are referring to as Shari'ah, then, the foregoing excerpt from the Qur'an – which all Muslims accept as being revelatory guidance from God – would seem to give expression to clear-cut evidence which indicates that the aforementioned sorts of compulsory activities constitute problematic understandings concerning Islamic principles.

Wood and Turner have made a mistake – and, unfortunately, many Muslims also make this same mistake – which has a logical form of the following kind: namely, that because someone who refers to himself, herself, or themselves as being Muslim and, then, proceeds to make statements concerning the requirements or nature of Shari'ah, then every Muslim is duty bound to accept what is being said as constituting that which is necessarily entailed by Islam.

Throughout the Muslim world, there are discussions and arguments which have taken place, or are taking place, and will continue to take place, in every mosque in the world concerning what is, and is not, the sect to which the Prophet was alluding in his aforementioned statement that gives expression to the right approach to Islam. Similarly, there are discussions and arguments taking place in every synagogue and in every church in the world about what alleged character or nature of the truth is which is at the heart of Christianity or forms the essence of Judaism.

Just as it is the case that not everything which glitters is gold, so too, not everything which is claimed to constitute Shari'ah can be shown to necessarily glow with the authoritativeness of whatever the truth might be. Wood and Turner stipulated that Muslims are instructed by various individuals that Shari'ah comes from God, and while the source of true Shari'ah is Divine, nonetheless, not everything which is referred to as Shari'ah gives expression to the truth and, instead, such utterances might only give expression to someone's limited and problematic interpretation of what one, or more, individuals believes concerning the nature of Shari'ah.

The Prophet Muhammad (peace be upon him) also is reported to have said: "Truly, the Qur'an has an outward and inward dimension, and the latter has its own inward direction, and so on, up to seven dimensions." Consequently, even if one were to argue that a given rendering of Shari'ah was correct in some outer sense, what of the other seven inward dimensions of meaning which are present in the Qur'an, and, therefore, what authority does anyone have who operates in accordance with some outward form of understanding concerning the nature of Shari'ah to say what is, or is not, permissible according to the other seven dimensions of Qur'anic meaning?

Sam Harris uttered a great deal of nonsense when, following his release of *The End of Faith*, he kept insisting

on asserting that all Muslims were required to abide by the literal meaning of the contents of the Qur'an. One can easily demonstrate the shortsightedness and shallowness of such a perspective.

Reflect on the following, seemingly simple, five word sentence in English – namely, "Mary had a little lamb." What is the <u>literal</u> meaning of the foregoing sentence?

Does the sentence refer to the fact that Mary once had a small lamb as a pet? Or, does the sentence mean that Mary ate a tiny amount of cooked lamb at a given meal?

Perhaps, the foregoing sentence refers to some experiment involving genetic or biological modifications in biological organisms – in this case a human being – and, as a result, Mary gave birth to a little baby lamb. Alternatively, maybe Mary was the name given to a ewe that subsequently gave birth to a little lamb.

Another possibility is that the literal meaning of the foregoing sentence is intended to convey the fact that Mary once had a pet lamb but no longer has that pet. Additionally, maybe the aforementioned sentence is making reference, in a somewhat unusual way, to the fact that Mary had played some sort of trick on a lamb and, in this sense, had, or took advantage, of a little lamb.

Conceivably, the sentence: "Mary had a little lamb" could serve as code for something else. For instance, if that sentence were to appear in the classified ads on a given day, then, it means 'x', but if that sentence is present in the classified ads on another day, then, it means 'y' or 'z,' and as such the literal meaning of the five words involves a code of some sort in which the meaning of the five words is a function of whatever day the words are posted in the classified ads of a given publication – and that is their "literal" meaning.

Consequently, a simple five word sentence is capable of giving expression to an array of possibilities. Whichever one of those meanings one might select constitutes a literal meaning of the five word sentence.

Just as Harris was mistaken in the way in which he tried to reduce the Qur'an to some notion of literal interpretations to which he alluded within his book, *The End of Faith*, so that he could try to paint Muslims into a sophistry-induced corner of his choosing during subsequent lectures and podcasts, so too, Wood, Turner, and an array of self-proclaimed Muslim authorities who maintain that they are giving expression to the essential nature of Shari'ah are wrong to try to require, if not compel, everyone to view Islam, the Qur'an, and Shari'ah through the frames, lenses, and filters which they have constructed in various, possibly quite arbitrary, ways.

In the closing pages of: *The Final Betrayal: How Technocracy destroyed America*, Wood and Turner provide a brief overview of a number of transliterated Arabic terms concerning banking, finance, and business arrangements. For example, they mention "mudarabah" as being a form of partnership which is characterized by the fulfilling of certain conditions, and they also touch upon the idea of "musharakah" in which partners share both profits and losses.

During their discussion of a set of transliterated Arabic terms, Wood and Turney also mention processes such as "salam" which involves paying in advance for future delivery of services or products and, as well, the two authors make reference to the properties of "ijarah" which concerns conditions governing leasing arrangements, and also the dynamics of "sukuk" which refer to the way in which financial bonds are linked to certain kinds of assets.

In Surah 24, ayat (verse) 37, the Qur'an advises one to reflect on the actions of certain individuals – namely: "Those whom neither merchandise, nor selling, diverts them from the remembrance of God … ." Consequently, one can't help but wonder to what extent involvement in, and preoccupation with, the foregoing terms of banking, finance, and business is capable of diverting one from remembrance of God, and, in addition, one could suppose

that there are ways of remembering God which are better than others and, therefore, even if one remembered God while engaged in commerce, can one necessarily suppose that such remembrance couldn't be improved on in ways which do not focus on commerce?

The Qur'an also indicates in Surah 18, ayat 7 that: "Lo! We have placed all that is on the earth as an ornament thereof, that We might try them – which of them is best in conduct." Presumably, banking, finance, and commerce are some of the ornaments which have been placed on Earth and through which human beings will be tried, tested, and challenged.

Wood and Turner have made the same, aforementioned sort of mistake which Sam Harris made in *The End of Faith* with respect to the issue of literal meanings discussed previously, and the point being made in the foregoing discussion is true irrespective of whether those meanings are associated with the Qur'an, or deal with claims by various self-appointed authorities concerning the meaning of Shari'ah, or involve what constitutes allegedly Divinely sanctioned practices in banking, finance, and commerce. The foregoing considerations by Wood, Turner, Harris, and various clerics are nothing more than the dynamics of hermeneutics or the 'dynamics of interpretation' that are being substituted for what God might, or might not mean, by various words, events, or other considerations.

Theology (whether of the sort that might be to the liking of Wood and Turner or theologies adopted by religious clerics of whatever stripe) is not going to settle the aforementioned sorts of issues. Reality is what will settle those matters. As the Qur'an indicates in Surah 17, ayat 81: "The Real has come and the unreal has vanished away. Lo! Falsehood is ever bound to to vanish."

Although there are those who are committed to interpreting the Qur'an through the process of tafsir (trying to intuit the meaning of a given passage in the

Qur'an based, among other things, on the historical circumstances which existed at the time a given revelation emerged in the consciousness of the Prophet) or through the process of ta'wil (which constitutes a set of methods which seeks to grasp the esoteric meanings of Qur'anic passages), there are, yet, other ways of engaging the Qur'an. For instance, there are some who believe that one should not, and cannot, interpret the Qur'an but, rather, that the Qur'an teaches one through affordances when those who have taqwa are opened up to the truth concerning certain aspects of the Qur'an.

Taqwa is an existential condition of sincere receptiveness to and openness to God' presence. Taqwa gives expression to a willingness to learn and apply what is learned to one's life.

Taqwa is a state of protection in which one is shielded from other than the truth. Taqwa is rooted in an awareness of God's presence and that God is ready to teach those who are truly ready to learn.

The Arabic root for taqwa gives expression to a central dynamic in the process of seeking to understand the nature of revelation. On the other hand, the desire to interpret the Qur'an tends to obfuscate what is being communicated to human beings through the Qur'an.

Wood and Turner – as well as many Muslims – are using methods of interpretation rather than seeking to discover the affordances associated with taqwa through which individuals can be opened up to whatever truths God cares to share with a given individual. There is a huge difference between trying to impose one's understanding on the Qur'an (an act of ego or nafs) and having the Qur'an impose its meanings onto the spiritual instruments of knowledge and understanding which are present in human beings – instruments such as: The "heart" (especially the dimension of the heart known as the "fu'ad" which is a form of seeing), "sirr" (the secret), "kafi" (the more hidden)

(both the term "sirr" and "kafi" are mentioned in Surah 20, ayat 7) or ruh (spirit).

Wood and Turner claim that since 2006 there has been an increasing acceptance in the West of financial, banking and commercial instruments which the two authors refer to as "Islamic products." They also seem to be 'warning' their readers that using such products is normalizing the presence of Islam in Western banking, financial.

According to Wood and Turner, such Islamic ways of doing business are increasingly being considered by the movers and shakers of Western commercial circles to constitute "ethical" expressions of economic activity through which to pursue so-called processes of "sustainable development" – a phrase which has come to serve as code for agendas (such as Agenda 21 and Agenda 30) which, among other things, entail a push toward green, renewable forms of energy that are being characterized as scientific ways of responding to the threat of global warming.

To whatever extent there are Western business people (irrespective of whether they are Christian, Jewish, members of some other religious orientation, or non-believers) who are joining with individuals from various Muslim countries in processes that are seeking to impose a false narrative onto the rest of the world concerning the issue of global warming and, as a result, are trying to contend that, among other things, issues involving carbon footprints, electrical cars, wind turbines, and solar panels constitute the best way of tackling the alleged problem of global warming, then such individuals are seeking to implement an agenda of technocracy, and there is nothing ethical about what is taking place. However, the Christians who participate in the foregoing activities do not speak for all Christians, and the Jewish individuals who participate in those activities do not speak for all Jewish people, and the atheists who participate in such activities do not

necessarily speak for all atheists, and the Muslims who participate in such activities do not speak for all Muslims.

There are a number of issues which constitute problems for the whole green technology framework. For instance: (1) As was indicated in the first section of this book, the whole notion of a carbon footprint is predicated on a theory about carbon cycles or the nature of climate change (e.g., that global warming is caused by the anthropogenic generation of CO_2) which cannot be proven to be true; (2) carbon swap markets which have arisen in conjunction with the notion of a 'carbon footprint' is nothing but a set of money-making scams and oppressive forms of social engineering because the alleged science (i.e., anthropogenically generated CO_2 causes global warming) is based on an array of untenable considerations, as has been outlined in Section 1 of the present book; (3) wind turbines work only when there is adequate wind available, and, moreover, they do not have problem-free ways of storing and transferring energy, and, in addition, wind turbines are capable of not only disrupting the ecological regions in which they are located, but, as well, have the capacity to induce a disabling illness in human beings known as 'wind turbine syndrome,' and therefore, does not constitute a viable way to replace – even in a partial sense – currently used forms of energy production; (4) solar panels work only when there is adequate solar illumination, and, in addition, they are relatively inefficient in the way they convert sunlight into electrical energy, and, as well, solar panels entail considerable toxicity in the mining, manufacture, and disposal of the resources which are needed to construct or dispose of such technology; or, (5) electrical cars involve a great deal of toxicity in their manufacture and use, and, as well, they rely on lithium-based batteries which require materials that are both toxic to mine as well as generate toxicity during the process of manufacturing, and, in addition, are susceptible to bursting into fires that are both quite hazardous as well as very difficult to extinguish; (6)

points (3), (4), and (5) above all require considerable amounts of carbon-based or nuclear based forms of energy in order to be able to mine the resources from which such green energy technologies are constructed, and, moreover, carbon-based and nuclear forms of energy also are needed to serve as back up when the wind is not blowing or the sun is not shining or electrical cars need to have their batteries recharged; (7) the AI and AGI infrastructure which is increasingly being proliferated across the country in order to be able to regulate and operate the foregoing technology is consuming incredible amounts of water for purposes of cooling, as well as using considerable amounts of carbon-based and nuclear-based forms of energy in order to be able to keep the AI and AGI server farms operational.

As a result, the utility bills and water bills of those individuals who live near such server farms are skyrocketing which means that those residents are actually being forced to subsidize the energy and water usage that is associated with such AI and AGI server farms. To add insult to injury, the noise pollution which emanates from the foregoing sorts of "farms" is making people ill as well as rendering the lives of those people to be unlivable or lived at a much lower quality of life because their living spaces are being invaded – if not infested – by server farms which are generating noise and frequency pollution 24 hours a day, seven days a week, and 365 and ¼ days per year, year after year.

In the next section (entitled: 'Islamic Leadership in FinTech') of their book: *The Final Betrayal: How Technocracy Destroyed America*, Wood and Turner supposedly are putting forth an account of how the Islamic world is seeking to have ascendancy in how financial dynamics and technology are combined. According to Wood and Turner, the foregoing push toward supposed Islamic world dominance is being accomplished by arranging for all financial institutions, AI dynamics, and the ledgers which underwrite blockchain transactions to

become integrated with the sort of supposedly Sharia-compliant banking, financial, and commercial concepts which were briefly discussed earlier in this section.

While it might well be true that there are various Muslim individuals, Muslim countries, and Muslim institutions that are committed to the idea of technocracy, nonetheless, this has nothing to do with Islam, the Qur'an, or Shari'ah. Consequently, for Wood and Turner -- or, for various Muslim individuals, countries, and institutions that are involved in trying to impose technocracy on the rest of the world -- to attempt to claim that whatever such proponents of technocracy are doing is what is required by Islam, the Qur'an, or Shari'ah is -- let's be kind here -- exceedingly problematic.

To whatever extent the foregoing sorts of Muslim individuals, countries, or institutions have become entangled in the machinations of technocracy, this is about control and nothing else. Such individuals are seeking to control the resources and the people of the world – not for the sake of God but for the sake of their opinions and interpretations.

Apparently, such individuals might have forgotten what is disclosed in the Qur'an, namely: "We shall surely question them, everyone, about what they were doing." (15: 92-93). In this world, people might be able to arrogantly claim whatever they like concerning the nature of Islam, the Qur'an, and Shari'ah, but there may well come a day in which such claims will be subject to the very closest of interrogations.

Wood and Turner make it seem in their book as if 1.8 billion Muslims are intent on seeking to impose Shari'ah on the world through the agency of technocracy and the two authors appear to fault the western financial institutions, banks, and commercial operations for enabling Muslims to be able to accomplish what, presumably, Muslims surely could not achieve on their own. Apparently, the foregoing scenario constitutes a final betrayal involving the manner

in which an array of western traitors have turned against the traditions of liberal political philosophy, democratic institutions, and free enterprise which have made the West great, and, in the process, have allowed the Muslim hordes to invade the West through the trojan horse of technocracy.

One can agree with Wood and Turner that a form of betrayal has been perpetrated. However, what seems to have been most egregiously betrayed is sound scholarship.

The Qur'an indicates: "O ye who believe. Be steadfast witnesses for God in equity and let not your hatred of any people seduce you so that you do not deal justly (with them). Deal justly, that is nearer to your duty ... ." (5:8) Perhaps, Wood and Turner should reflect on the foregoing considerations and deliberate as to whether their words in the book: *The Final Betrayal: How Technocracy Destroyed America*, have treated Muslims, Islam, the Qur'an, and Shari'ah with equity and justice.

Technocracy should be opposed because it seeks to impose a form of tyranny on the world which is attempting to subdue and control all human beings, as well as control all resources. Some of the people who are involved in, and proponents of, such oppressive dynamics might refer to themselves as Muslims, but some of those individuals also might refer to themselves as: Christians, Jews, Hindus, Buddhists, Sikhs, Indigenous people, as well as atheists, and, in addition, they might describe themselves as being proponents of capitalism, socialism, communism, feudalism, militarism, corporatism, or some other economic system of thought.

Nonetheless, the sole focus of the acolytes of technocracy is on establishing full spectrum dominance by exercising complete control of all people and resources. Yet, irrespective of however they might describe themselves, the words they use are merely intended as camouflage for the underlying intentions of domination and control.

The intentions underlying technocracy are not constructive in character. They are self-serving, devolutionary, dystopian, exploitive, and predatory.

Commerce is about engaging in those exchanges which are considered to be more likely to lend support to an essential project of life – namely, to have a legitimate opportunity (i.e., the degrees of freedom) to push back the veils of ignorance concerning the truth about the nature of one's relationship with reality so that, among other things, one will be in a position to assist others to be able to undertake their own essential project of life. Technocracy is the antithesis of commerce in the foregoing sense because with technocracy one will be told what reality is (rather than being afforded the chance of exploring possibilities in one's own manner) and, in addition, one will be forced to engage life according to the principles of technocracy rather than the principles of sovereignty (the topic of Part 3 of this book)

One of the dynamics through which technocracy imposes itself upon, kills, and, then, consumes the lives of people is through what might be referred to the "anaconda principle". The anaconda snake kills its prey by coiling itself around the forthcoming, meal and systematically leveraging the process of inhalation and exhalation in order to bring about the termination of life.

More specifically, once an anaconda has coiled itself about its prey, the snake waits for the prey to exhale, and, then, tightens its coils around the forthcoming meal so that the lungs of the prey have less capacity to take in more oxygen during the next round of inhalation. The foregoing process takes place during each cycle of a prey's process of exhalation, and, eventually, the prey will die from suffocation, if not from the ramifications of being crushed by coils which are applying increasing forms of intense pressure from which there is no escape.

In a technocracy, the role of the coils can assume a variety of forms. For instance, data can be leveraged to apply all manner of pressure on the life of an individual.

Physiological data, medical data, financial data, educational data, career data, family data, behavioral data, psychological data, emotional data, political activity data, consumer data, policing data, military service data, debt data, diet data, legal data, technological use data, entertainment data, travel data, face recognition data, utility use data, and relationship data can all be used to squeeze a person's life in whatever manner that the individual or individuals who are leveraging the anaconda principle can introduce into the life of any given person. All of the foregoing kinds of data can serve as access points through which the lives of "targeted" individuals can be engaged, shaped, stalked, swarmed, tortured, manipulated, exploited, pressured, squeezed, bankrupted, rendered ill, blackmailed, compromised, isolated, and killed.

One often hears the mantra – 'If a person has nothing to hide, then, there is no harm in being surveilled.' Such propaganda completely misses the point (and this was the intention underlying such propaganda) that once a person's life data has been gathered and stored, then, one has no idea how that data will be organized, filtered, parsed, or accessed in the future or when, where, why, in what way, and by whom it might be used.

You, personally, might believe that you have nothing to hide. However, the psychopaths and sociopaths who are preoccupied with issues of control will approach the data points of your life not as you would see and understand those points but, rather, they would view those data points through a framework which colors, parses, organizes, uses such data in terms of whether, or not, that data serves their interests or, if necessary, how the data must be modified if such interests are to be served.

Consequently, you, as a human being, have absolutely no value to them. All that matters is the extent to which

your data can serve whatever the needs and purposes of the technocratic network might be at any point in time.

Moreover, given that such a network tends to be drawn up as a mesh network of some kind, its functional topology is organized in ways that enable the controllers to journey to their technocratic destinations in a variety of ways. This property means, that the node on such a network which gives expression to your data can be: Used, by-passed, modified, or eliminated according to the machinations of such a technocratic network.

Furthermore, increasingly, data is not being processed by human beings. It is being handled by so-called AI systems which have been enabled to autonomously do -- in their own inimitable way – all manner of things known and unknown in conjunction with such data and for which there is no human oversight or with respect to which human beings are becoming increasingly incapable of understanding what is being done by those systems.

Furthermore, there is a double-standard which characterizes the issue of data-gathering. From the perspective of the system which is operating in accordance with the anaconda principle, all aspects of the lives of citizens should be transparent, but when topics concerning the activities of the overlords are considered, then, conditions are imposed which induce screens of opaqueness to lower that prevent anyone from learning about what is actually going on due to claims of: Clearance protocols, non-disclosure agreements, proprietary rights, national security issues, classified documents, Black Ops, black sites, black budgets, protected sources, secret negotiations, executive privilege, confidential informants, and matters which are considered to be too sensitive to be made public.

The foregoing arrangements are said to be necessary in order to protect and preserve democracy. However, we don't live in a democracy, but, rather, we live in a republic in which the people in power are supposed to abide by the

only guarantee which is given in the Constitution (Article IV, section 4) – namely, the guarantee of a republican form of government which requires that its officers and employees will operate in accordance with the principles and values of republican morality which involve: Objectivity, impartiality, reason, nobility, compassion, self-sacrifice, honesty, egalitarianism, fairness, absence of bias, dedication to the truth, altruism, and an unwillingness to serve as judges in their own causes.

The atmosphere of secrecy within which government operates is not meant to protect the republic. It is meant to prevent citizens – toward whom the government (federal, state, and local) have a fiduciary responsibility -- from having access to data which demonstrates that the guarantee of a republican form of government is not currently being honored and has not been honored for a very long time ... nothing to see here folks, just move along.

In 2018, Yasha Levine released the book *Surveillance Valley: The Secret Military History of the Internet.* The work is well-researched, well-sourced, and well-written and, as such, constitutes one of many books that could be cited which document how secrecy and opaqueness are intended to camouflage the manner in which the republic has been and is being, bit by bit, dismantled.

The purpose for offering such an itemized list is to provide the reader with a sense – at least to a degree -- of how the anaconda principle is conceived, constructed, and set in motion through the machinations of technocracy which are dedicated to establishing, enhancing, protecting, and extending systems of control. However, what follows is little more than a series of sketches concerning some of what: Has been, is, and -- if the technocrats get their way -- will continue transpiring by means of the sphere of influence through which technocracy is enveloping the world and, naturally, for a more in depth excursion into the events that are shaping, and giving expression to, the aforementioned sphere of influence, the reader is

encouraged to read the all of the aforementioned work by Yasha Levine.

Surveillance is key to gathering the foregoing sorts of data. Through such data coils are fashioned in ways that can be used to serve the dynamics of the anaconda principle which will be used to control to what extent human beings will be permitted to exhale and inhale and what pressures will be brought to bear on such cycles of existential necessity.

As noted earlier, there are millions of: Born psychopaths, ideological psychopaths, transactional psychopaths as well as sociopaths who operate within the bowels of: Government (federal, state, and local), banking, the legal system, educational institutions, the judiciary, corporations, the military, the police, healthcare, and the media. There are millions of other relatively normal people who are employed by, or work with, the foregoing sorts of individual, and, therefore, have become entangled – knowingly or unknowingly -- in the destructive, oppressive dynamics of the anaconda principle.

While most of the factual dimensions of the following set of itemized list of events is drawn from the book by Yasha Levine, there are a few 'facts' (hopefully this is the case) which have been added by me, as well as there are facts from Mr. Levine which have been joined together in a manner that is different from the way they appear in his book.

In addition, there is a certain amount of interpretive commentary which can be found interspersed among various facts that might come from me rather than from Yasha Levine. Nonetheless, I believe such commentary resonates with the perspective which Mr. Levine is putting forth in his book.

Where things are right in what follows, this likely reflects his research. However, if there are things which are wrong, then, this is likely to be my contribution.

(1) During the early stages (1961) of the Vietnam War, Project Agile was introduced as a counterinsurgency program. Among other things, it featured the use of chemicals that had devastating defoliation capacities which had been developed secretly at a U. S. Army Lab which was located in Fort Dietrich, Maryland.

Obviously, work on the foregoing chemicals had been taking place long before August 10, 1961, which marked their first date of release in the jungles of Vietnam. Moreover, the release of such toxins all took place long before the United States began to fight its "non-war war" which resulted in the deaths of some four million Vietnamese and some 56 thousand-plus American soldiers in response to a false flag, phantom, pseudo-event that was said to have taken place in the Gulf of Tonkin (and which former Secretary of Defense, Robert McNamara subsequently and publicly confirmed had never taken place) which led to a government resolution (1964) that was issued in order to enable the government and the military to do an end around the requirement that, supposedly, only Congress can declare war … wink, wink.

(2) Project Agile led to the birth of Project Ranch Hand. The latter project produced chemical agents that were coded by colors such as Orange, Blue, Pink, and Purple and not only were such chemicals responsible for destroying jungles and food crops in Vietnam but, as well, those chemicals helped to bring about the deaths and suffering of hundreds of thousands of Vietnamese citizens – all in contravention of the Geneva Conventions, but, perhaps, this is what is meant by the notion of living better through chemistry (at least in relation to the perpetrators).

Project Agile and Project Ranch Hand were the handy work of a government group which had begun operations in 1958. The group was initially known as the Advanced Research Project Agency.

Initially, A.R.P.A. arose in response to the perceived threat which was represented by Sputnik and the

underlying Soviet facility with a variety of space-related technologies (such as rocketry). Later, the organization was transitioned into the Defense Advanced Research Project (D.A.R.P.A.) and later on A.R.P.A. and D.A.R.P.A. served as the gift that kept on giving when it came to forms of technology which might be useful with respect to the desire to control all manner of things.

The foregoing program was promoted to Congress as an organization which would constitute a public-private partnership that would be affiliated with the Pentagon. It would constitute a system that would induce universities and various corporations (via lucrative contracts) to work with the government to produce new forms of military technology.

D.A.R.P.A. was not only responsible for the deployment of the two aforementioned projects (Projects Agile and Ranch Hand), but, as well, that governmental operation was ensconced in research activities which were directed toward Command and Control protocols/dynamics. Later on, the internet network would arise when aspects of Project Agile were combined in certain inventive ways with aspects of Command and Control research.

(3) Initially, A.R.P.A. got off to rocky start. This was due to something the Pentagon was, and is, good at – namely, infighting concerning issues of control, power, money, and having to suffer through the slings and arrows of outrageous indignities and frustrations associated with those occasions when individuals from the military might be required to take a certain amount of direction from an "uppity" civilian presence with respect to various military projects.

(4) The individual who finally brought a certain amount of order, functionality, and direction to A.R.P.A. was William Godel. Godel had been associated with the very secretive, destructive, and lethal program in Vietnam which was mentioned previously and known as Project Agile. Later on, after helping to get A.R.P.A. rolling, Godel

was convicted – not for the horrendous deaths, injuries, and environmental/agricultural destruction which he helped to bring about in Vietnam – but, instead, he was convicted for conspiring to commit embezzlement involving some $18,000 which resulted in a five-year jail sentence.

While in Vietnam – and prior to incarceration -- Godel also was connected (according to a former head of A.R.P.A.) with the intrigues of Air America flights which were helping to lend support to the CIA's black-operations in Laos through the smuggling and sale of heroin that, in turn, was used to fund and equip anti-communist militias in Laos and elsewhere in Southeast Asia ... a strategy which might, or might not, have provided inspiration for the subsequent Iran-Contra affair in which -- in an attempt to by-pass the Boland Amendment which had been passed by Congress to limit the extent to which the United States could provide support to the Contras – arms were sold to Iran through Israeli intermediaries in exchange for money which would be used to fund the Contras in Nicaragua during the Regan administration.

Prior to working at A.R.P.A., Godel had worked in the Office of the Secretary of Defense. During his stint in the Office of the Secretary of Defense, he had spent considerable time interacting with the CIA and the NSA.

Based on his experiences, observations, and reflections that occurred in conjunction with, among other things, a 1950 clandestine operation to Vietnam that took place prior to Project Agile but which helped point the way to giving birth to the latter project, Godel came to the conclusion that the French were doing things all wrong in Vietnam.

As a result, he began to believe what was needed was a way to fight wars which departed from the techniques used in World War II as well as which were being used in relation to the traditional, colonial type of war that was being waged by the French in IndoChina. More specifically,

Godel believed there were insurgencies being waged all over the world – in the Middle East, Latin America, Africa, Asia – and, therefore, what was needed was a methodology that would be capable of countering those insurgencies

The new style of warfare was known as counterinsurgency. In essence, it advocated that smaller wars should be fought which employed covert, psychological tactics (propaganda, intimidation, terror, and coercion) that would be carried out amidst the wonders of various kinds of technological innovation.

Apparently, Godel didn't appreciate that the reason why insurgencies were occurring all over the world was because of the tyrannical, imperialistic policies which were being pursued by the West – policies which presupposed, among other things, that the West was entitled to acquire and control whatever resources might be present in targeted countries. What Godel also might not have appreciated is how the past can be prologue to the future, and consequently, he might not haven foreseen (or, perhaps, he did and just didn't care) how the techniques of counterinsurgency which he was helping to develop – including aspects of propaganda, intimidation, terror, killing, and high-tech dynamics – could be used against the people of America by its own government.

Ten good examples concerning the foregoing claim – among many others which also might have been cited – are: (a) The creation of the the CIA in 1947 (especially its covert side of operations which became psychopathological in its orientation, pursuits, and activities), together with (b) the establishment of the NSA a few years later, which among other things suffered from an anal retentive, obsessive-compulsive, paranoid-driven anxiety disorder concerning the issue of surveillance and data collection; (c) the MK-Ultra programs which conducted experiments and field tests involving the use of psychedelics, techniques of hypnosis, as well as different forms of behavioral modification programs which were

authorized by Allen Dulles beginning in the early 1950s and which – prior to, and following the Church hearings in the mid-1970s – transitioned into the development of technologies that tapped into the potentials of electromagnetic phenomena that were able to be used to surveil as well as to direct injurious electromagnetic pulses at targeted individuals (The so-called Havana Syndrome comes from a long line of experimental work which was carried out by a pathological government as well as affiliated institutions and corporations); (d) A.R.P.A. which, as previously indicated, opened its doors in 1958 and began grand projects like Project Agile and Project Ranch Hand, and, then, became more sophisticated – as well as more devious – in the manner through which it sought to find ways to control people and events; (e) the Childhood Vaccine Act of 1986 which made the federal government responsible for processing and defending against claims of injury to children due to the use of vaccines and which made the American taxpayer responsible for compensating successful injury claims involving vaccines rather than requiring that the individuals – namely, vaccine manufacturers and pharmaceutical companies – who were actually responsible for such harms be held responsible for compensating such claims; (f) the emergence of H.A.A.R.P. – High-frequency Active Auroral Research Program – in 1993 and its role in the development of, among other things, directed energy weapons, weather modification, and techniques of mind-control; (g) 9/11 and its ensuing, never-ending war on terror – terror being defined as whatever the government considered to constitute a form of resistance to the former's desired ends; (h) the egregiously referenced legislation – and, therefore, an expression of an intentional act of misdirection – that is known as the Patriot Act of 2001 which, in effect, enabled the government to operate in all manner of ways which are consistent with oppressive acts and policies of tyranny but for which it, or its representatives, can never be held accountable; (i) the P.R.E.P. Act of 2005 – which,

ostensibly, gives expression to legislation which, supposedly, seeks to establish a form of Public Readiness and Emergency Preparedness for various kinds of problems, but which, in actuality, serves, to a large extent, as a tort shield against liability claims concerning pharmaceutical companies and medical practitioners during a period of declared emergency; (j) COVID-19 which, beginning in 2019, became, among other things, the means through which one of the greatest transfers of wealth in the history of America took place and, in the process, enriched the already rich, and, as well, destroyed many small businesses, while creating an atmosphere of compulsion in the military, educational institutions, business establishments, and the halls of governance which forced people to take an alleged treatment which could not deliver on any of the claims that were being made on its behalf. All of the foregoing events served to enhance the capabilities, influence, and degrees of control to which the aforementioned anaconda principle could give expression.

(5) Project Agile -- with which the aforementioned William Godel had been intimately involved – not only exulted in the use of toxic chemicals in Vietnam such as Agent Orange, but, as well, Project Agile was passionately engaged in the gathering and storing of all kinds of data for possible military use ... data that catalogued: Population, ethnicity, tribal characteristics, interrogations (both friendly and hostile), migration routes, sociological and anthropological considerations concerning indigenous peoples; weapons usage, village life, and farming practices. The data was recorded through a multiplicity of formats, including: Written notes; recorded interactions; typewritten reports, computer punch cards that were turned into reams of printouts, and so on.

The primary problems concerning such an array of data formats was the absence of any centralized system through which that data could be organized and accessed. After all, if one did not understand what kinds of data were

in one's possession or where that information was located, then, data – no matter how extensive it might be – was just something that occupied time, space, and resources without providing any constructive return on whatever had been invested in gathering, coding, and storing that material.

(6)   On October 1, 1962, Joseph Carl Robnett (J. C. R.) Licklider took the reins of leadership as director of the Behavioral Science and Command and Control Research center at A.R.P.A.. He had been given the responsibility for developing productive functionality with respect to systems dealing with various aspects of intelligence collection and communication, including data management.

One of the ideas with which Licklider was consumed and wanted to explore during his tenure at A.R.P.A. had to do with possibility of establishing a centralized, robust system for communicating all manner of data – especially whatever might be related to matters of intelligence … a system that could not be destabilized or would not be vulnerable to interference of any kind. In conjunction with the foregoing possibility, Licklider had a lot of thoughts concerning the way in which one might be able to constructively organize processes of interfacing between human beings and electronic devices, including computers.

By way of preparation for his new position, Licklider had completed an undergraduate degree which combined majors in mathematics, physics, and psychology. Following graduation and during World War II, Licklider spent time at the Psycho-Acoustic Laboratory housed at Harvard University where he explored various aspects of human communication.

Following his war-years at Harvard, he transitioned to the Massachusetts Institute of Technology where he became involved in the research that was taking place at Lincoln Laboratory. Lincoln Labs – which was a collective venture of: IBM, different branches of the U. S. military, as

well as M. I. T. – was located about 10 miles outside of Cambridge, Massachusetts.

The foregoing facility was focused on generating technology, including computer systems, which would be able to operate a network of radar installations that could be integral to a national defense system. Licklider went to work on realizing the ambition with which he began his job – namely, to develop a centralized, robust, protected system of gathering, relaying, processing, and communicating data

One of the first inventions that emerged from the Lincoln Labs was a computational form of technology which was known as: Semi-Automatic Ground Environment, or SAGE for short. SAGE was America's first computer network, and it tied together a number of intelligence centers that were situated in different localities around the country and which would process data coming from regional land-based and coastal radar systems and, then, make that data available to various military bases and missile installations that were part of the network.

SAGE would be the prototype for all subsequent forms of surveillance-analysis systems. In other words, it was a network that would receive information from facilities which were geographically separated from one another and, then, once received, such information or data could be analyzed and, made available to various level of authority (government, military, corporate) for subsequent disposition.

SAGE went on line in the early 1960's, but, soon thereafter, it's capabilities became passé as contingencies began to emerge which exceeded the capabilities of that networked system. Nonetheless, Lincoln Labs went on to become a multidisciplinary hub for the collaborative research efforts of a collective of scientists, engineers, government technicians, academics, and corporate personnel which, among other things, brought about the

kinds of technological innovations that underwrote and made the Internet possible.

While Lincoln Labs was doing its thing, Norbert Wiener was teaching and doing research elsewhere at M. I. T.. He had been creating the foundational components for what came to be known as cybernetics which, among other things, studied the flow of information which was present in various kinds of networks and through such study sought to grasp the structural nature and character of the roles that different flows of information played in those systems.

Claude Shannon was also present at M. I. T. during this same period, but Shannon and Wiener thought about the nature of information somewhat differently from one another. Shannon believed that information was a form of technology which enabled the efficient transmission of data from one location to another with minimal, if any, loss of content, but he also believed that information didn't necessarily entail meaning of any kind, whereas Wiener maintained that information could give expression to various kinds of meaning.

Wiener indicated that human beings could be considered to be cybernetic systems. As such, human beings were entities that could process information in a variety of ways as it flowed through the network which gave expression to, at least, the biological and cognitive aspects of human experience.

In addition, Wiener felt that the day might not that far off when human beings and machines could be interfaced to such a degree that one might not be able to tell where the human aspects began, and the machine-based aspects left off, or vice versa. Wiener's work was one of the inspirations for the emergence of an interest in systems that, like human beings, could collect, store, organize, and analyze the way in which information flowed through such a system – in other words, cybernetics could be linked to the dynamics of artificial intelligence.

However, before he passed away in 1964, Wiener also developed a fairly intense concern with respect to the way in which political and military power might be married to cybernetic, information processing systems. As such, he was worried about how those systems might be used to generate more efficient and expansive ways of surveilling, oppressing, controlling, and killing human beings.

Lincoln Labs was committed to developing the kinds of technology which would underpin a centralized system for collecting, storing, organizing, analyzing, and communicating information – which is what the Internet became. However, the systems being developed through Lincoln Labs were for the use of the military and government, and as subsequent history has demonstrated, those systems became the backbone of extensive networks of surveillance and data gathering in relation to ordinary citizens.

There is an aura of darkness which is associated with Wiener's aforementioned concerns involving the hazards which he believed surrounded the coupling of political/military/corporate power with cybernetic technologies, and this darkness relates to the issue of psychopathology which was touched upon previously. Scientific research facilities (whether in a political, military, corporate, or academic context) are not necessarily just about scientific exploration in some pure, objective, neutral sense.

Unfortunately, there are elements of ideological psychopathy, transactional psychopathy, institutional psychopath, natural psychopathy, and sociopathy everywhere in society – including within the activities of science and engineering. Those elements of psychopathy are constantly on the look out for how discoveries and inventions can be leveraged to serve psychopathic needs.

To be sure, some – perhaps even many – of the individuals participating in research projects may be doing so because they are talented in various areas of

mathematics and/or science and have an essential curiosity that is seeking to figure out – in some innocent but significant fashion – how things work or how certain kinds of technological systems can be made to work for constructive purposes. However, unfortunately, the latter sorts of individuals can become entangled with psychopaths or sociopaths of one kind or another who are affiliated with the same research projects – either as researchers, managers, subsidizers, and/or clients.

As a result, there often are two dynamics running through many research projects. On the one hand, there is the science and engineering projects which are pursued for what such research might reveal about the nature of being human and the way in which that set of phenomena might be connected to reality, and on the other hand, there are the dimensions of science and engineering which are pursued for how the products of those endeavors can be transformed into instruments of control (financially, militarily, governmentally, educationally, medically, and corporately).

Consequently, in the beginning of a research project, the exploratory process might well be directed toward trying to figure out how, for example, something can be used to help "us" control "them." However, one should keep in mind that such research can be reconfigured at any time to become directed at elements of "us" who -- for arbitrary, psychopathic or sociopathic reasons -- have been transitioned into the "them" side of the ledger.

Surveillance is one of the tools of technocracy which is quite flexible as to how it can be used and against whom it might be used. So, while in the beginning, problems surrounding issues of command and control might have been pursued in order to better deal with an array of named foreign enemies, and, as a result, various technical dimensions of the Internet were enabled to come into being, nevertheless, the technologies of the Internet are

such that they can be weaponized against anyone and everyone at any time, both foreign and domestic.

Technocracy is always about control. There is nothing neutral about the sciences and technologies which are used to subsidize the dynamics of technocracy and technocratic oppression because to whatever extent there is a potential downside to the properties of a given form of science, engineering, or technology, then, one cannot defensibly contend that such research is neutral.

Of course, human beings are vulnerable to the machinations through which we parse experience. Consequently, the presence of willful blindness can induce a person to miss what is readily observable if one permits oneself to look at things in a truly objective fashion.

Unlike Wiener, Licklider – who knew and interacted with Wiener -- was engrossed with, and attracted to, the potential upside of the cybernetic framework and the manner in which it applied to his research. As a result, there is a certain amount of uncertainty concerning the degree to which Licklider might have had some sort of situational awareness concerning the presence of the many kinds of psychopaths and sociopaths who could have had contact – whether directly or along the periphery – with the research projects which he was directing and who might have been looking for ways to leverage various aspects of that research in which he was involved for their own psychopathic or sociopathic projects and purposes.

On the one hand, Licklider spoke about using computer technology to, for example, lift black kids out of poverty. On the other hand, in an interview which took place just a few years before he passed away in 1990, Licklider mentioned the name "Bill Godel"(one of the architects of Project Agile in Vietnam) and how that individual always seemed to be angling to acquire some sort of control over Licklider's research.

From time to time, Licklider indicated that he had a sense that there were various things which happened in

conjunction with his research that seemed rather dodgy or suspicious, and, as a result, he tried to keep away from those sorts of activities and, as well, to try to make sure that none of his research would be used in, for example, the counterinsurgency programs in Vietnam. Yet, there also is evidence that he attended meetings in Washington, D. C. in which the participants openly discussed how the on-going research involving command and control could be used to enhance the process of counterinsurgency.

Moreover, Yasha Levine clearly indicates in *Surveillance Valley* that there were many business contracts which were in effect during 1963 which showed that there was a co-mingling of funds between Godel's Project Agile and Licklider's work with the Command and Control Research center at Lincoln Labs in Cambridge. Presumably, Licklider should have been aware that there were connections between what was going on in Massachusetts and what Godel was doing in Vietnam.

On the surface, the research projects which Licklider directed might have been about solving certain critical problems concerning command and control so that intelligence could be more effectively utilized against foreign enemies, whether invented or real. Nonetheless, once the genie is freed from the confines of research, then that genie can be induced to become complicit in matters which many people might not have foreseen when a given research project began.

Life is not necessarily always a matter of preparing for what one can see coming. Life is often shaped by that which one cannot see coming – the so-called black swan events – and the modus operandi of psychopaths, as well as hostile sociopaths, of all stripes is to find ways to blindside intended marks so that those marks never expect – and, therefore, cannot prepare for -- that which transpires.

The extent to which Licklider could have been operating under the influence of willful blindness

concerning how his research might have been used by actors of questionable morality, or the extent to which he was being naïve concerning the psychopathic nature of the forces which were lurking about his work, is uncertain. In many ways, trying to resolve the foregoing uncertainty is an irrelevant issue because, in one way or another, the proponents of technocracy have been able to find ways to access, as well as to leverage such research, so that it could be used to serve agendas rooted in technocratic control machinations, and Levine's aforementioned book goes into considerable detail concerning the many ways in which this process of repurposing technology has taken place again and again over the last, at least, 75 years in order to better serve the interests of those who are enamored with the phenomena of control.

(7) Two years after joining the Command and Control Research division of Lincoln Labs, Licklider left for IBM. Given the virtually bottomless cache of money which could be thrown his way at the Lincoln Labs and given the ambitions that he had when he came to Lincoln Labs (previously noted), one can't help but wonder if the reason why Licklider left MIT for IBM was because he had accomplished all that he could or because his Spidey-sense was tingling and, to mix metaphorical contexts, he was being told: "Danger, Will Robertson, danger" (my apologies to anyone who is not familiar with world of Spider Man or the old television drama: "Lost In Space").

Whatever the truth of the foregoing possibilities might be, two years after Licklider left Lincoln Labs, Lawrence Roberts, a new whiz kid was hired to work at the A.R.P.A. Command and Control Research department which was located in the Pentagon. Among other capabilities, this 29-year old phenom could speed read and, as a result, he could devour the contents of a relatively lengthy book in ten minutes, and he applied his many talents to resolving some difficult technical problems while employed by the Pentagon.

Roberts was being tasked with further operationalizing the work which had been started by Licklider during the latter's tenure at the Command and Control Research division located at Lincoln Labs. Roberts was able to successfully realize that with which he had been tasked.

When Roberts began his tour of duty at the Pentagon, there were an array of computational centers which had been established at different locations (mostly in California) but which also included programs at M. I. T., Utah University, and elsewhere. Roberts' job was to link those facilities together into a unified, smoothly interacting system consisting of a set of computationally and algorithmically oriented centers or nodes in a distributed network, and when his work – and that of a few other individuals -- had been completed, the ARPANET would emerge.

One of the many challenges entailed by the foregoing assignment was that each and every computer center which was to be part of the network which was being created operated with different kinds of technology – both in relation to hardware as well as in relation to software. So, the puzzle to be solved was how does one link together such a diversity of technologies in a unified, interactive fashion.

Six years later, the foregoing challenges had been resolved. In October of 1972, the system was tested over a three-day period at a conference held in Washington, D. C. during which computer consoles had been set up and participants could contact and interact with centers which were part of the network and which were located in various regions of the country.

The technological breakthrough which enabled ARPANET to come to functional life was known as the IMP. This stood for: 'Interface Message Processor'.

The foregoing processing medium had the capacity to serve as if it were a sort of universal translator. In other words, the IMP would serve as a dynamic interfacing

process which would engage the languages that were operating on different computer systems and enable those computer systems to communicate or message with one another without difficulty or without anything being lost in translation.

Somewhat surprisingly – at least to those responsible for IMP and to those who saw its value -- rather than ARPANET being touted as representing a brilliant success, various groups – especially student groups – began to protest the breakthrough. The reason for the protests is that an organization – Students for a Democratic Society -- had somehow gained access to a nearly, one hundred page document which had been written by (wait for it) the previously encountered J. C. R Licklider.

The foregoing document provided an overview of a project which was to be known as the Cambridge Project (both MIT and Harvard were participating in the project). The project was envisioned to encompass forms of technology which could be applied to various programs of counterinsurgency that were being carried out by the West (especially America) in other parts of the world.

The Licklider document indicated that once such a project was completed, then, participating centers all over the world would be connected together in a unified fashion. This would enable those centers to communicate all manner of data with one another.

The data would be engaged, analyzed, and used in different ways by different centers depending on the needs, interests, and/or roles of those centers. Among other things, the data could be used to generate predictive models concerning how a given group of insurgents might conduct themselves under various conditions, and, therefore, such data might lead to the development of steps which could be taken to counter, if not nullify, the activities of whatever insurgents were being targeted.

The students who were protesting ARPANET could see the hazardous potential nature of the writing that was

appearing on the proverbial wall. In other words, while ARPANET might initially be used against peasants in Vietnam (and this was bad enough given that, among other things, Vietnam had never attacked the United States), eventually, ARPANET also could be used against various individuals and groups within the United States that might – and, subsequently, were – considered to be insurgents by those who were in power.

Thus, just as radar systems could be connected together to provide an early warning system against attacks by bombers and missiles (as SAGE previously had done for a relatively brief period of time), so too, the emergence of ARPANET meant computational systems could be connected together to provide an early warning system against anyone on the domestic scene who was considered by people in power to be exhibiting what were deemed to be insurgent-like characteristics. Those characteristics could be gathered, parsed, catalogued, organized, analyzed, and used to generate models which, in turn, could be used to try to counter the activities of those who went about their lives within America.

Today, one might be situated safely on the 'no-threat' side of a unified political, economic, policing, military ledger. Tomorrow, depending on how data was collected, parsed, catalogued, organized, analyzed, and communicated to this or that center of authority, one's name – for completely arbitrary reasons – could be transferred to the active, threat side of that same ledger and, as a result, one's life would be forced into having to teeter on the edge of an existential abyss.

Students were not the only ones who were concerned about the capabilities of ARPANET. On June 2, 1975, Ford Rowan, a television correspondent for NBC, reported on the evening news that the government, via its military, had built a computer network system which was capable of transmitting data to any of the facilities or nodes which were part of that network, and among the participating

members or nodes were: The CIA, NSA, the FBI (and all police departments which are linked into the FBI computer systems), the treasury department, the RAND corporation, the Pentagon, nearly two dozen universities and a further dozen, or so, other research facilities.

Rowan's revelations were not giving expression to wild conspiracy-like speculations. His sources for the foregoing news report had come from concerned insiders at A. R. P. A., the Defense Department, the CIA, and the Secret Service.

Rowan was being told, again and again, by a variety of individuals -- who might know a thing or two because, apparently, they had been exposed to a thing or two -- that the government had succeeded in building a complex, sophisticated, robust, surveillance network that was very difficult for non-participating parties to be able to penetrate or destabilize. That system had the capacity to gather, organize, analyze, and communicate data concerning anyone in whom it was interested and such data could be shared with an unknown number of recipients for unknown reasons.

Rowan's 1975 NBC news report concerning a surveillance network which had been constructed by the military was supported by another report which had been issued some five years earlier (1970) when Christopher Pyle, a former instructor at the U. S. Army Intelligence School located just outside Baltimore, wrote an article in a publication known as the *Washington Monthly* which disclosed the existence of another surveillance program that was being run by the U. S. government. This program was known as CONUS–Intel and was focused on gathering intelligence throughout the continental United States.

The program employed thousands of agents who had been instructed to infiltrate and work undercover in conjunction with a wide variety of domestic political groups, social justice movements, activists, and peace

organizations in order to collect data on American citizens. CONUS-Intel had begun its activities in 1965.

In a sense, CONUS-Intel was a version of William Godel's Project Agile but was being run on American soil rather than in Vietnam or Thailand. Moreover, ARPANET was a technological upgrade that both assisted and surpassed previously established surveillance programs.

(8) The Internet is a network of networks. In other words, the Internet is a series of networks which interact with one another, and, as such, the Internet is a more complicated edition of the ARPANET in which a multiplicity of computing networks were being linked together rather than just a group of computing centers being forged into a single network.

Two individuals who had worked on different aspects of ARPANET's development were Vint Cerf and Robert Kahn. On the one hand, Cerf had worked on a team which came up with the operating system that ran the routers which constituted the backbone of ARPANET, and, on the other hand, Kahn had worked with a group linked to a company run by Licklider which had developed routing protocols for ARPANET.

Cerf and Kahn came together in 1973 to try to figure out how to create an infrastructure which would be able to functionally link different computer networks together. In other words, Cerf and Kahn were mapping out the sort of technological architecture which would make the interaction of networks – i.e., the internet -- possible.

The result of their collaboration was the development of a language which would enable various networks – despite whatever differences might be present in those networks – to functionally interact with one another. This new architecture resonated with the previously mentioned IMP innovation which had helped make the ARPANET possible and which enabled various computer systems to be functionally linked together across geographical distances – despite whatever differences might exist in the

respective forms of hardware and software present in those computer systems.

The new language was referred to as TCP/IP. This is short for Transmission Control Protocol/Internet Protocol.

What ARPANET had done for the military and government, the Internet was about to do for the military, the government, AND corporations. In other words, just as the ARPANET provided a medium that linked together universities, research centers, defense agencies, and governmental departments that were part of ARPANET and which were trying to coordinate activities concerning issues that were considered relevant to the military defense of American interests, so too, the Internet would serve as a means for, say, corporations to have access to a treasure trove of data concerning the ideas, values, beliefs, interests, behaviors, political inclinations, activism, hobbies, medical issues, financial considerations, and consuming habits of human beings which could be collected, catalogued, organized, analyzed, and communicated to other parties at distance. Through such data processing management, human beings could be engaged, influenced, shaped, manipulated, seduced, and informed in whatever way such corporations chose to use the data to which they had access.

Search engines could be built which would respond to different people in different ways. In other words, Internet searches could be algorithmically organized to yield different search possibilities for different people depending on the data profiles that had been developed for the people who were engaged in such searchers.

In addition, those searches could be shaped by the algorithmic dynamics through which Internet searchers were conducted so that certain kinds of information might not ever be seen. Alternatively, a person might be provided with a list of possible sources of information that only gave expression to the biases, values, ideas, vested interests,

beliefs, and so on of the people who made the search engine possible.

Social media platforms could be built which would encourage people to reveal all manner of information about themselves, and, then, such data could be weaponized by the people operating the social media platform and, subsequently, used against social media users in subtle ways that, for instance, might seek to nudge voting or other kinds of behavior in one way rather than another (e.g., think "Cambridge Analytica"). Or, those same social media platforms could establish "community standards" that censored everything except a world view that was compliant with, or subservient to, some perspective concerning the nature of reality, and if one were not willing to submit to such community standards, then, one would be cancelled.

Automated algorithmic systems (sometimes called bots) could be let loose on the Internet to create the impression that there were people who were in support of, or opposed, to various ideas or issue when, in reality, nothing was going on except the manipulation of 0's and 1's in order to create false scenarios which might be treated as being real by other human beings who were traveling about the Internet's virtual-scape. An army of bots could be used to encircle, harass, bully, and exhaust someone who was voicing a view that the operator of those bots didn't like, or such bots could be used to create the impression that some given idea or person or theme was trending and encourage people to investigate this new phenomenon.

Deep fakes could be created in which one has difficulty knowing whether one is dealing with something that is real or something that is not-real. One observer recently suggested – and I don't know how one would fact-check this contention -- that as much as 50 % of what is currently transpiring on the Internet might be a function of AI activity and content, but a time could soon be coming in

which everything that is on the internet is AI-generated and reality, then, might just become whatever AI says it is.

For example, during a recent interview with Joe Rogan, Elon Musk proposed that, perhaps, within five years, or so, any human being who ventured onto the Internet would be completely immersed and entangled in a series of experiences which, in one way or another, were entirely a function of AI generated content. Whatever one encountered would be non-human in nature.

If what Musk was intimating turns out to be true, then, in a few years, the Internet might consist of nothing but a series of AI-virtual bubbles -- like so many Holodecks – in which one would be like a lone human adrift on, and within, a vast alien sea. One could spice up the foregoing possibilities with something from research which already has been conducted and is continuing to be advanced by D.A.R.P.A. and others (which has been reported on by, among others, Dr. James Giordano, an expert in emerging technologies, biosecurity, and neurocognitive sciences) that the technological capacity to read and write ideas or thoughts into a human being's consciousness already exists.

 The foregoing sorts of mental intrusions can be done with such sophistication that they cannot necessarily be detected by the individual into whom ideas or thoughts are being written. Consequently, such an individual would have no way of knowing whether what was transpiring in their mind was self-generated or imposed from without, and, in the process, a person's life could be pushed in many directions because what was taking place in their minds would be treated as it it were their own way of thinking about things and choices would be made that reflected such imposed modalities of thinking and understanding.

Techniques might be developed through the Internet that, seemingly, offered people freedom of speech but which, actually, only gave expression to a scenario in which a person's ability to make contact with other

individuals was virtually non-existent. In other words, people might be permitted to say whatever they like, but what they said would not be permitted to reach anyone … no one hears your words or your screams in such an empty space.

Techniques of shadow banning could be used to induce individuals to believe that the content which they produce can be accessed by others when, in reality, such content is being blocked in ways that render that content not only inaccessible but, effectively, non-existent. As such, people would become encased in a virtual bubble, as if they had been whisked off to a CIA black site by some process of extraordinary rendition in which one is completely isolated and no one would know that one was even alive.

Moreover, Big Tech companies are increasingly cooperating with an array of military programs, projects, and research activities that are designed to surveil citizens and to control the behavior of the latter individuals – socially, politically, financially, epistemologically, medically, cognitively, educationally, and spiritually. Palantir, Google, Microsoft, Amazon, Meta, Apple, SpaceX, OpenAI, Starlink, as well as a host of other corporations have established a multiplicity of joint ventures that seem to be lending problematic forms of support to, among others, the inherent desire to control that tends to characterize the military, the CIA, the NSA, and the FBI and leads to the oppression of people everywhere.

The Internet serves the machinations of technocracy now just as the ARPANET did back in the 1970's and Project Agile did in the 1960s and MK-Ultra did in the 1950's. In fact, one might even say that the Internet is really just Project Agile writ large.

The techniques and methods used in Project Agile remain the same, except now the dynamics of data collection, parsing, cataloguing, organizing, analyzing, and using such data are increasingly being subsumed under the autonomous activities of so-called artificial intelligence

systems which are being directed toward not just American citizens rather than Vietnamese peasants, but toward citizens everywhere.

Data is the new oil. Data is why the Internet exists and that data is being weaponized against ordinary human beings in an increasing number of ways.

George Orwell once said that: "Who controls the past, controls the future. Who controls the present, controls the past". The government and corporations have joined together in an array of public/private partnerships which give expression to schemes of technocratic machinations which are designed to establish dominion over the present, so that the past and future can be reshaped according to the interests, likes, and dislikes of those who are participating in those public/private partnerships so that an array of programs involving full-spectrum dominance over all people and resources can be established.

Technocracy is actively pursuing the anaconda principle. The grip of technocracy is being tightened as one goes about one's life and breathes in and out.

When Rome was in ascendency, all roads led to Rome. Now, with technocracy in ascendancy, all roads lead to control.

Part 3: Sovereignty

One often hears that America is a nation which operates in accordance with the 'rule of law'. A more accurate description might be to say that America is a nation that operates in accordance with a 'law of rules.'

The rules being alluded to in the foregoing paragraph have become a law unto themselves. Those rules serve to frame and filter pretty much all official decisions, and while different kinds of legal precedents, executive orders, legislative activities, and theological musings might be invoked to provide a certain amount of rhetorical camouflage that gives expression to social, legal, economic, educational, and political forms of magical misdirection and sophistry, as well as to offer the sort of political, if not legal, cover that enables plausible deniability to continue to serve as a successful way of evading accountability, nonetheless, no matter what the nature might be with respect to the conceptual clothing that is draped about them – such rules tend to inform, orient, shape, and stabilize the manner in which the overlords of America go about their various activities … activities which have had, and continue to have, devastating consequences for citizens, both in America and in the rest of the world.

There are about 18, or so, of the foregoing sorts of rules which give expression to the "law of rules." Various individuals might express these sorts or rules differently, but all of the possible ways for giving expression to such rules tend to have a resonance with one another, and, as a result, whatever their specific linguistic form might be, independent, unbiased observers who have hearts with which to see tend to be able to detect the family resemblance (as Wittgenstein might say) which connects those different ways of describing those rules.

Moreover, however those rules might be stated, they are all in opposition to the establishment, enhancement, protection, and active choices that involve principles of sovereignty. The latter principles will be introduced during

a subsequent portion of the current section of the present book.

One should note before proceeding, however, that there are differences between a rule and a principle. On the one hand, rules often consist of fairly narrow conceptual structures which tend to be restrictive with respect to the degrees of freedom (such as exceptions to the rule) which are available for giving expression to whatever aspect of experience the rule seeks to hermeneutically map, while principles entail more degrees of freedom which are capable of capturing or alluding to nuances (many of which are non-linear in character) that are not possible in conjunction with rules.

For example, the English spelling rule: 'i' before 'e' except after 'c', states what is generally the case within a relatively narrow context of the English language – namely, in most cases, one should place 'i' before 'e' when faced with decisions concerning in which order to place the two letters – 'i' and 'e' – (such as in: "believe" and "relieve") when spelling a word that juxtaposes those letters in some way . Yet, the foregoing rule also indicates that there are exceptions to the general rule when the two letters 'i' and 'e' appear after the letter 'c' (such as in: "conceive", "deceive", and "perceive") and the 'i' no longer is placed before the 'e' notwithstanding the previously noted basic rule.

Nonetheless, there also are exceptions to both of the foregoing aspects of the spelling rule which cannot be included in the initial rule without that rule becoming so complex that one tends to lose sight of just what the nature of the rule is which one is citing. For example, the words: "Pleistocene" and "frequencies" contravene both aspects of the previously specified spelling rule, and, as a result, if the foregoing spelling rule were modified in order to include such exceptions, then, the rule tends to lose the directional specificity which are usually render the initial simplicity of

the rule attractive to a person seeking to determine how to proceed in certain circumstances (in this case spelling).

The situation with respect to principles is more nuanced and often more non-linear. For example, consider the principle: "Do unto others as you would have them do unto you."

There are many things that could be done that might satisfy the foregoing principle, but there are no concrete examples given in the principle as was the case in the previously discussed spelling rule. Moreover, different people might entertain alternative ideas in relation to what sorts of things one might be prepared to have done to oneself as a guide with respect to how one might wish to treat other individuals, but again nothing specific is stated … and the foregoing principle would mean something different to a masochist or sadist than the principle might convey to someone who was, say, a Christian.

Consequently, there tend to be more degrees of freedom and less specificity that are present in principles than in rules. Furthermore, rather than talking about exceptions to a rule which can be part of a given rule's structure, there tends to be a more complex, less linear dynamic which is present in principles that one uses to judge as to whether some given relationship does, or does not, constitute an exemplar of a given principle, and as such, there is a sense in which there are no exceptions to a principle but, rather, a specific possibility either has the appropriate features to render it an expression of the principle or it does not, and, generally speaking, this means that one has to develop a sense of the internal logic of the principle in order to be in a position of being able to determine what does, and does not, qualify as an instance of a given principle.

The following list of rules is not put forth in order of hierarchical importance. Instead, for those who are proponents of the ensuing sorts of rules, the collective, interactive dynamics of such a network is whatever is

considered to be effective in the exercise of control, and, moreover, in general, such rules brook no exceptions unless such exceptions are to the advantage of the rule giver.

A note of caution – the following rules are very densely packed and intricately woven. They might have been written in another way – perhaps more simply -- but for a variety of reasons which will remain unmentioned, the rules have been put in the format which the reader will encounter below.

If a reader rushes through these rules, then such an individual is not likely to grasp the full nature of what is being said. Therefore, a person should engage the following considerations as themes for meditation, contemplation, and considerable critical reflection.

-----

(1) Despite no one (including Chief Justice, John Marshall) being able to put forth a convincing set of arguments which definitively reveal in what way -- as legal fictions, or inventions, which allegedly exist to help jurists resolve legal problems in a manner which has not been Constitutionally specified or authorized – corporations can be equated with non-fictional, existential human beings, then, it follows that <u>corporations should be considered to be eternal persons that enjoy rights which are equal to, if not superior to, whatever rights actual human beings have,</u> and, moreover, human persons should be subservient to corporate persons rather than requiring corporations to be subservient to human beings and, in the process, serve the needs and interests of the latter, and, in addition, <u>one should push from consciousness any consideration that corporations were anathema to the colonists</u> who stood by the Declaration of Independence, fought a war of Independence, and made certain that corporations had no part in the text of the Constitution.

(2) Whenever they like, <u>federal legislators are permitted to violate the provisions of the 1st Amendment</u> which stipulates that "Congress shall make no law respecting the establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." The foregoing permission is necessary since virtually every piece of legislation which is passed by Congress exhibits elements of: (a) exhibiting a fundamental commitment to a set of ideas, as well as (b) entailing a sense of the sacred (i.e., supposedly gives expression to the truth in some way), and (c) promoting, and advocating for, various moral duties of care which are supposedly entailed by whatever is being considered to be "true, and such duties of care or moral obligations are required for a given piece of legislation to become active, and, furthermore, while each of the foregoing three elements is characteristic of all religions, nonetheless, given that everyone acknowledges that Congress is not permitted to make laws respecting the establishment of religion, then, ipso facto, what Congress is doing when it passes legislation which exhibits the foregoing elements of religion cannot possibly be of a religious nature -- appearances to the contrary notwithstanding – and therefore, such provisions of the 1st Amendment should be ignored .

(3) Given that the judicial system has only been granted a form of judicial power which can be extended "to all cases, in law and equity, arising under" the Constitution and given that the Constitution does not specify that such judicial powers can be used to arbitrarily stipulate what the Constitution means, and, notwithstanding the obvious possibility that judicial power should, perhaps, be restricted to, and directed toward, aspects of cases that will ensure that all members of the three branches of government are operating in accordance with the guarantee of Article IV, section 4 of the Constitution concerning a republican form of government (the only guarantee given in the Constitution) – that is, a government which operates in accordance with the

principles of republican morality (i.e., exhibiting qualities of: Honesty, objectivity, reason, self-sacrifice, fairness, nobility, compassion, equitability, impartiality, and not serving as judges in their own causes) -- nonetheless, the aforementioned <u>judicial system should be provided with all necessary degrees of freedom to arbitrarily do other than it is entitled to do under the Constitution,</u> and furthermore, that which is done should be done in a post facto way so that whatever social damage that might be able to accrue or whatever problems that might be able to ensue following the enactment of a given piece of legislation will have been provided with a substantial temporal and social opportunity to fester before any steps can be taken to try to rectify problems which should never have been permitted to arise in the first place.

(4) The judicial systems, legislatures, and the executive branches which are active on all levels of government <u>should ignore the principle set down in the Ninth Amendment</u> which indicates that notwithstanding "the enumeration in the Constitution, of certain rights," nonetheless, the foregoing sorts of enumerated rights cannot be used "to deny or disparage others" (i. e., rights) "retained by the people," and, therefore, <u>this process of ignoring the possibility of other, unspecified rights to which the Constitution alludes enables the foregoing branches of government to claim they have standing to specify what those other unspecified rights can and can't be</u> notwithstanding the manner in which such alleged standing gives expression to a process of denying and disparaging other rights which are unspecified but to which, according to the Constitution, the people are entitled.

(5) The judicial systems, legislatures, and executive branches in various states <u>must insist</u> that when the Constitution stipulates that: "The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the states, are reserved to the states respectively, or to the people," then, <u>this necessarily means</u> that <u>one must</u>

consider the terms: "states and "the people" to be precisely equivalent to one another despite the fact that the first nine amendments were entirely about the rights of individuals and not about the rights of states and despite the fact that the Ninth Amendment indicates that the people have unspecified rights which cannot be denied or disparaged and, therefore, presumably, among these unspecified rights are rights to powers which do not belong to the states and despite the fact that the Bill of Rights was in response to the concerns of individual citizens – not states – that had been voiced again and again during different Ratification Conventions which had been convened to vote on the document which had been issued by the Constitutional Convention which took place in Philadelphia in 1787.

(6) The federal and state governments need not honor the guarantee which is given in Article IV, section 4 that: "The United States shall guarantee to every state in this union a republican form of government" which requires that government officials on all levels of government are required to operate in accordance with the principles of republican moral philosophy (and this is what constitutes a republican form of government) which was set forth during the Enlightenment and which entails giving expression to a set of qualities of character such as: Honesty, objectivity, rationality, impartiality, fairness, self-sacrifice, egalitarianism, honor, compassion, and an unwillingness to serve as judges in one's own causes, and, furthermore, federal government officials are free to disregard the notion that the words: "shall protect each of them" (i.e.,the states) "against invasion" does not extend to the people of those states and does not encompass the need to protect those people from being invaded by corporations, militarized police forces, judicial practices, or the folly of state government officials that are denying and disparaging the unspecified rights or undelegated powers that belong to the people independently of the states.

(7) Despite the fact that the term "national security" does not appear anywhere in the Constitution but, instead, the Constitution indicates that it (the contents of said document) is to be considered the supreme law of the land and, therefore, the only kind of security which is needed is to ensure that the principles of the Constitution are preserved, honored, as well as put into practice to the advantage of everyone, and, therefore, there is no kind of security apart from Constitutional security, then, <u>the members of the Judiciary, Congressional, and Executive branches should be entitled to claim that an</u> <u>opaque, vague, secretive, opportunistic, self-serving, weaponized version of national security should always have priority over the Constitution</u>.

(8) <u>Private banks must be legislatively and judicially enabled to operate as a shadow – if not the actual -- form of government</u> which tends to conduct financial business in ways that run contrary to the guarantee given in Article IV, section 4 in which the federal government is required to protect states and their people from invasion, including banks and other financial forces or corporate entities which are funded by banking interests that are private in nature and which tend to deny and disparage the unspecified rights and undelegated powers of the people to be able to establish financial institutions that are public utilities rather than private corporations ... private corporations which – by virtue of the "law of rules" – must operate in accordance with principles that require those entities to behave in a psychopathic fashion and, therefore, obligates those institutions to act in the best interests of a network of private banks rather than in the fiduciary interests of the people in general.

(9) Given how the Constitution indicates in Article 1, section 8, clause 3 that the federal government has the right "to regulate commerce among foreign nations and among the several states and with the Indian tribes" and also given that nothing in the foregoing commerce clause indicates that such regulation must be conducted as a form

of capitalism in which banks, property, corporations, and Big Tech are permitted to undermine the guarantee of republican government which is present in Article IV, section 4 or that such commercial regulation should be permitted to interfere with, deny or disparage the unspecified rights and unregulated powers of the people under the Ninth and Tenth amendments, or that commerce should be legislatively permitted to be established as a religious-like process contrary to the requirements of the First Amendment (and economists tend to be as inclined toward being proselytizers of what they consider to be a sacred calling which is morally compelling as any religious preacher), then, in view of the foregoing considerations, one must necessarily acknowledge the absolute right of government to do whatever it likes with respect to the regulation of commercial activity and, in addition, concede that such regulation need not have any relevance to the Constitutionally stated intention that seeks: "to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity."

(10) Notwithstanding the inconvenient fact that the Thirteenth Amendment indicates that "Neither slavery nor involuntary servitude, except as a punishment for crime whereof the party shall have been duly convicted, shall exist within the United States, or any place subject to their jurisdiction" nevertheless, education should be a compulsory process which informs people how to become nothing but servants of and, be of service to, the "law of rules," and, therefore, educational processes should take whatever steps are necessary to ensure that educational processes do not assist individuals to explore the possibilities which are present in the unspecified rights and undelegated powers which have been acknowledged to be fundamental rights under the Ninth and Tenth amendments and which might enable those individuals who are forcibly present in the public system of education

to develop viable and constructive understandings and/or skills that would help them realize the truth in relation to their relationship with different facets of reality.

(11) The notion of "capital" <u>must be understood to refer only to issues of property, money, and the means of production that operate in accordance with the "law of rules"</u>, and, therefore, the idea of capital must necessarily, exclude all possibilities which employ that idea as a way of referring to what human beings, in general, bring to the process of commerce, and, therefore, deals with the essential needs, rights, values, aspirations, creative talents, and modalities of co-operation which serve the interests of the generality of people rather than serving the interests of those whose existential way of being in the world tends to be a function of self-serving, narrow, rigid, machinations which seek to use capital in a manner which is consonant with the "law of rules" in order to facilitate processes which are designed to enslave, exploit, and abuse the generality of human beings.

(12) Given that the entire edifice of security clearance protocols reeks of a religious system in which the one who is granted access to one of the inner sanctums of a mansion of secrets must have an unyielding commitment to the sacredness of a clearance protocol system which is rooted in a deep sense of fiduciary responsibility or moral duty to various systems of arbitrary beliefs out of which different kinds of clearance protocols arise and which tend to be indifferent to how adhering to such a set of religious beliefs undermines, and is destructive of, the guarantee which lies at the heart of the constitutional protections, rights, and powers which belong to the people – and not the government -- then, obviously, <u>members of government should abide by the non-transparent, binding character of secretive security clearances which have replaced the Constitution with a series of non-disclosure agreements.</u>

(13) Given the importance which information, knowledge, and evidence has for human beings, <u>the government should take steps to ensure that media outlets</u> (television, the Internet, radio, movies, newspapers, magazines, mobile phones, and journals) <u>will provide access to only the very best quality of disinformation, misinformation, bias, false narratives, and faulty scientific studies</u> in order to enhance the likelihood that the generality of people will never be able to escape from the media bubble in which they have been immersed or entangled, and, furthermore, <u>if any sources of actual evidence or truth should threaten to break through the outer boundaries of the aforementioned media bubble that has been created, then, those alternative sources should immediately be labeled as advocates of conspiracy theory</u> (e.g., everyone knows that to suggest the possibility that anyone else other than Lee Harvey Oswald, in the case of John Kennedy, or Sirhan Sirhan, in he case of Robert Kennedy, or James Earl Ray, in the case of Martin Luther King, or Tyler Robinson in the case of Charlie Kirk is, as the FBI and CIA have assured us, constitute nothing but conspiracy theories), notwithstanding the fact that conspiracies have been proven to have occurred on a regular basis during proceedings which take place in courtrooms across the country every week of the year, but, nonetheless, given that such unpalatable possibilities exist, then, the <u>government should double-down in its support of people like William Casey</u> -- a former head of the CIA and an active proponent of the "law of rules" – <u>who once proudly indicated that: "We'll know that our disinformation program is complete when everything the American public believes is false."</u>

(14) Rather than invest in the infrastructure of the country (e.g., transportation, energy, education, affordable living facilities that are not environmental hazards, health, agriculture, and waterways), <u>the government must be dedicated, instead, to directing the hundreds of billions, if not trillions, of dollars of tax-payer money as well as other</u>

kinds of resources (e.g., human life) into the establishing of: (a) Standing armies which serve the purposes of the "law of rules" rather than defend the general populace; (b) 800 military bases located around the world which operate on the basis of SOFA (Status of Forces Agreements) arrangements which are imposed on, and strip sovereignty from, the countries in which such bases are located and whose personnel believe that they are hammers and all other aspects of the world are but nails; (c) forms of weapons that possess lethal and debilitating forms of nuclear, biological, chemical, electronic, optogenetic, and nano-scale capabilities which, increasingly, will be controlled by autonomous systems that are allegedly intelligent and which, increasingly, not only will operate beyond human control but which will be imposed on anyone – whether foreign or domestic – who is unwilling to submit to the "law of rules" way of doing things, and by being preoccupied with, if not obsessed with, such weapons systems, the government will never have to consider the possibility that investing in infrastructure is a more equitable, efficient, and constructive use of tax-payer dollars than is a military system which thinks only in terms of force, compulsion, destruction, conquest, and oppression.

(15) Rather than explore -- in a rigorous, objective manner -- an array of possibilities concerning issues relevant to medical practice and considerations of health that will enable and permit people to make their own choices concerning the nature of the approaches to health and medical treatment which seem to be best suited to those individuals and their circumstances, and rather than abide by the possibilities which are present in the unenumerated or unspecified rights and undelegated powers of the people that are indicated to exist in the Ninth and Tenth amendments and which extend to, among other things, the realm of medicine or health (which have not been delegated to the federal government and, in addition, which are not necessarily the exclusive purview

state governments), and rather than acknowledge that the attempt of the federal government to impose a theological-like approach to medicine onto citizens is a violation of the First Amendment provisions which prevent Congress from making any "law respecting an establishment of religion, or preventing the free exercise thereof" [and many theories of medicine satisfy all of the aforementioned elements – see (2) above – which are present in the etymology of the notion of religion and, therefore, would seem to be religious in nature], and rather than acknowledge how Article IV, section 4 indicates that the federal government is under the fiduciary obligations of a constitutional guarantee which stipulates that the central government is duty bound to protect the states and their people from invasions – and many theories of medicine constitute a chemical and biological invasion of human beings – then, the government should compel the people who live in the various states to abide by arbitrary, morally questionable forms of biological and medical exploitation that are implicated in the health crisis which exists in the United States.

(16) Instead of taking steps to ensure that a President will be provided with all the constructive help and support that might be able to assist such an individual to uphold an oath of office which indicates that such a person's primary responsibility is to "preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States", clearly, the only reason that various agencies and departments within the executive branch exist (e. g., the: FBI, CIA, NSA, EPA, Department of Energy, the Department of Justice, the Department of Defense, the Department of Health and Human Services, the Department of Education, the Department of Commerce, the National Institute of Health, CDC, the FDA, the Department of Homeland Security, together with an array of other agencies and departments) is to ensure that the "law of rules" effectively protects the vested interests of various agents of control and power rather than to ensure that the principles of the

<u>Constitution will be preserved, protected, and defended the Constitution.</u>

(17) Given that no one has been able to prove – in a manner which is acceptable to everyone – that human beings are anything other than guests on this planet and, therefore, they are not necessarily entitled to ownership of either the land or its resources, and, furthermore, given that neither the land nor the resources of the Earth can be shown in any non-arbitrary manner to belong to governments, corporations, nations, states, tribes, and people or that such governments, corporations, nations, tribes, and people can be shown to have a non-arbitrary and inherent right to: Conquer, colonize, acquire, sell, barter, trade, lease, exploit, dispose of, or pollute such land and resources, then, surely, <u>governments that operate in accordance with the "law of rules" are entitled to use and dispose of the lands and resources of the Earth according to the likes and dislikes of those governments</u>, as well as to be entitled to do whatever is necessary to ensure that nothing comparable to the Charter of the Forests be established by the people (1217 – which is much more important than the Magna Carta which emerged a few years earlier – 1215 – because the latter affected only the elites – such as barons – whereas the former charter affected all people, elite and peasant alike) which would assist human beings to engage the Commons in a manner that would provide methods that would enable those Commons to be shared constructively, and in a co-operative manner, with different aspects of the ecologies of the Earth that would permit humans to serve, to the best of their ability, as caretakers of the Earth's lands, resources, and various life forms until the actual owner of the planet is disclosed or revealed and whatever modifications to the foregoing set of possibilities and arrangements which are needed or indicated can be made.

(18) Given that all forms of government are technocracies which use whatever technologies are available as mediums through which those governments

can engage in processes of: Conquering, controlling, oppressing, exploiting, harassing, bullying, misinforming, lying, propagandizing, indoctrinating; punishing, terrorizing, policing, compelling, killing, injuring, sickening, imprisoning, lobotomizing, euthanizing, starving, and enslaving people according to the needs and dictates of the "law of rules," then, presumably, it makes perfect sense that <u>all governments should be given the degrees of freedom and technological facilities that are needed to surveil, store, catalogue, and analyze every aspect of the lives of individuals with respect to</u>: Health, finances, debts, political inclinations, entertainment preferences, education, job performances, career choices, religious history, medical treatments, vaccination status, travel activities, living arrangements, possessions, consumption behavior, utility usage, group affiliations, friends, relatives, marriages, affairs, medications taken, physiological readings, emotional characteristics, charitable donations, values, beliefs, social media postings, messaging history, various biodigital markers and physiological signatures, e-mail correspondence, phone conversations, zoom meetings, reading habits, vulnerabilities, etc., s<u>o that such governments can construct a digital twin of each individual that can be stored in the cloud and which can be constantly updated, surveilled and analyzed by autonomous systems of algorithms which have been designed to serve the "law of rules"</u> to ensure that any given individual is doing exactly what the government expects of such an individual, but if such an individual should be detected to be non-compliant in any way, then, there are sets of algorithms that exist which will be activated by the presence of non-compliance and, as a result: Digital bank accounts can be shut off; living arrangements can be terminated; food can be withheld; jobs can be lost; access to buildings and public facilities can be denied; education can be discontinued; travel can be reduced to zero; medical considerations can be ignored; one's family and friends can be induced to turn their back on such offenders lest

the former individuals be deemed as, and tagged for, being non-compliant, and one might be required to undergo a reeducation program in which one undergoes a process of biodigital convergence in which one one is initiated into the ways of the hive mind and, thereby, becomes subject to the full spectrum dominance of shifting government interests and, as such, be made ready for whatever manner of servitude or array of thought processes and emotional attitudes are deemed to be appropriate … or, the government of technocracy can just kill you using the latest technological means to do so … such as terahertz bullets, or optogenetic pulses, or nanobots, or drones, or directed energy scalar waves or 6-G frequencies released by satellites, and so on – any one of which has the capacity to turn your biological activities off, or modulate them, in one way or another.

Notwithstanding what has been said to this point in the book, what is being asserted is nothing more than conspiracy theory isn't it? Moreover, technologies like Pegasus, Ptech, Promise, Prism, Lavender, and D.A.R.P.A. generated systems of algorithms which are capable of being weaponized while, among other things, they read from, and write to, people's minds and bodies don't really exist do they? … and you know, with certainty, that the foregoing questions can be answered in the affirmative, how?

The following principles are in response to a question that someone once asked me – namely, "What is sovereignty?" These principles all stand in opposition to – and, consequently, are opposed by – the previously described "law of rules" which currently directs – and for much of the last several hundred years has directed – economic, legal, educational, social, political, financial, military, medical, and media-related activities in the United States.

-----

(1) Sovereignty is indigenous to, and inherent in, the potential of human beings. It is not derived from society or governments but, in fact, exists prior to, and independently of, the formation of society and governments.

(2) Sovereignty is the right to realize essential identity and constructive potential in ways that are free from techniques of undue influence (which seek to push or pull individuals in directions that are antithetical to the realization of sovereignty) but, as well, in ways that do not infringe on the like rights of others.

(3) Sovereignty entails the human capacity (and corresponding duties of care) to be able to push back the horizons of ignorance concerning the nature of reality.

(4) Sovereignty encompasses the right to the quality of food, shelter, clothing, education, and medical care that are minimally necessary to realize identity and constructive potential through the process of pushing back the horizons of ignorance.

(5) Sovereignty is rooted in the duties of care that are owed to others to ensure that those sovereignty rights are established, protected, and nurtured.

(6) Sovereignty is the right to choose how to engage the dynamics of: 'neither control, nor be controlled'.

(7) Sovereignty entails establishing local councils that constructively promote and develop principles of sovereignty and if necessary those councils would help

mediate disputes that arise along the boundary dynamics involving the principle of: 'Neither control nor be controlled'. The composition, selection, and nature of the council would be similar to that of a grand jury.

In other words, council members would not be elected but chosen through an agreed-upon random-like process and, then, subject to a vetting process to determine the suitability of a given individual for taking on the responsibilities of the aforementioned council ... much like prospective jurors go through a voir dire process. In addition, the length of service would be for a limited time (6 months to a year) before new members would be selected through the sort of non-manipulated manner and vetting process that was noted earlier. Like a grand jury, the members of a local sovereignty council would be empowered to investigate whatever issues and problems seem relevant, but, unlike a grand jury, that council would have the authority to research issues, subpoena witnesses, and present their results directly to the community for further deliberation without having to go through the office of a prosecutor or attorney general.

(8) Sovereignty is the responsibility of individuals to work toward realizing their own individual sovereignty within a collective context that gives expression to the idea of sovereignty being writ large for the community as a whole.

(9) Sovereignty is rooted in economic activity that serves the principles of sovereignty, not vice versa. Corporations should be permitted to exist only as temporary charter arrangements devoid of any claims of personhood and they should be designed to serve specific purposes of value to both individual and collective sovereignty. Whatever profits accrue from corporate activity should be shared with the communities in which the corporation operates.

(10) The constructive value of money is a function of its role in advancing the principles of sovereignty for

everyone. The destructive value of money is a function of the way it undermines, corrupts, and obstructs the principles of sovereignty.

Money acquires its value through the service it provides in relation to the establishment, enhancement, and protection of sovereignty. The money-generating capacity of banks should serve the purposes of sovereignty both individually and collectively. Banks should be owned and regulated by local communities as public utilities. Moreover, whatever profits are earned in conjunction with bank activities should be reinvested in the community.

(11) Capital refers primarily to the constructive potential inherent in human beings and only secondarily to financial resources. The flow of capital (in both human and financial terms) should serve the interests of sovereignty, both individually and collectively.

(12) Sovereignty is not a zero-sum game. It is about co-operation, not competition.

(13) Sovereignty is rooted in the acquisition of personal character traits involving: Honesty, compassion, charitableness, benevolence, friendship, objectivity, equitability, tolerance, forgiveness, patience, perseverance, nobility, courage, kindness, humility, integrity, independence and judiciousness.

(14) Sovereignty is not imposed from the outside in but is realized from the inside out through struggle by the individual to come to grips with the meaning of the idea of: 'Neither control nor be controlled'.

(15) Sovereignty is rooted in struggling against: Dishonesty, bias, hatred, jealousy, greed, anger, selfishness, intolerance, arrogance, apathy, cowardice, egocentrism, duplicity, exploitation, and cruelty.

(16) Sovereignty is the process of struggling to learn how not to cede one's moral and intellectual agency to anything but: Truth, justice and character in the service of realizing one's identity, and constructive potential, as well

as in the service of assisting others to realize their identity and constructive potential.

(17) Sovereignty can never be defended, protected, or enhanced by diminishing, corrupting, co-opting, or suspending the conditions necessary for the pursuit, practice, and realization of sovereignty. Sovereignty should not be subject to the politics of fear.

(18) Sovereignty is rooted in the principle that no person can represent the sovereign interests of another individual unless the sovereign interests of everybody are equally served at the same time.

(19) The activities and purposes of: Governments, nations, institutions, and corporations should always be capable of being demonstrated -- beyond a reasonable doubt – to be the service of the sovereignty of the people, taken both collectively and individually.

(20) Sovereignty is rooted in the principle of de-centralization whenever doing so would serve the interests of sovereignty better than some form of centralization would be able to accomplish in a clearly demonstrable manner.

(21) Efficiency and wealth should be measured in terms that enhance the way of sovereignty, not the way of power.

(22) The principles of sovereignty should be rooted in the notion of sustainability, and those principles should not be pursued or realized at the expense of destroying the environment … either with respect to the short term or in conjunction with the long term.

(23) Sovereignty is rooted in the cautionary principle. In other words, if there is a reasonable doubt about the safety, efficiency, judiciousness, or potential destructive ramifications of a given activity, then that activity should be suspended until a time when those doubts have been completely, successfully, and rigorously addressed.

(24) The defense of sovereignty is best served through the co-operation of de-centralized communities of sovereign individuals ... with only occasional, limited, and secondary assistance from centralized institutions and groups.

(25) Standing armies do not serve the interests of sovereignty but, rather, serve the interests of the bureaucracies that organize, fund, equip, and direct those standing armies. Being able to defend one's country and communities from physical attack does not require standing armies but, instead, requires sovereign individuals who understand the value of defending the principles of sovereignty that help a community and network of communities to flourish.

(26) The police should serve and protect both individual, as well as collective, sovereignty. The police should not be the guardians and enforcers of arbitrary laws that are designed to protect centralized governments, corporations, institutions, and other bodies that tend to operate in accordance with the way of power and, therefore, in opposition to the way of sovereignty.

(27) When done correctly, the practice of sovereignty creates a public space or commons that is conducive to the pursuit and realization of the principles of sovereignty by everyone who is willing to struggle toward that end.

(28) Sovereignty is rooted in the principle that the commons – that is, the resources of the Earth, if not the Universe – cannot be proven, beyond a reasonable doubt, to belong to anyone. Therefore, the commons should be shared, conserved, and protected by all of us rather than be permitted to be treated as individual, institutional, corporate, or government forms of private property.

(29) Whatever forms of private property are considered to be permissible by general consensus, that property should serve the establishment, enhancement, and protection of the principles of sovereignty, both individual and collective.

(30) Aside from what is necessary to operate a business in an effective and productive manner, as well as what is necessary in the way of resources to be able to improve that business through research and development, and/or is necessary to provide a fair return for the employees of such a business for their collective efforts, then any profits that are generated by a business should be shared with the community or communities in which that business resides. The shareholders of a business should always be the entire community in which a business is located and not just a select number of private shareholders.

In exchange for foregoing kind of arrangement, there should be no taxes assessed in conjunction with businesses. At the same time, both businesses and the community become liable for whatever damages to individuals, the environment, or other parts of the community that are adversely affected by the activities of those businesses.

(31) A market in which all of its participants are not sovereign individuals is not a free market. Markets that exploit the vulnerabilities of participants are not free. Markets that are organized by the few in a way that undermines, corrupts, or compromises the principles of sovereignty are not free.

Markets in which the participants are all equally sovereign are free. Nonetheless, the freedom inherent in those markets should serve the interests of sovereignty for those who are both inside and outside of those markets.

(32) Sovereignty is only realizable when it is rooted in a collective, reciprocal, guarantee that we will all treat one another through the principles of sovereignty.

(33) Violations of sovereignty are an impediment to the full realization of the principles of sovereignty. However, those violations should not be primarily or initially be subject to punitive forms of treatment.

Instead, violations of sovereignty should be engaged through a process of mediated, conflict resolution and reconciliation intended to restore the efficacious and judicious functioning of sovereignty amongst both individuals and the collective. This mediated process is, first and foremost, rooted in a rigorous effort to determine the facts of a given situation before proceeding on with the process of mediation, conflict resolution, or reconciliation.

A community has the right to defend itself against individuals who violate, and show a disregard for, the sovereignty rights of other individuals. The aforementioned right to self protection might assume the form of: Treatment, exile, incarceration, paroled supervision, community service, and other forms of negotiated settlement with respect to those who undermine the principles of sovereignty.

(34) Alleged scientific and technical progress that cannot be rigorously demonstrated beyond a reasonable doubt to enhance the pursuit and realization of principles of sovereignty by everyone is subject to being governed by the precautionary principle.

(35) Sovereignty is not a form of democracy in which the majority rules on any given issue. Rather, sovereignty is a process of generating consensus within a community that can be demonstrated, beyond a reasonable doubt, to serve the sovereignty interests of everyone.

(36) Sovereignty is rooted in the principle that with respect to any given practice, then, before making a community decision concerning that practice, then a community should take into consideration what the impact of that practice is likely to be on generations seven times removed from the current one.

(37) Everyone should underwrite the costs of pursuing, establishing, enhancing, realizing, and protecting sovereignty -- both individually and collectively -- according to his or her capacity to do so.

(38) Sovereignty is not a function of political maneuvering, manipulations, or strategies. Rather, sovereignty is a function of the application of: Reasoned discussion, critical reflection, constructive reciprocity, creative opportunities, and rigorous methodology in the pursuit of pushing back the horizons of ignorance and seeking to establish, enhance, realize, and protect sovereignty, both individually and collectively.

(39) Sovereignty is not about hierarchy or leadership. Advisors and technical consultants who are capable of lending their expertise and experience to a given project that serves the interests of sovereignty in a community are temporary facilitators whose responsibilities do not extend beyond a given project or undertaking. Those facilitators often tend to arise in the context of a given need and, then, are reabsorbed into the community when a given need has been met.

(40) Education should serve the interests of establishing, developing, enhancing and protecting the principles of sovereignty – both individually and collectively – and not serve the interests of the way of power. Education should not use techniques of undue influence that push or pull individuals toward accepting, or rejecting, specific philosophical, political, economic, or religious perspectives.

(41) To whatever extent taxes are collected (and the issue of taxes needs to be considered and justified – to the extent that this can be accomplished -- in a critically, rigorous fashion), those taxes should be assessed only on a local basis and only after all sovereignty needs of an individual for a given period of time have been addressed. Those taxes should be proportional -- within generally agreed upon specific limits -- to a person's capacity to pay those taxes without undermining a person's ability to fully pursue realizing the principles of sovereignty.

Whatever taxes are collected can only be used in conjunction with projects of which the individual taxpayer

approves. Disputes concerning the issue of taxation should be handled through mediated discussions and not through punitive or coercive policies.

The foregoing statements of principle concerning the idea of sovereignty mark the beginning of the exploratory process, not the end. We all need to critically reflect on the foregoing set of principles because what we have today is working for just a very small number of individuals that follow the way of power and the system which can be referred to as the "law of rules," and which seek to prevent people in general from being able to pursue, establish, enhance, realize, and protect the principles of sovereignty,

Sovereignty is not something new. The idea of sovereignty has been inherent in human beings for a very, very long time, but, unfortunately, as events have demonstrated again and again, for thousands of years, people's aspirations for sovereignty have been thwarted persistently and rigorously by the way of power and its bastard offspring, the "law of rules" at nearly every juncture of history.

A person can commit one's moral and intellectual agency to the cause of sovereignty or an individual can cede that moral and intellectual agency to those who belong to the power elite – economically, militarily, socially, intellectually, politically, educationally, legally, and religiously. A great deal hangs on the nature of the judgments one makes with respect to the issue of how one decides to cede one's moral, intellectual, and spiritual agency.

Sovereignty in not about democracy. It goes beyond democracy, and, indeed, one might legitimately ask what democracy even means if it does not give expression to the principles of sovereignty.

Sovereignty is consistent with some of the basic features of a republic, and one might note that the term "democracy" does not appear in the American

Constitution. As such, the principles of sovereignty could help to realize the potential of the current constitutional framework provided that certain provisos are keep in mind which require one to engage the constitutional framework through a reworking of various aspects of that document which assists one to get rid of the bathwater while retaining the baby.

The first consideration to take into account is that the battle between, on the one hand, engaging the Constitution as a document of opportunity for establishing principles of sovereignty, and, on the other hand, engaging the Constitution as an expression of the "law of rules" will not be won – if it is won -- through the ballot box or the judicial system. This is because both the judicial system – from the municipal level to the level of the Supreme Court of the United States – are, at least to a considerable degree, entangled within the kind of "law of rules" system which was outlined in the first part of the present section, and, consequently, either prior to, or soon after, being voted into office (by usually not more than 20% of registered voters and an even a smaller portion if one uses eligible voters who are not registered, and do not vote, as one's baseline), elected officials tend to become either corrupted by, or thwarted by, the system which gives expression to the "law of rules" which often controls or substantially influences, what takes place politically – whether on the municipal, county, state, or federal level – and, therefore, the conditions of governance will never be able to be reformed through either the courts or the ballot box.

To undertake the challenge of reorienting the Constitution toward its inherent potential for bringing sovereignty into the lives of all citizens, people must have the capacity to do an end-around the courts as well as around elected officials. Somewhat ironically, this sort of an end-around is precisely what, among other things, the ninth and tenth amendments could have been enabling people to do if they only understood those amendments – which they don't seem to have grasped in the past and still

don't seem to understand but which has been staring citizens in the face for 237 years.

More specifically, neither the courts nor elected officials have any constitutional standing with respect to the aforementioned two amendments because neither the courts nor elected officials have any authority, under the Constitution, to deny or disparage the unspecified rights which are referenced in the Ninth Amendment (since any attempt to prevent people from exercising such unspecified rights would, ipso facto, be an act of denying and disparaging those rights), and, in addition, any attempt on the part of the courts or federally elected officials to prevent people from pursuing the undelegated powers which are rooted in the Tenth Amendment would, in effect, constitute an attempt to claim that powers which have not been delegated to the federal government, nor denied to the states, can, notwithstanding what the Constitution says, be withheld from the states or the people, and, as indicated previously, the terms "states" and "people" are not necessarily equivalent.

In addition, given that the only guarantee which is present in the Constitution (i.e., Article IV, section 4) stipulates that each of the states (and, therefore, the people in those states) must be afforded a republican form of government, then, this constitutional provision requires that all government officials – whether elected or appointed/hired by elected officials – must act in accordance with the principles of republican moral philosophy, and this fiduciary responsibility or duty of care requires that, among other things, officials and government employees should be: Honest, impartial, unbiased, tolerant, compassionate, rational, noble, fair, egalitarian, self-sacrificing, honorable, and not willing to act as judges in their own causes.

Without the foregoing moral code, the guarantee of providing a republican form of government comes to nothing. For example, to claim that the guarantee of a

republican form of government has to do just with the structural character of governance and, therefore, only requires government officials to provide three equal branches of governance, then, such a guarantee is rendered relatively empty and meaningless given that the conduct of the individuals in those branches is not subject to the sort of "good conduct" which reflects the principles inherent in republican moral philosophy.

Unfortunately, for one reason or another (and the courts – both federal and state – as well as Congress, the Executive, the educational system, and the media have had a great deal to do with why things are, and have been, the way they are), the people of the United States, for 237 years, have resisted examining and critically reflecting on the possibilities and potential which are present in the unspecified rights and undelegated powers of, respectively, the Ninth and Tenth amendments – rights and powers which, in the case of the Ninth Amendment, do not belong to the three federal branches of government or state governments, and in the case of the Tenth Amendment do not belong exclusively to the states because the Constitution also has specified that the people have access to such undelegated powers.

Among the actions which might be taken by the people under the Ninth and Tenth amendments is the following possibility. For instance, corporations should be returned to operating in accordance with the notion of a charter which – in limited ways and for temporary periods of time -- is a process that extends permissions modulated by a set of conditions in relation to a given collection of individuals to operate in the community for some public good.

Irrespective of whether individuals are, or are not, part of such a chartered collective, they must be capable of being held accountable for their actions. However, such accountability is, for the most part, absent from corporate law as presently conceived because human beings, via their lawyers, use the way corporations are legally

structured to shield the human members of the chartered collective from financial and criminal consequences for the harms which they might set in motion as a result of activity which has been generated through such a corporate context.

As chartered entities, corporations should not be permitted to be transnational or use off-shore accounts to hide their assets. As chartered entities, corporations should be entirely transparent to the public.

Such chartered arrangements should be required to put aside a portion of their earnings in compliance with fixed standards for which there are no exemptions, dispensations, or deductions. This is not levied as a tax but as a payment to the community for having been granted permission to participate in such a chartered arrangement.

Furthermore, since chartered arrangements are extensions of the federal government, they are required to abide by the guarantee which is present in Article IV, section 4. Therefore, those entities, must adhere to the principles which are inherent in the republican moral philosophy.

Furthermore, to whatever extent such chartered companies are operating on behalf of, or in relation to, municipal, county, or state projects, then, the federal government must ensure that those chartered entities operate in accordance with the guarantee of republican governance because this is part of what is entailed by the process of providing each of the states with a republican form of governance as well as protecting those states against all manner of invasion, including from chartered arrangements.

Education, banking, and medicine are three other areas which could be explored through the framework and lenses of the unspecified rights and undelegated powers of the Ninth and Tenth amendments. For example, one might consider the possibility that all three of the foregoing areas should be run as public utilities which are operated by the

people independently of, or in co-operation with, the federal or state governments.

Education, banking, and medicine should neither be privatized and, thereby, be held hostage to the arbitrary efficiencies of the profit motive in which capital is understood in terms of money rather than in terms of the flow of principles of sovereignty among human beings, nor should the foregoing three sorts of activities be held hostage to the whims of those who have some sort of governmental power but who wish to leverage that power in order to impose the "law of rules" on people and, thereby, deny the people opportunities to use the dynamics of education, banking, and medicine to establish, enhance, and protect the conditions necessary for sovereignty to flourish.

One can align the activities of education, banking, and medicine with the dynamics of the "law of rules". Alternatively, one can align the activities of those three extremely important aspects of life with the dynamics of the principles of sovereignty.

1% of the people will wish to align themselves with the "law of rules." These are the same people who have leveraged the "law of rules" to ensure that they are members of the 1% who are dedicated to seeking different ways of controlling human beings as well as the resources of the Earth irrespective of how such controlling behavior might adversely affect the other 99% of human beings or what devastation accrues to the environment and its interlocking set of ecologies.

Once the other 99% of the population develops a sense of what the principles of sovereignty entail and how they work, my prediction is that the remainder of the populace will be inclined toward aligning themselves with such principles. However, there are some obstacles which need to be overcome.

For instance, suppose two individuals are enjoying a walk in a public space. One of the two carries a boombox of

some kind which is blaring out some sort of music that is to the liking of that individual but is not to the liking of the other individual who is sharing the same public space.

Is the person who is publicly broadcasting the music merely actively exploring the unspecified rights and undelegated powers of the Ninth and Tenth amendment? This sort of question could be extended to many kinds of activities that occur on a daily basis within any given community.

The foregoing sorts of dynamics might lead to any of the following possibilities: A request for a person to either lower the volume or to put on head phones while listening to the music; an argument, when the person toward whom the forward request is directed says: "Why don't you walk somewhere else" or "Why don't YOU put on some head phones?"; tit-for-tat exchanges; fear; conflict escalation; bouts of anxiety; a fight; the appearance of police; court dates; fines jail time; community tensions; a loss of sleep; and a loss in a quality in life experiences. The foregoing scenarios are often quite likely because the society in which we live – a society which talks incessantly about freedom, liberty, and rights – tends not to assist people to learn how to constructively navigate the boundary conditions of their lives in a constructive fashion when tensions and frictional forces emerge at those boundary conditions.

To be sure, schools, places of worship, the media, as well as various kinds of community organizations (e.g., girl scouts) often offer food for thought concerning such matters. However, most people do not have regularly operating mediational facilities or healing circles readily available to them through which to learn the skills that are necessary to be able to develop one's own approach to sovereignty while extending degrees of freedom to other people with respect to their own journey toward developing their own approach to the exercise of sovereignty.

The rights that are given expression in the Bill of Rights tend to refer to the nature of the relationship between a given level of governance and human beings. What about the nature of our relationships with one another apart from the government?

What is meant by the notion that human beings have unspecified rights which the government can neither deny nor disparage? What is meant by the idea that there are undelegated powers to which government cannot have access?

How would people – independently of, and sometimes in co-operation with government – go about constructing arrangements that would help realize functional systems of education, banking, and medicine. Unfortunately, those who are dedicated to the "law of rules" abhor a vacuum and, as a result, they have rushed into areas to which they are not constitutionally entitled but which often lie fallow because the people have never taken, or been encouraged to take, the time needed to rigorously and methodically explore how unspecified rights which cannot be denied or disparage by government officials or how undelegated powers that belong to the people, and not the federal government, can be used for constructive purposes.

There are two things that can obstruct the emergence of conditions and principles of sovereignty. (1) The 1% who wish to continue to benefit through a political-economic-financial-educational arrangement that engages the Constitution through the lenses of the "law of rules" (which has been the case for much of the last 237 years), and (2) those who possess the potential for sovereignty but have been induced by the advocates of the "law of rules" to compete with, and be antagonistic toward, one another concerning the exercise of such sovereignty rather than to learn how to cooperate with each other, independently of the government (and, sometimes in co-operation with one, or another level of government) and,

in the process explore, and where appropriate, realize the potential of sovereignty both individually and collectively.

There are some dynamics which could assist the foregoing process. For example, the cases which are pursued by the judicial system should be directed toward examining whether the laws which Congress wishes to pass, or the actions which the Executive wishes to undertake, or the methods used by the judiciary, meet the requirements of Article IV, section 4 of the Constitution which guarantees to each of the states, and, therefore, the people who live within those states, a republican form of government which is rooted in a moral philosophy which gives emphasis to behavior that exhibits qualities of character quite independent of any theological or non-theological framework.

The foregoing manner of approaching cases focuses on the qualities of character through which legislation is proposed, discussed, and voted on and, therefore, tends to distance itself from claims concerning what the Constitution allegedly means and, therefore, how various hermeneutical aspects of the Constitution must be applied to this or that situation. If the methods of Congress, the Executive, and the Judiciary are required to meet moral standards such as: Honesty, fairness, reason, equitability, compassion, impartiality, honor, nobility, objectivity, and an unwillingness to serve as judges in one's own causes, then, whatever the concrete nature of a given piece of legislation might be, perhaps, principles of sovereignty are much more likely to be realized than if Legislative, Executive, or Judicial actions were not held to such moral standards (and, therefore, the guarantee of Article IV, section 4 was not observed) and, as a result, one is much more likely to encounter the many problems which tend to emerge when the "law of rules" governs the behavior of those in power.

Moreover, as indicated previously, waiting for legislative, executive, or judicial actions to address

problems after the fact (i.e., once they have arisen through, say, the passing – by the Legislature -- and signing – by the President) seems to lack the sort of proactive foresight that could be of value if one were interested in trying to prevent unnecessary difficulties from arising which might have been detectable if the Judiciary and members of Congress or the Executive had sought to examine the quality of the moral character which informed such legislation or Executive actions before it was signed into law. As some tradespeople say: "Measure twice, cut once."

In addition, members of Congress need to be helped to appreciate, more insightfully, just how much of what they have done in the past and what they are doing in the present tends to violate the provisions of the First Amendment which indicate that "Congress may make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free expression thereof." Unfortunately, the elements which are present in the etymology of the term "religion" are in evidence in almost all legislation by means of which legislators are seeking to impose some sort of economic, political, cultural, financial, educational, military, or medical way of doing things which requires citizens to have: (a) commitment to an idea, belief, or theory, (b) a sense of the sacred (i.e., the sense that something is true, and, therefore, right to do), and (c) duties of care with respect to whether, or not, to comply with such legislation just as any kind of religion might require of an individual.

Legislation should be about taking steps to establish, enhance, or protect the conditions and principles of sovereignty. If legislators serve the interests of sovereignty, sovereignty will serve the interests of governance.

As has been said, give a person some, fish, that person is fed for a day. Teach that person how to fish, that individual is provided with a way to feed himself, herself, or themselves for life.

The same is true with respect to issues of sovereignty. If the task of government is believed to be one of assisting people to be sovereign, then, trying to do everything for such individuals might, or might not, help those individuals to become sovereign for a day, but if government were to focus on establishing conditions which encourage the development and use of principles of sovereignty by everyone, then, government would be assisting individuals to learn how to become sovereign agents independent of government for the rest of their lives.

The Commerce Clause is intimately connected to the foregoing considerations. To insist that this clause must be engaged through the lens of this or that kind of capitalistic system seems as if a theology is being espoused for the spread of an economic and financial sort of religious-like system.

The Commerce Clause shouldn't be a way of facilitating capitalism, communism, socialism, feudalism, mercantilism, corporatism, or militarism. The Commerce Clause should be about establishing processes that facilitate the flow of sovereignty by means of commercial activities and, thereby, help people – individually and collectively – have the opportunity to work toward realizing the truth concerning the nature of their relationship with reality via the exercise of principles of sovereignty which are rendered possible, at least in part, through commercial activities that help create conditions for the emergence of sovereignty rather than conditions of entrapment and oppression.

Before closing, there are just a couple of comments that touch on the growing inclination of many people to want to engender governance with autonomous systems of algorithms which, supposedly, will help enhance and render governance a more efficient and effective process, and this brief discussion will bring us back full circle to the topic of AI with which this book began. One observation which can be made with respect to the foregoing issue is

that while the concern expressed by some individuals about the possible emergence of "artificial general intelligence" (allegedly sentient, super-intelligent entities) possibly leading to an extinction level event could be a genuine concern, nonetheless, those sorts of individuals might have become so preoccupied about what could come to be – i.e., human extinction via super-intelligent entities – that aside from the irony of how an allegedly intelligent stratagem for an enhanced, more efficient and effective form of living could bring about a state of affairs which runs in an entirely opposite direction (i.e.,human extinction), there is a further consideration about which commentators might wish to worry because such a conceptual and emotional preoccupation could have induced those individuals to have missed what might already be here and quite capable of leading to human extinction quite apart from the existence of super-intelligent machines.

More specifically, autonomous algorithmically-driven systems don't have to be sentient, super-intelligent, or have achieved singularity in order to constitute a threat to humanity. All that such systems need to be able to do is to have the capacity to generate systems of logic that are opaque to human understanding and, therefore, inherently difficult for human beings to counter – as Lee Sedol and lots of other Go players discovered when AlphaGo made "move 37" which was later acknowledged to have been a critical transition point that. subsequently, led to victory by the AlphaGo system and, yet, even human beings who had a deep understanding of the game of Go didn't sense or understand what was happening as it was happening.

Deep machine learning techniques are already providing autonomous systems with the capacity to combine different modalities of heuristic wherewithal, including various forms of reprogramming that have the potential to take the system in directions that give expression to unexpected, or what might be termed emergent, properties. These combinatoric methods for

introducing automatic reprogrammable heuristic capabilities into such systems can give rise to networks of logic that can be opaque even to the creators of those systems, and, therefore, despite the fact that such reprogrammed systems are not super-intelligent and sentient, they still can operate with agency (in other words, such autonomous systems can induce things to happen in one way or another), and such agency would be a function of underlying processes of functionality that could be opaque to human understanding, and, if so, then, irrespective of whether, or not, those systems are sentient or super-intelligent, this might be an irrelevant issue because the issue of sentience or super-intelligence would not necessarily have to be present in order to bring human existence to an end … systems or networks of agentic logic that are opaque to human understanding might do the trick as well.

A second point to ponder upon in conjunction with the foregoing considerations also raises a variety of other issues. Many people seem to suppose that if an AGI system is developed that it will be smarter than human beings.

However, even if one were to concede that possibility, what follows from this? The foregoing question alludes to an important problem.

In other words, just as human beings, who have a certain amount of 'game' with respect to intelligence, have been able to generate all manner of problems which seem to have exceeded the capacity of such human levels of intelligence to be able to resolve, what guarantee is there that however intelligent AGI systems might be, or might become, that those systems will necessarily be any better at avoiding the sorts of unanticipated problems which might be generated by AGI-generated intelligent activity that could arise. In other words, irrespective of the presence of some form of super-intelligence, nonetheless, is there any logical or empirical necessity which requires one to suppose that super-intellectual capabilities will be

able to detect the possible blind spots which could exist amidst the epistemological and hermeneutical shadows that might be present in the depths of such intellectual abilities and which could lead to the emergence of problems that lead to collateral forms of damage which were not anticipated by those "intelligent" systems, despite whatever staggering capabilities might be present in that intelligence?

Maybe, human beings are not the only entities which should be concerned with extinction level events that can be made possible through the exercise of intelligence. Perhaps, AGI systems, as well, should be concerned with extinction level events which their super-intelligence might set in motion in unanticipated ways.

Maybe, super-intelligence is as vulnerable to black swan events just as limited intelligence seems to be vulnerable to those sorts of events. Maybe autonomous systems of intelligence – no matter how super – might be (like human beings) unable to cope with that which transcends their epistemological capacities.

Maybe, super-intelligent systems will confuse or conflate hermeneutics with epistemology. "To die, to sleep. To sleep: perchance to dream [or hallucinate]. Aye, there's the rub".

If so, then, the foregoing sorts of possibilities would seem to reduce the alleged "dark enlightenment" musings of people such as Nick Land, Curtis Yarvin, Peter Thiel, and Elon Musk into a state which appears to shimmer with an absence of understanding. Perhaps the "reason" the foregoing notion of "enlightenment" is referred to as being "dark" is because there are so many convoluted, obfuscating, non-linear forms of epistemological and hermeneutical shadows that are flowing through their alleged condition of 'enlightenment' that this led to an epiphany in which a person comes to realize that if one does not understand what is going on, then, this is, itself, a form of enlightenment, dark though it might be.

Trying to deal with the presence of autonomous, agentic networks of algorithmically driven, combinatoric forms of logical opaqueness might have helped the aforementioned individuals to realize that such autonomous systems have a very good chance of exacerbating the many problems already confronting human beings rather than being able to provide any sort of constructive resolution to those problems. If so, then, perhaps, such a realization tends to radiate as though 'through a glass darkly.'

Alternatively, conceptually speaking, the hermeneutical system being constructed by Land, Yarvin, Thiel, and Musk appears to be pretty much of a closed system or bubble chamber in which they listen to themselves but not necessarily to anyone outside the system. If so, then, as with all closed systems which only feed off themselves, eventually, entropy begins to take away whatever degrees of freedom that kind of a system might have had because whatever free energy is present becomes depleted, and, consequently, one is left with a system which has no capacity to give expression to constructive forms of work and, therefore, that kind of a system only emanates a sort of darkness.

The four Mouseketeers – who are all for one, and one for all, except when they are not -- might have found an abundance of ways for making money and acquiring power. However, given such pursuits, they might not have much of an interest in, or time for, helping humanity to constructively deal with issues which have a sine qua non status with respect to issues of sovereignty, and some of those issues have been explored in the present book.

The aforementioned individuals have been known to critique the short-comings of democracy. However, this tends to give expression to a straw-dog or red-herring (pick your organism) set of arguments.

One of the primary challenges with which human beings have been confronted since their appearance on

Earth, is about the principles of sovereignty and not about the problems of "democracy." Indeed, the term "democracy" tends to so vague and vapid that conceptually pursuing it seems more like a dog chasing its own tail than a form of dynamics which can be considered to be focused on anything that might be of a heuristically valuable nature.

Furthermore, ideas that feature the need for an unelected, CEO-like monarch to take charge of human affairs seems more like a devolutionary venture into the realms of 'Dungeons and Dragons' than facets of a substantive conceptual exercise of any kind. The aforementioned individuals might have a good grasp of how to go about leveraging the tipping points which are present in the unending conflicts that are generated by the desire to control people and resources, but such an understanding seems more suited to the previously discussed "law of rules" scenarios which, unfortunately, are at the heart of so many human problems, and as a result the aforementioned individuals seem to want to just prolong, and become champions of, a cul-de-sac, useless process of existential musical chairs in which the person who happens to be able to acquire the only remaining seat of power gets to bully everyone else in a game that was rigged from the beginning by individuals who recommended that life be engaged through the lenses of control rather than the lenses of sovereignty.

Furthermore, there is something rather disquieting, and not at all inspiring of hope or confidence, with respect to individuals who appear to want to advocate for a framework of "accelerationism" in which everything should get torn down as quickly as possible and people should be cast aside as expeditiously as possible so that the 1% will be able to make money and acquire power via a reconstruction process that is steeped in Machiavellian-like machinations that provide new opportunities through which to seek to gain control over people and resources in a rather pathogenic manner. Apparently, there are a lot of

people in Silicon Valley who are quite taken with the foregoing notion of "dark enlightenment" which only goes to show that people can be quite bright in some aspects of life while teetering on the brink of becoming, if not already currently being, quite dumb in other facets of life.

The foregoing considerations concerning automated systems as well as the material in the rest of this book are merely suggestive. Such observations and critical reflections are offered in the hope that they might serve as a sort of catalyst for the emergence of a broader, more intense, and more heuristically valuable discussion concerning climatology, technocracy, and sovereignty.

Bibliography

Achbar, Mark Abbott, Jennifer & Bakan, Joel – *The Corporation*, Big Picture Media Corporation, 2004.

Bakan, Joel and Abbott, Jennifer – *The New Corporation: The Unfortunately Necessary Sequel*, Telefilm Canada and the Rogers Group of Funds through the Theatrical Documentary Program, In association with CRAVE, A Division of Bell Media, 2020.

Bakan, Joel – *The Corporation: The Pathological Pursuit of Profit and Power*, Free Press, 2005.

Bender, Emily M. & Hanna, Alex – *The AI Con: How to Fight Big Tech's Hype and Create the Future We Want*, Harper Collins, 2025.

Brown, Bruce – *The History of the Corporation, Volume 1*, BF Communications, Inc., 2003.

Corbett, James – *Reportage: Essays In the New World Order*, Editions Shukutou, 2025.

Linebaugh, Peter – *The Magna Carta Manifesto: Liberties and Commons for All*, University of California Press, 2008.

Corsi, Jerome R. – *The Truth About Energy, Global Warming and Climate Change*, Post Hill Press, 2022.

Hao, Karen – *Empire of AI: Dreams and Nightmares in Sam Altman's OpenAI*, Penguin Press, 2025.

Harris, Sam – *The End of Faith*, W. W. Norton, 2005.

Hartmann, Thom – *Unequal Protection: The Rise of Corporate Dominance and the Theft of Human Rights*, Rodale Inc., 2004.

Levine, Yasha – *Surveillance Valley: The Secret Military History of the Internet*, Icon Books Ltd., 2018.

Moran, Alan (Editor) – *Climate Change*, Stockade Books, 2015.

Sinclair, Upton – The Brass Check, Classic Books, 1919.

Smith, C. Paul – *The Climate Change Hoax Argument: The History and Science That Expose a Major International Deception*, Frederick Printing, 2021.

Suleyman, Mustafa With Bhaskar, Michael– *The Coming Wave*, Crown Publishing Group, 2023.

Varoufakis, Yanis – *Technofeudalism: What Killed Capitalism*, Melville House Publishing, 2023.

Wood, Patrick M. – *Technocracy: The Hard Road to World Order*, Coherent Publishing, 2018.

Wood, Patrick M., Turner, Courtenay – *The Final Betrayal: How Technology Destroyed America*, Coherent Publishing, 2025.

Whitehouse, Anab – *Beyond Democracy*, Bilquees Press, 2018.

Whitehouse, Anab – *Quest For Sovereignty*, Bilquees Press, 2018.

Whitehouse, Anab – *Sovereignty: A Play In Three Acts*, Bilquees Press, 2023.

Whitehouse, Anab – *Sovereignty and the Constitution: An Unexpurgated Guided Tour*, Bilquees Press, 2021.

Whitehouse, Anab – *Sovereignty Versus Modalities of Control*, Bilquees Press, 2025.

Whitehouse, Anab – *Technological Reflections*, Bilquees Press, 2024.

Whitehouse, Anab – The People Amendments, Bilquees Press, 2018.

Whitehouse, Anab – *Toxic Knowledge*, Bilquees Press, 2024.

Yudkowsky, Eliezer & Soares, Nate – *If Anyone Builds It, Everyone Dies: Why Superhuman AI Would Kill Us All*, Little, Brown and Company, 2025.