

# 21<sup>st</sup> Century Common Sense - The truth will set you free

Phineas Gage<sup>1</sup> (pseudonym) -and-Mark Warren Moody (autonym)

A Betabilitarian

February 27, 2024

Cover Signet Artists: Matthias and Christoph Held

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> <u>https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Phineas\_Gage.</u> A long dead Decent American whose life experience contributed significantly to neuroscience when he accidentally blew a tamping iron through his own head working with dynamite on the railroads. Mr. Gage survived and recovered, but because of the tamping iron's injury to his brain, his personality completely and inexplicably changed. The author didn't suffer a tamping iron through his brain; instead he suffered rigorously honest self-education over a period of several years.

#### Dedication.

21<sup>st</sup> Century Common Sense is dedicated first to the infinite intricacy and wonder of the natural world, second to the infinite co-operation, imagination, curiosity, creativity, beauty, joy, and love of humanity (not as distinct from the natural world, but as part of it), third to his parents and sisters, fourth to the father of his soul, fifth to the families of the dozens of great friends he calls the aunts and uncles of his soul, sixth to the rest of his consanguineous family, seventh to Thomas Paine, eighth to the Decent Americans in America's founding generation (particularly those, and their families and friends, who died or were injured fighting for Common Sense's vision of broader freedom, equality, and happiness), ninth to those subsequent generations of Decent Americans that continued America's tendency to realizing Common Sense's vision up until nearly (about 9 months shy) 61 years ago, tenth to the lucky accident of which he is proud, to have been born an American in the 20<sup>th</sup> century, able to imagine Common Sense's vision fully reinvigorated in the first half of the 21<sup>st</sup> century.

#### Know Thyself.

Oracle at Delphi (Temple of Apollo's) Central Inscription<sup>1</sup>

Until the Lion Learns to Write, Every Story Will Glorify the Hunter. - African Proverb

So, first of all, let me assert my *firm belief* that the only thing we have to fear is...fear itself — nameless, unreasoning, unjustified terror which paralyzes needed efforts to convert retreat into advance. In every dark hour of our national life, a leadership of frankness and of vigor has met with that understanding and support of the people themselves which is essential to victory. And I am convinced that you will again give that support to leadership in these critical days. [emphasis supplied] - *Franklin Delano Roosevelt* 

I learned that courage was not the absence of fear, but the triumph over it. The brave man is not he who does not feel afraid, but he who conquers that fear.

- Nelson Mandela

If your dreams do not scare you, they are not big enough. - *Ellen Johnson Sirleaf* 

Knowledge is power. Knowledge shared is power multiplied. - *Robert Boyce* 

<sup>1</sup> The Oracle was consulted by the most powerful people in the Greek and Roman Empires when they couldn't make a decision for themselves. The inscription was definitely not in English. It was in ancient Greek – *gnothi seauton* (and it, of course, was depicted in the ancient Greek alphabet). The Latin translation *Temet Nosce* was popularized when Neo visited the Oracle in her kitchen (https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=EUN1ClT9i9w) in 1999's *The Matrix*. People acting together as a group can accomplish things which no individual acting alone could ever hope to bring about. *Franklin Delano Roosevelt*

We hold these *truths* to be self-evident, that all men are created *equal*, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain *unalienable Rights*, that among these are Life, Liberty and *the pursuit of Happiness*. That to secure these rights, Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just powers from the *consent* of the governed, --That whenever any Form of Government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the Right of the People to *alter* or to *abolish* it, and to institute new Government, laying its foundation on such principles and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their Safety and Happiness. [emphases

supplied]

The Declaration of Independence

Evil may so shape events that Caesar will occupy a palace and Christ a cross, but that same Christ arose and split history into A.D. and B.C., so that even the life of Caesar must be dated by his name. Yes, 'the arc of the moral universe is long, but it bends toward justice.' There is something in the universe which justifies William Cullen Bryant in saying, 'Truth crushed to earth will rise again.'

Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.

You can't solve a problem until you diagnose it accurately.<sup>2</sup>

Major Scott Ritter

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> And 27 antecedents: <u>https://www.entrepreneur.com/leadership/27-quotes-to-change-how-you-think-about-problems/288957</u>.

If you try to speak out, they will stamp on your tongue To your land they will come, till you stand up as one<sup>3</sup>

Lowkey Keep Your Hand On Your Gun

Livin' in the new world with an old soul These rich men north of Richmond Lord knows they all just wanna have total control Wanna know what you think, wanna know what you do And they don't think you know, but I know that you do 'Cause your dollar ain't sh– and it's taxed to no end 'Cause of rich men north of Richmond<sup>4</sup>

> Oliver Anthony Rich Men North of Richmond

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> <u>https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=nBNeD57-RVg</u>.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> <u>https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=sqSA-SY5Hro</u>.

## **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

NTRODUCTION1
ULY 4, 17767
The United States' Founding Legal Document: The Declaration of Independence9
<b>BEING HUMAN IN THE 21<sup>ST</sup> CENTURY</b> According to Science and Faith)15
The Delphic Oracle: Know Thyself16
Maslow's Pyramid (Our Basic Needs)18
A Special Note About Our Need For Nutritious Food24
The Next Step on Maslow's Pyramid Has Recently Been Scientifically Proven28
Our Obedience To Authority Is, Literally, Simultaneously Homicidal And Suicidal30
Excessive Income Inequality is Anti-natural; The Pareto Principle. Our Domestic Enemy Lost The War on Poverty' Which Should Be Ended
We Love Technology and Forget What It Is44
We Also Love Nature47
We Also Love Sex (Natural and Essential As It Is); Let's Talk About Sex Baby"47

We Also Love Drugs; Therefore Our Domestic Enemy Fabricated, Then Decisively Lost, A 'War on Drugs' Which Should Be Immediately Rethought52	ŗ
<b>NOVEMBER 15, 1777 – JUNE 21, 1788</b> ( <i>The Codification of The Declaration of Independence</i> )	
November 15, 177758	
September 3, 1783 – May 25, 178759	
June 21, 178862	
IN THE 21ST CENTURY, AMERICANS MUST FINALLY LEARN THAT "WAR IS A RACKET"; AND A FULL-FRONTAL ASSAULT ON COMMON SENSE	
Two Concrete Proofs That War Is A Racket71	
FEBRUARY 20, 1939 – JULY 20, 1945 (Hitler's and Nazism's Defeat)	
<b>WTF HAPPENED IN 1971?</b> (Our Domestic Enemy's Ensuing Theft of \$47 Trillion From You)76	
Lewis Powell's Famous Memo84	
<i>QUI BONO</i> ; OR WHO, <i>EXACTLY</i> , IS OUR DOMESTIC ENEMY THAT HAS STOLEN \$47 TRILLION FROM US IN 50 YEARS? (Roughly Identified and Numerically Quantified)	
One Billion Is A Brain-Alteringly Large Number	
How Many American Billionaires Are There?	
Who Are The Billionaires' Minions?	

Our Domestic Enemy's – The Billionaires' and Their N	<i>Ainions'</i>
– Weak And Easily Alterable Societal Architecture	
("The Billionaires' System")	
CONCLUSION	

#### INTRODUCTION.

"Time makes more converts than reason", Thomas Paine wrote in his Introduction to 1776's *Common Sense*.<sup>1</sup> Thomas Paine can appropriately be characterized as the United States of America's *true* founding father – but he has been largely written out of history, largely excised from the 21<sup>st</sup> century American collective consciousness.

If you're surprised that America's arguable true founding father is rarely referred to as such consider two relatively recent prominent references to Thomas Paine:

- 1. At his July 17, 1980 acceptance speech for the Republican Party nomination for President, Ronald Reagan actually quoted Thomas Paine, but only referred to Thomas Paine (with typically colloquial self-aggrandizing, history shrinking, faux-grandeur) as we believe no American has before or since as "Tom"<sup>2</sup> (as though you'd like to have a beer with Thomas Paine, rather than understand him). "We have it in our power to begin the world over again" Reagan quoted Paine from the final paragraphs of *Common Sense*.<sup>3</sup>
- 2. Nearly 30 years later in President Barack Obama's January 2009 inaugural address, Obama – equally deceptively (note: a Democrat now, rather than a Republican) – centered Thomas Paine. Obama actually called Thomas Paine "**the father of our nation**" but made us think he was talking about George Washington. Obama said (for all those blue-no-matter-who Decent Americans reading

<sup>3</sup> Have you ever heard Thomas Jefferson diminutively referred to as Tom? When was the last time a Thomas Jefferson quote attributed to Tom? Thomas Jefferson, fully prescient of today, said: **"The issue today is the same as it has been throughout all history, whether man shall be allowed to govern himself or be ruled by a small elite."** How much less gravitas would that statement have if it were merely attributed to a man named Tom? <u>https://www.azquotes.com/quote/559886</u>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> <u>https://americainclass.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/08/Common-Sense-</u> Full-Text.pdf.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> <u>https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=SBP2gvZTnwM</u> @38m 51s.

this, you won't find it hard to recall Obama's soaring (as if to composed music) rhetoric: "At a time when the outcome of our revolution was most in doubt, the **father of our nation** ordered these words be read to the people: **'Let it be told to the future world, that in the depth of winter, when nothing but hope and virtue could survive, that the city and the country, alarmed at one common danger, came forth to meet and to repulse it."** [emphasis supplied].<sup>4</sup> George Washington – who we somewhat habitually think of as the father of our nation – did not think or articulate those words. Thomas Paine did. In The American Crisis (a series of essays written to galvanize the founding generation during the Revolutionary War).<sup>5</sup>

There are numerous books about Thomas Paine, his life, his ideas, and how his ideas spread feverishly throughout the founding generation's consciousness (from town hall to beer hall and back again) to birth our great nation. Scott Liell's 2013 book *46 Pages* is a vivid and engaging account.

Time makes more converts than reason. What does that mean, and who was Thomas Paine and what was *Common Sense*? The United States of America's immediate future depends on you – *Decent* Americans<sup>6</sup> – developing an answer to these 3 questions. The internet will provide relatively fast answers to the last 2 questions (see footnote 1), and you'll quickly learn that Thomas Paine was vehemently opposed to slavery before that was fashionable. The answer to the first question, however, lies in your own hearts, brains, bodies and souls. We write this with confidence because your freedom (such as it's become) depends on it. Without *your* freedom, the United States of America will die. Its murder – by the slow,

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> <u>https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=VjnygQ02aW4&themeRefresh=1 (at 20 minutes, 09 seconds (20:09).</u>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> <u>https://genius.com/Thomas-paine-the-crisis-annotated.</u>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup> You are not 'ordinary' or 'average'. You are American. The 'elites' (perhaps the most *un*American label ever conjured; a mere modern aristocracy) labelled you ordinary and average.

manipulative, and deliberate strangulation of your voice – is being undertaken by a Domestic Enemy.

Our geography (the Atlantic Ocean to the East, the Pacific Ocean to the West, Canada to the North, and Mexico and the Gulf of Mexico to the South<sup>7</sup>), coupled with our population – more than 333,000,000 of us<sup>8</sup> - dictate, with the application of reason, that a Domestic Enemy is infinitely more dangerous to us than a foreign enemy. As you consider those words, recall that every federal politician, and judge, as well as every member of the military in the United States is <u>sworn</u> to defend the United States against "*all* enemies, foreign *and* domestic."

America, we have an open and notorious, hiding in plain sight, Domestic Enemy ("Our Domestic Enemy").

Using manipulated, incredible, and distorted information driven into your brains, hearts, and souls through phone and computer and television screens, Our Domestic Enemy makes it frightening – but fortunately not too frightening – for you to confront and cage it. Naturally, we find it almost incomprehensible, almost inconceivable, that American blood courses through Our Domestic Enemy's veins. '*How could that be?*' our minds struggle, that struggle of reason made much more difficult by our fear (which is just an emotion).

Before revealing Our Domestic Enemy, we urge you to take 20 minutes to listen to what many believe to be the greatest commencement speech ever given in America (of those that we've heard, we agree). It was given to the graduating class of Kenyon College, Oregon in 2005 by a Decent American writer who is credited with altering the direction of American literature: David Foster Wallace.<sup>9</sup> Foster Wallace's 2005 commencement speech is called *This is Water*.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup> <u>https://printable-us-map.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/05/amazing-united-states-map-and-oceans-pics-printable-map-new-printable-map-of-the-united-states-with-oceans.png</u>.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>8</sup> <u>https://www.census.gov/newsroom/press-releases/2022/2022-population-estimates.html</u>.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>9</sup> <u>https://uipress.uiowa.edu/books/legacy-david-foster-wallace</u>.

In *This is Water*, attempting to accelerate reason's struggle to speed up time – time unquestionably being your most valuable commodity by any measure (just ask someone whose been handed a cancer death sentence) – Foster Wallace pushes us to focus *hard* during our day-to-day lives on the "obvious" that surrounds us every day. Do you pay any more attention to the ground that you walk than a fish pays attention to the water that it swims in? Can you truly internalize the fact that even though every one of your senses and feelings attempts to convince you that you're the center of the universe that *You're not*?

On April 14, 2023, we got the opportunity to ask the inestimable Professor Noam Chomsky<sup>10</sup>, among other things, what he thought of *This is Water*. As yet, Professor Chomsky has not answered; the email exchange and questions to him are attached at the end of this pamphlet as **Exhibit A**. If you haven't heard of Professor Chomsky, don't worry, we have so much information to pay attention to in the 21<sup>st</sup> century and Our Domestic Enemy extols obedience and indoctrination through propaganda over education. We now pose these same questions on **Exhibit A** to *every* high school teacher, law student, journalist, lawyer, and professor in America. We also pose the same questions to every individual (whether American or not) listed on **Exhibit B**.

We urge you (and all of them) to take 20 minutes to listen to *This is* Water (https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=DCbGM4mqEVw&t=520s) before trying to answer **Exhibit A** – no matter how interested in (or certain) you are who Our Domestic Enemy is. Having allowed *This is Water* to open your minds, most importantly, we pose **Exhibit A's** questions to you – the People, we citizens of The United States of America.

To shrink the conversion gap between time and reason, exercise your common sense in this 21<sup>st</sup> century using your critical faculties aided by the most significant tool of human freedom ever invented – the internet. Think about that: *the most significant tool of human freedom ever invented – the internet*. What's common sense? Your exercise of your critical thought and logic driven insistently by the realization of a better future for you and your children.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>10</sup> <u>https://news.mit.edu/1992/citation-0415</u>.

Our Domestic Enemy is engaged in an Information War against us. The internet renders this War quickly and easily winnable by us – authentic (uncorrupted and honest) goes viral. If you tamp down your emotional response (which requires you understanding it first), your reason will gain greater foothold in your thoughts and behavior and you'll find more space to reason. We can promise you that, with the assurance that it is not an extravagant promise.

To further speed the number of reason's converts, we exhort you to consider the fate decent Germans faced before World War II (many people, particularly given inflation's ravages, are comparing today in America to 1930s Germany). One prominent German pastor – Martin Niemöller – who was a long and outspoken supporter of Hitler and Nazism before he saw their horrors and terror gave us a (too late because of Niemöller's political leanings at the time) future warning that Decent Americans would do well to internalize today:

"First they came for the socialists, and I did not speak out—because I was not a socialist.

Then they came for the trade unionists, and I did not speak out because I was not a trade unionist.

Then they came for the Jews, and I did not speak out—because I was not a Jew.

Then they came for me—and there was no one left to speak for me."<sup>11</sup>

These obedient, acquiescing Germans (who lacked the courage to see and face the monsters amongst them), historically, became known – scornfully across the world – as 'Good Germans.'<sup>12</sup> We cannot afford to become, in the first quarter of the 21<sup>st</sup> century, a generation of 'Good Americans.' Our Domestic Enemy has already come for the socialists. Ask Omali Yeshitela,

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>11</sup> Niemöller's words are in the Permanent Exhibition at the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum

https://encyclopedia.ushmm.org/content/en/article/martin-niemoeller-first-theycame-for-the-socialists.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>12</sup> <u>https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Good\_German</u>.

the leader of the Uhuru Movement.<sup>13</sup> Our Domestic Enemy took out the trade unionists some time ago. They have come for the Jews (not the Zionists, the Jews) too. In Niemöller's telling, *you're* all that's left.

Niemöller's words, lamenting time's lack of impact on his reason, are echoed by the more familiar saying: "The only thing necessary for the triumph of evil is for good men to do nothing." Whether Edmund Burke said this or not, as Reuters has recently seen fit to question even though we've believed otherwise for centuries (?!), Burke did, also, say:

"When bad men combine, the good must associate; else they will fall, one by one, an unpitied sacrifice in a contemptible struggle."<sup>14</sup>

Bad people (the Hitler's, the Goebbels', the Goering's, the Eichmann's and all of the rest of the German ruling class) have combined to form Our Domestic Enemy, and we must *now* associate to strip all power from them.

We Decent Americans, who care more about those less fortunate than ourselves than we do about concocted narratives designed to provoke our fear, are the "good" that Burke referred to.

The question in 21<sup>st</sup> century America is not whether your government is big or small (President Reagan had a knack for obfuscation, didn't he?). The question is whether your government promotes your lives, your liberties, and your pursuit of happiness by restraining the powerful forces that seek to degrade your lives in favor of ridiculously inappropriate luxuries for the powerful.<sup>15</sup>

As we asked Professor Chomsky in **Exhibit A**, we ask you: if you vote for what you perceive to be the lesser of two evils, aren't you still voting for evil?

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>13</sup> <u>https://www.tampabay.com/news/breaking-news/2022/07/29/who-are-the-uhurus-the-st-petersburg-group-probed-by-fbi-for-russian-ties/</u>.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>14</sup> <u>https://www.reuters.com/article/factcheck-edmund-burke-quote-idUSL1N2PG1EY</u>.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>15</sup> <u>https://www.bbc.com/news/world-europe-60241145</u>.

*Vote Your Conscience* in November, 2024, and July 4, 2026 – our 250<sup>th</sup> anniversary, known as a Semiquincentennial<sup>16</sup>, may become the day that America finally celebrates the realization of its full tolerant, disobedient, and thoughtful potential. Imagine celebrating that day (less than 3 years away) having thrown off the "mind forg'd manacles"<sup>17</sup> wrought – on the left and right – by Our Domestic Enemy. How about *all of us* just vote for different, and determine whether different turns out to be evil; and if s/he does, remove them from office.

Hopefully you read Thomas Paine's Common Sense before reading this far. If you did, you'll notice that as well as urging us to use our time – *now* – to speed our reason, he, in our view accurately, predicted:

"The cause of America is in a great measure

the cause of all [hu]mankind."

We – Americans – are about to permit our destiny to be murdered because we lack the courage to believe in ourselves as human beings born in this magnificent country. America is an idea and an ideal – an ideal that insists upon its belief that human beings can securely govern their own lives. That's where the vast majority of our bravery and freedom have come from over nearly 250 years. It's time to summon your courage and to be brave again – to secure our freedom and our freedoms for at least the next century.

### JULY 4, 1776.

Like so many historical dates, particularly recently, narrowing an historical event to a single day – "July 4" – strips the actual historical event of all context and comprehension.<sup>18</sup> Though it is a fact that America was in

<sup>18</sup> Big recent dates include 9-11(2001); January 6 (2021), February 24 (2022; although we just call this Putin or Ukraine) and October 7 (2023; although most of the rest of the world calls this the Al-Aqsa Flood). As you will see, like 7-4, these *all* require historical context to be even vaguely understood. Before we get there, why do

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>16</sup> <u>https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/United States Semiquincentennial.</u>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>17</sup> <u>https://www.poetryfoundation.org/poems/43673/london-56d222777e969</u>. The Poetry Foundation is the best online poetry repository the author is aware of.

fact born – after being conceived months earlier with the publication of Thomas Paine's *Common Sense* – on July 4, 1776 when the 13 Colonies unified to throw off the manacles of the British monarch's, 'Mad' King George III's, imperial colonialism.

Just like most of your births came about 9 months after your conception (and many followed months or years after your parents' wedding), July 4, 1776 did not happen in a magical and inexplicable vacuum. Look at, among other events, the battles of Lexington and Concord or the Boston Tea Party. Consider whether East Palestine, Ohio (2023), Lahaina, Hawaii (2023), Cop City, Georgia (2023) or any number of other events (including the current rampancy of mass shootings across America<sup>19</sup>) might find historical resonance in the events that gave rise to the virality of Thomas Paine's *Common Sense*.

The 13 Colonies formally unified by executing what few, if any, law students in the 20<sup>th</sup> and 21<sup>st</sup> centuries have been taught (because most law professors and legal scholars have forgotten or ignore (or, arguably worse, *never understood*)) is our **actual** founding legal document: The Declaration of Independence. Our Declaration of Independence is only a couple of pages long. You are urged to read it in aid of your own reason before we quote from it: <u>https://www.archives.gov/founding-docs/declaration-transcript</u>; this way you'll know we're not gas-lighting or misinforming (what's the difference?) you by misquoting, or quoting out of context.<sup>20</sup>

you think we don't remember 11-22 (1964)? Most Decent Americans today will immediately know what you mean if you say 9-11, January 6, or October 7; but do we immediately know what November 22 means?

<sup>19</sup> <u>https://www.gunviolencearchive.org</u>.

<sup>20</sup> A quick note on sources and gas-lighting (no different from lying). If someone – a family member, a friend, a journalist, a politician; anyone – is describing or characterizing a document or a speech, don't trust their characterization or description until they have given you access to the same document or speech. Wikileaks is the premier example of this. A further note: in this pamphlet 21<sup>st</sup> Century Common Sense, we have tried to do that wherever we've been able. In characterizing, and countering, 21<sup>st</sup> century American Russophobia for example, we might rely upon CIA Director William Burns' infamous 2008 'Nyet Means Nyet' Memo: <u>https://wikileaks.org/plusd/cables/08MOSCOW265\_a.html</u>. We cannot vouch for It begins:

"In Congress, July 4, 1776 The unanimous Declaration of the thirteen united States of America".

Note that the 'united' is lower case because it was used as a verb – The United States had not yet been named (which happened a couple of months later on September 9, 1776<sup>21</sup>). Note also that this was the first document that called the colonies (which were previously known as the United Colonies) "States".

In short, the Declaration of Independence is undeniably the legal contract that gave birth to The United States of America. The United States Constitution, brilliant in many respects as we shall see, was always and remains antagonistic to the People's – our – freedom conceived in *The Declaration of Independence*. As you ponder whether it can be true that the Declaration of Independence and not the Constitution (as we've been whipped to believe) is our founding legal document, bear in mind that our most cherished 21<sup>st</sup> century rights – the first, second, fourth, fifth, sixth, eighth, ninth, and tenth amendments, only became codified rights on December 15, 1791: more than 2 years *after* the Constitution was ratified.<sup>22</sup> Then consider that every one of those rights is, right now, under heavy assault by Our Domestic Enemy,

This is because a tiny group of people in the founding generation (who all happened to be white property-owning men with white wives and

the accuracy of any source not based on original documents or speeches. In this regard, we have relied heavily on Wikipedia.com which is often not trustworthy but tends to get basic facts (dates and names) correct – and we know there's a large number of people who believe it both knowledgeable and trustworthy; we believe it knowledgeable and capable of being rendered trustworthy.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>21</sup> <u>https://www.history.com/this-day-in-history/congress-renames-the-nation-united-states-of-america</u>.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>22</sup> <u>https://www.archives.gov/founding-docs/bill-of-rights-transcript#toc-the-u-</u> <u>s-bill-of-rights.</u>

white children and – mostly – plenty of slaves) subverted the blood, sweat and trauma the rest of the Founding Generation (mostly white nonproperty-owning people with white spouses and white children and no slaves) shed and endured to achieve the freedom promised in *The Declaration of Independence*. The majority of the founding generation were also white, largely indentured servants, and *did not have slaves*. The commanded freedoms that caused the founding generation to rise up and take on the most powerful imperial colonialist the world had known to that point – the British Empire – were indelibly and straightforwardly articulated in *The Declaration of Independence*.

It begins, as you've hopefully now read for yourself, with a call for the founding generation to:

"dissolve the political bands which have connected them with another".

Its second paragraph begins with the soaring rhetoric of freedom that so many of us know, even if Joe Biden<sup>23</sup> called these words, with forgetful derision, "a thing" only a few years ago:

#### "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness." [emphasis supplied]

If in the 21<sup>st</sup> century you think that the word "men" should be replaced with "people", we don't necessarily disagree (though we'd decry editing source documents without clear, and permanent, annotation). Either way, we're certain that these magical words are inappropriately – perhaps viciously – characterized as "a thing". Read their promise again and again. Maybe it'd be better if Joe Biden had just admitted that he'd forgotten the words, but so far for a President of The United States in the 21<sup>st</sup> century, that's apparently not possible; we need to place principles before personalities.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>23</sup> <u>https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=JIVJCDwZUkM</u>.

The Declaration of Independence continues, in its next sentence: "That to secure these rights, Governments are instituted among [People], **deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed**" [emphasis supplied]

In 21<sup>st</sup> century America, then, where does the power of the United States federal government, and that of *every* state and local government come from? *Our* "consent". The reason, and the only reason that we can see, that the United States has been 'exceptional' is because its birth was the first, and most glorious, experiment of its kind in human history. The idea was that your freedom came from your birth, *and nowhere else*. "The issue today is the same as it has been throughout all history, whether man shall be allowed to govern himself or be ruled by a small elite."<sup>24</sup>

Do you feel free today, right now, ruled by a small 'elite'? Are you free to think for yourself? Are you free to speak your mind about whatever you want to speak your mind about? Are you free to change jobs because your boss is a tyrant? Or will you 'just' lose yours and your children's healthcare? Are you free to live with your integrity intact? Are you free to pursue your dreams? We guess that for the vast majority of us, the answer to each of these questions is a resounding: "**NO**; *hell, no*?"

All this answer means is that in the 21<sup>st</sup> century your government is not working for you and is not abiding, or attempting to abide, by the only things in the United States that give the government legitimacy – your consent for them to help you to protect your inalienable rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. They work for you; you can't forget that.

The next sentence of the second paragraph of *The Declaration of Independence* tells us *precisely* what to do in such a reality:

"That whenever any Form of Government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the Right of the People to *alter* or to *abolish* it, and to institute new Government, laying its foundation on such principles and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their Safety and Happiness. Prudence, indeed, will dictate that Governments long established should not be changed for light and transient causes; and accordingly all experience

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>24</sup> See footnote 3, above.

hath shewn, that mankind are more disposed to suffer, while evils are sufferable, than to right themselves by abolishing the forms to which they are accustomed." [emphasis supplied]

There's that word 'evil' again, and in 2024 you'll be forced to vote for the lesser of two evils again unless you do something about it. Unimaginable in 2020, in 2024 you're being forced to choose between the **exact** same two evils as you were in 2020: Trump v. Biden. Not only is it the merry-go-round of Democrat versus Republican (as it always has been), it's Biden versus Trump. Are you spitting 'neither!' as you contemplate that reality?

At law school, we are taught that unassailable principles of law are called "black letter law" – these are legal principles that are beyond jurisprudential debate. It is beyond jurisprudential debate (whether in the 18<sup>th</sup> or 21<sup>st</sup> centuries) that the single most American statement of black letter law is that when an American government becomes destructive of our lives, liberties, and pursuit of happiness, it is "the Right of the People to alter or abolish that government." We are legally obligated, as Americans, during any such alteration or abolition of government, to be guided by "prudence"– we will not alter or abolish the government for "light and transient causes"; we will only alter or abolish the governments are no longer sufferable.

The next sentence of the second paragraph of *The Declaration of Independence* states that it is not only our 'right' but our **duty**:

"But when a long train of abuses and usurpations, pursuing invariably the same Object evinces a design to reduce them under absolute Despotism, it is their right, it is their *duty*, to throw off such Government, and to provide new Guards for their future security." [emphasis supplied]

We will detail, in this pamphlet, a small number of the "long train of abuses and usurpations" that the Republican and Democrat(ic) Parties have slaughtered us with over the past fifty years. If you agree that we have been abused and usurped, as an American it is not just your right, but *your patriotic duty* to "throw off" (or, alter or abolish) that government.

We need "new Guards" for our future security.

We can only empower these Guards by becoming Guards ourselves, fully aware of who Our Domestic Enemy is, and standing together (unified as the 13 colonies were), <u>peacefully and non-violently</u>. "Such has been the patient sufferance of"<sup>25</sup> Decent Americans over the past 50 years that we are now constrained "to alter" our former systems of government.

*The Declaration of Independence* continues to specify 27 specific complaints against the tyrannical imperial colonialist King George III. Among other things, the founding generation complained that King George III:

"refused his Assent to Laws"; "has forbidden his Governors to pass Laws of immediate and pressing importance"; "has refused to pass other Laws for the accommodation of large districts of people"; "has called together legislative bodies at places unusual, uncomfortable, and distant [], for the sole purpose of fatiguing them into compliance with his measures"; "has obstructed the Administration of Justice"; "has made Judges dependent on his Will alone, for the tenure of their offices, and the amount and payment of their salaries"; "cut[] off our Trade with all parts of the world"; "impos[ed] Taxes on us without our Consent"; "has plundered our seas, ravaged our Coasts, burnt our towns, and destroyed the lives of our people"; "is at this time transporting large Armies of foreign Mercenaries to compleat the works of death, desolation and tyranny, already begun with circumstances of Cruelty & perfidy scarcely paralleled in the most barbarous ages, and totally unworthy the Head of a civilized nation" and "has excited domestic insurrections amongst us".

Do these sound familiar to you as a 21<sup>st</sup> century Decent American? You will see examples of how your government has done each of these enumerated grievances to *you* throughout this pamphlet. Just focus on one for the moment. Your government refuses to obey the law (think Abu Ghraib or Jeffrey Epstein or Robert Menendez (to name 3 of many)).

Government's job is no more and no less than to make laws and to enforce laws. Government has no business in any aspect of your life that

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>25</sup> Have you read the Declaration of Independence carefully yet? If not, here it is again: <u>https://www.archives.gov/founding-docs/declaration-transcript</u>.

should not be controlled by laws (likely 85-90% of your lived life). Instead, your government has ignored laws that are of immediate and pressing importance to you for decades. In September 2014, Martin Gilens (Professor of Politics at Yale and Princeton's School of Public and International Affairs) and Benjamin Page (Professor of Decision Making at Northwestern University) published a study titled "Testing Theories of American Politics: Elites, Interest Groups, and [Decent Americans]". Professors Gilens and Page were trying to figure out whether your vote mattered in the 21<sup>st</sup> century, and whether your interests matter to your government. To do this, they analyzed 1,779 policy proposals nationally surveyed between 1982 and 2002 which would not require a Constitutional Amendment or a court ruling to become law. Starkly, the study, which we're going to call the "Our Domestic Enemy, Definitively Proven, Report" concludes that "economic elites and organized groups representing business interests have substantial independent impacts on U.S. government policy, while [Decent Americans] and mass-based interest groups have little or no independent influence [emphasis supplied]."<sup>26</sup>

In terms of barbarity, Our Domestic Enemy terrorizes whoever it pleases whenever it pleases. If you haven't studied, and are not still studying the East Palestine, Ohio train wreck (February 3, **2023**)<sup>27</sup> or the disaster at Lahaina on Maui August 8, **2023**)<sup>28</sup>, you're, with all due respect, not paying enough attention. If you haven't studied, and are not still studying the Oxycontin Massacre (let's just call it what it is – far more than a 'crisis') which made one family (the Sacklers) enormously rich (*multi*-

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>26</sup> <u>https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/perspectives-on-politics/article/testing-theories-of-american-politics-elites-interest-groups-and-average-citizens/62327F513959D0A304D4893B382B992B</u>.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>27</sup> <u>https://www.nytimes.com/2024/02/16/us/politics/biden-east-palestine-visit.html</u>.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>28</sup> <u>https://www.tennessean.com/story/news/nation/2024/02/06/maui-police-report-lahaina-wildfire-response/72487059007/.</u>

<sup>21</sup>st Century Common Sense 3.0 – edited March 26, 2024.

Billionaires) by killing hundreds of thousands of us<sup>29</sup>), you're, with all due respect, not paying enough attention. If you don't know that 50,000 of us die every year for the crime of not being able to afford healthcare<sup>30</sup> and another 500,000 more of us declare bankruptcy every year for the same crime<sup>31</sup>, you are, forgive us, still not paying sufficient attention. If you don't know how many of us (unarmed poor white *and* poor black and brown) the police forces across the United States kill every year, you are not paying sufficient attention.

It is *not our fault* that we are not well informed, it is Our Domestic Enemy's fault, but it is your fault if you don't start informing yourself online – *for free* – now; you have a tool that allows you to think bigger and faster than any generation in human history: the internet. Use it. In 1776, Thomas Paine's *Common Sense* informed our founding generation of the cause of the tyranny screwing their lives, and in 2024, we'll expose and see Our Domestic Enemy as the cause of the tyranny screwing our lives.

#### BEING HUMAN IN THE 21<sup>ST</sup> CENTURY (According to Science and Faith)

We believe that because America's cause of freedom is to secure, promote and protect every one of our lives, liberties, and happiness, we need to explore what it means to be human in the 21<sup>st</sup> century. Wouldn't you agree that being human, at its best, means being secure in your life and liberty and being able to pursue as much of yours and your family's

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>29</sup> Watch Michael Keaton in a starring role in the 2021 TV series *Dopesick* based on the 2018 book *Dopesick: Dealers, Doctors, and the Drug Company that Addicted America* by Beth Macy. Why on earth don't we continually hear from Michael Keaton and Beth Macy? Perhaps they both just believe the problem was magically solved when Trump or Biden were elected? <u>https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Dopesick (miniseries)</u>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>30</sup> <u>https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2020/jan/07/americans-healthcare-medical-costs</u>.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>31</sup> <u>https://www.snopes.com/fact-check/643000-bankruptcies-in-the-u-s-every-year-due-to-medical-bills/</u>.

happiness as possible? An American government that doesn't aggressively tackle so-called "diseases of despair"<sup>32</sup> (rampant drug (*especially* alcohol and nicotine) addiction and suicide) has **zero** American legitimacy, especially when we know of highly effective free solutions. How can you pursue happiness during a pandemic of despair?

#### The Delphic Oracle: Know Thyself.

To fully pursue happiness, we must first learn who we are, as individuals. As a collective group, we Americans already know who we are: we are brave and free, living in the land of the free and the home of the brave. Or, more accurately, we're living in the land that we were born to realize.

You may not have heard of the Oracle at Delphi (the "Oracle"). Delphi was a town in Greece on the south-western slope of Mount Parnassus. The Oracle was a 'religious' site where, beginning about 3,500 years ago, and for over one thousand years, the most powerful citizens of the Greek (and Roman) Empires went when they needed to consult the gods. When these powerful citizens had trouble making decisions about war or peace or marriage or heredity, when they could not make up their own minds, could not sort through the information themselves, they went to consult the Oracle.

The central inscription, immediately above their heads as they entered the Oracle, had a simple directive, which translates from the Ancient Greek as: "**Know Thyself**". When the most powerful people, those with the most opportunity at the time to self-actualize (fully pursue their happiness), were confused about a course of action, their first guide was to know themselves. As human beings, then, we have known for thousands of years that the most important thing to know in order to make a good decision for yourself is to know who you are. A person's got to know their emotional, physical, and intellectual limitations.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>32</sup> <u>https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Disease\_of\_despair;</u> <u>https://www.statista.com/topics/5961/diseases-of-despair-in-the-us/</u>.

Yet we're not taught this. We should be. From kindergarten through post-graduate study; from the playground to wherever the playground took you.

It's not like this hasn't regularly popped up in Western intellectual history and popular culture. Many of our most exalted philosophers, artists, thinkers, and writers have made the same statement differently over the past 500 years of Western history.

Here are a few limited examples of words from those exalted Western minds: (i) Adam Smith (who many today call the father of capitalism as a result of his 1776 book The Wealth of Nations) in his book The Theory of Moral Sentiments (published in 1759) wrote: "The first thing you have to know is yourself. A man who knows himself can step outside himself and watch his own reactions like an observer."33; (ii) Socrates said "To know thyself is the beginning of wisdom" and "My friend...care for your psyche...know thyself, for once we know ourselves, we may learn how to care for ourselves"; (iii) Pythagoras said "Man know thyself; then thou shalt know the Universe and God"; (iv) Benjamin Franklin said "There are three things extremely hard: steel, a diamond, and to know one's self'; (v) Oscar Wilde said "Know thyself was written over the portal of the antique world. Over the portal of the new world, 'Be thyself' shall be written''; (vi) Henry David Thoreau said "Not until we are lost do we begin to understand ourselves"; (vii) Aldous Huxley said "There is only one corner of the universe you can be certain of improving, and that's your own self"; (viii) Friedrich Nietzsche said "One's own self is well hidden from one's own self; of all mines of treasure, one's own is the last to be dug up"; (ix) when Neo goes to meet the Oracle in the 1999 movie The Matrix, above his head in her kitchen is the phrase "Temet Nosce" which translates to "Know Thyself" from Latin<sup>34</sup>; and (x) when Decent American Carol Shelby (played by Matt Damon in the 2019 movie Ford v Ferrari who, together with Ken miles (played by Christian Bale) designed the Ford GT and thereby

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>33</sup> If you read *The Theory of Moral Sentiments*, you'll understand that the economic system Smith was trying to construct in *The Wealth of Nations* was never formed.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>34</sup> <u>https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=EUN1ClT9i9w.</u>

successfully destroyed Ferrari's dominance at Le Mans in 1966) describes a racing car driver's brilliance and the balance between man and machine, he says: "There's a point, at 7,000RPM where everything fades. The machine becomes weightless. Just disappears. And all that's left is a body moving through space and time. 7000RPM, that's where you meet it. You feel it coming; it creeps up on you close in your ear. Can I ask you a question, the only question that matters? Who are you?"<sup>35</sup>

Who are you?

#### Maslow's Pyramid (Our Basic Needs).

In 1943, Decent American Professor Abraham Maslow, professor of psychology at numerous leading American universities, and the 10<sup>th</sup> most cited psychologist of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, published a pyramid of human needs which is widely known as Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs, but because hierarchies are less obviously useful to humanity than we thought in the 20<sup>th</sup> century and prior (even considering Professor Jordan Peterson's insistence on the dominance of our lobster genes), we'll call it what it is: a Pyramid.<sup>36</sup>

The Pyramid's base is our need to keep our body alive and functioning – clean air, clean water, nutritious food, and basically comfortable shelter (our "Basic Needs"). Next, up the Pyramid, is safety – so as our bodily autonomy cannot be suddenly violated, revealing the concept that we *own* our own bodies. It is an almost inescapable conclusion (without engaging in severe sophistry violative of basic common sense) that your most valuable possession is your own body.<sup>37</sup> Think about it – what would your house or your car or your diamond ring be to you without your body? You own your body; absorb that. Think of it as a prized possession. If you don't take care of the magnificently wrought machine that is your

<sup>37</sup> And, as will become abundantly clear, your most valuable commodity is your time.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>35</sup> <u>https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=TKW6pndJ2Dw</u>.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>36</sup> <u>https://timvandevall.com/wp-content/uploads/2013/11/Maslows-Hierarchy-of-Needs.jpg</u>.

body and which you are lucky to have, that's a question for you. The antithesis of owning your own body is being a slave, as so memorably and disgustingly articulated by Willie Lynch (a Brit whose last name gave us the verb 'to lynch') in his 1712 speech to the colony of Virginia that became known as his Letter on The Making of a Slave.<sup>38</sup> Among other atrocities Lynch advocated for "controlling your black slaves" "for at least 300 years", Lynch promoted using "fear, distrust and envy for control purposes" and "the same basic principle that we use in breaking a horse" to "**KEEP THE BODY, AND TAKE THE MIND!**" As an American in the 21<sup>st</sup> century, you undeniably own your own body and you can only keep your mind if you know who you are. Does it feel to you, as a 21<sup>st</sup> century Decent American, that Our Domestic Enemy has taken Mr. Lynch to government.

If you think mentioning slavery in 21<sup>st</sup> century America is too farfetched, just consider the United States Supreme Court's decision in its June 2021 decision *Nestlé USA, Inc. v. Doe.*<sup>39</sup> Nestlé, Cargill, Inc.<sup>40</sup> and other global American corporations were sued by six Malian citizens because "they were *trafficked* into Ivory Coast as *child slaves* to produce cocoa. [emphases supplied]" With words disguised as law, the United States Supreme Court's standard operating procedure (words divorced from American principles, that is), the Court threw the six slaves' claims out of court without *any* investigation. The Supreme Court was not interested at all in whether American corporations were trafficking in child slave labor.<sup>41</sup>

Decent Americans with any knowledge of recent Supreme Court jurisprudence or history would expect this to have been one of the Court's (in)famous 5-4 decisions. It wasn't. **It was 8-1**. Eight Supreme Court

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>38</sup> <u>http://www.gatheringofchrist.org/wp-</u> content/uploads/2013/10/WillieLynchLetter.pdf; <u>https://archive.org/details/willielynchlette0000lync.</u>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>39</sup> <u>https://www.supremecourt.gov/opinions/20pdf/19-416\_i4dj.pdf</u>.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>40</sup> <u>https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Cargill</u>.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>41</sup> This lack of interest might begin to explain why sex trafficking continues to be such a persistent problem in 21<sup>st</sup> century America?

'Justices' determined that slavery used by global American corporations should not only not be investigated but should be totally unaccountable – because if a global American corporation cannot be held accountable in the United States, it cannot be held to account anywhere. In the first quarter of the 21<sup>st</sup> century, the United States Supreme Court ratified slavery. Lest you cry "*But they were foreigners!*", tell that to the American slaves (unless you think there should be no distinction between a slave and a prisoner (and we bet there should be)) in prison across the United States.<sup>42</sup>

One day (soon, hopefully), *Nestlé USA, Inc. v. Doe* will have the same national shame and ignominy as *Dred Scott* <sup>43</sup> or *Korematsu*.<sup>44</sup> (together with many abominations delivered to us by the Supreme Court over the past fifty years).

On the Pyramid's next level, Maslow tells us that as human beings we all need to love, and be loved by, other human beings. This has now been scientifically proven in the largest longitudinal study of humans ever done (see pp.27-28, below). We need familial love, romantic love, friendship love; we need all of it because we're co-operative and social beings.

Next up the Pyramid (as your government has also known since at least 1943), we human beings need self-confidence, and finally – at the Pyramid's apex – we need to do what Maslow characterized as "self-actualize" (which means, in some important sense (as Professor Peterson often likes to say), to be as individually imaginative as possible, constrained only by your conscience and your happiness).

A government, therefore, mandated to protect our lives and liberties (as ours unquestionably is) *must first* vigorously protect our rights to clean air, clean water, nutritious food, comfortable shelter, the cheapest possible energy to heat and cool the shelter, and a world class education. How have the Republicans and the Democrats done with any 1 of these Basic Needs over the past 50 years? A great education (no matter whether it's honed in

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>42</sup> <u>https://www.npr.org/2023/11/13/1210564359/slavery-prison-forced-labor-movement.</u>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>43</sup> <u>https://www.law.cornell.edu/supremecourt/text/60/393</u>.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>44</sup> <u>https://www.law.cornell.edu/supremecourt/text/323/214</u>.

the classroom, at home, on the streets, or while having fun) is a basic right because without one, you'll never be able to effectively climb the next steps of the Pyramid, much less reach its apex where you really learn what it means to be you. If a government denies easy access to any one of these, it should be abolished – just like the Founding Generation decided to abolish British imperialism and colonialism in 1776.

Let's just scratch the surface of how our government is dealing with two of these Basic Needs: clean water and shelter (the same facts could be told about all the remaining Basic Needs, but space constrains). Can we all agree, first, that clean water should be essentially free in the 21<sup>st</sup> century? Instead, Americans are forced to buy nearly 50 billion bottles of water every year (you can think of tax however you please, but *that* sounds like a heavy tax on your life). The global bottled water market is \$283.01 billion.<sup>45</sup> Between 2010 and 2021 we nearly *doubled* the amount of bottled water we buy. The largest bottled water companies are: Nestlé (with brands like San Pellegrino and Perrier and, until recently, Poland Spring (which Nestlé sold to 2 "private equity firms" in 2021 for \$4.3 billion<sup>46</sup>)); Coca-Cola (with brands like Dasani and SmartWater); and PepsiCo (with brands like Aquafina).

Common sense dictates that if Decent Americans felt safe drinking the water that came out of the taps in our homes, or the taps in restaurants and bathrooms, or the water fountains across America, Nestlé, the Coca-Cola company, and PepsiCo would collectively lose tens of billions of dollars in annual revenue – and our own pocketbooks would be much better off. The environment would also be much better off as we wouldn't need so many plastic bottles (for those of you concerned about fossil fuels, improving every American's access to clean water would also shrink fossil fuels' impact since fossil fuels make plastic bottles).<sup>47</sup>

<sup>47</sup> <u>https://www.cnn.com/2023/03/16/world/plastic-water-bottles-un-report-climate/index.html.</u>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>45</sup> <u>https://www.zippia.com/advice/largest-bottled-water-companies/</u>.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>46</sup> <u>https://nypost.com/2021/02/17/nestle-sells-poland-spring-other-water-brands-for-4-3b/</u>.

Plainly Nestlé, Coca-Cola, and PepsiCo are incentivized by undrinkable water, so how do these corporations (not people) ensure undrinkable water? They buy stock or have ownership interests in companies that pollute the water, of course. Is there a single multinational or national corporation that doesn't contribute to water pollution somewhere? You might begin your exploration of this question with three movies: 1998's A Civil Action (based on the 1995 book of the same name; starring John Travolta); 2000's Erin Brockovich (played by Julia Roberts) and 2019s Dark Waters (starring Mark Ruffalo). Each involves massive corporations using a legal system to evade accountability for poisoning water. After the 2023 East Palestine, Ohio disaster, the real Erin Brockovich<sup>48</sup> went to East Palestine to talk to residents and promote recovery and the importance of clean water. Ohio law enforcement through a weird, sinister, and seemingly tyrannical government organization called a "Fusion Center"<sup>49</sup> – labeled Ms. Brockovich a terrorist.<sup>50</sup>

If reporters are arrested and jailed and activists are arrested and called terrorists for speaking out, it's no wonder that you likely may not know that: (i) on March 3, 2023 in Springfield, Ohio (a city of nearly 60,000 people about 235 miles from East Palestine), a 212 car *NFR* freight train derailed with 30 cars carrying toxic chemicals (including about 100,000 gallons of benzene, sulfuric, and hydrochloric acids)<sup>51</sup>; or (ii) on March 9,

<sup>48</sup> <u>https://www.brockovich.com</u>.

<sup>49</sup> The Department of Homeland Security tells us: "Fusion Centers are stateowned and operated centers that serve as focal points in states and major urban areas for the receipt, analysis, gathering and sharing of threat-related information between State, Local, Tribal and Territorial (SLTT), federal and **private sector partners**." <u>https://www.dhs.gov/fusion-centers</u>.

<sup>50</sup> <u>https://www.msn.com/en-us/news/us/ohio-law-enforcement-links-erin-brockovich-to-potential-for-special-interest-terrorism-threat-in-east-palestine/ar-AA189W9o</u>.

<sup>51</sup> <u>https://news.yahoo.com/springfield-train-derailment-look-hazardous-</u> 220615964.html. 2023, a 212 car NFR freight train derailed in Alabama<sup>52</sup>; or (iii) Louis Shuster, an NFR train conductor was killed when an NFR train struck a dump truck in Cleveland, Ohio.<sup>53</sup> We can't say much, but we can say that none of these (or hundreds of other) chemical accidents can be good for clean water. And we haven't even yet mentioned President Obama's infamous handling of the Flint, Michigan water disaster.

Surely, we all agree that our governments (state, federal, and local) have miserably failed this basic test? And it's *not* that these – our – governments are unable to provide us with nutritious food, clean water, and decent shelter; it's that they don't get paid by their donors to do so. Government is just unwilling because it's filled with spineless, and therefore utterly corrupt and contemptible human beings.

In the 21<sup>st</sup> century, it's not too much for every American to demand, and receive by the early years of the century's second quarter, clean potable water essentially for free.

How does our government perform with providing shelter to its people? What might it take to solve that problem? Do we have any proof of homelessness being solvable (hint: Finland)? We assume that if you live in, say, New York City, your conscience is assaulted every day by a beggar with a child or a homeless person making the subway car unrideable because the disheveled human being taking a nap reeks.<sup>54</sup> Every part of us cries out in empathy for help (even if it's partly out of self-interest), and

<sup>53</sup> <u>https://fox8.com/news/union-fundraising-for-nfs-train-conductor-killed-in-crash/</u>.

<sup>54</sup> New York City, by way of limited example, has roughly <u>50,000</u> homeless people (<u>https://www.coalitionforthehomeless.org/wp-</u> <u>content/uploads/2021/09/NYCHomelessness-Fact-Sheet-7-2021.pdf</u>) and **88,830** vacant rent-stabilized apartments (not to mention the tens of thousands of non-rentstabilized apartments) <u>https://www.thecity.nyc/2022/10/20/vacant-rent-stabilized-</u> <u>apartments-nyc/</u>. Even if some small fraction of the homeless want to be homeless, there are enough *rent-stabilized* apartments for *every* homeless person in New York City to be able to get themselves back on their feet.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>52</sup> <u>https://www.nbcnews.com/news/us-news/norfolk-southern-train-derails-alabama-hours-ceo-testifies-congress-rcna74183</u>.

we're just told that it's the exclusive fault of those poor bastards. Because we fear confronting those actually at fault, we fall for this manipulation (that's a big part of how and why propaganda works). Meanwhile, those actually at fault own tens (maybe hundreds) of thousands of vacant apartments in New York City. This antagonizes any sense, much less common sense.

#### A Special Note About Our Need For Nutritious Food.

Not just food; nutritious food. What is nutritious food? Natural, and as chemical-free as feasible.

In Michael Pollan's 2006 book *The Omnivore's Dilemma*, he begins by summing up his meticulously researched findings in one of the most succinct paragraphs ever written in the English language:

"Eat food. Not too much. Mostly plants." By "food" he means naturally sourced nutrition. By "too much" he means don't be greedy – your body needs what it needs, and no more. By "Mostly" he means that you should eat more plants (potatoes, lettuce, tomatoes, broccoli, and spinach to name a few) than animals or fish (even if that equation was 60/40 or 51/49, Mr. Pollan's conclusion "Mostly" would remain accurate). He's making a nutritious calculation, not a political one.

Unsurprisingly, that diet describes the diet of every human being across the planet in the approximately (who's counting a missing hundred thousand years, when we each only have about 100 actually on the planet?) 300,000 years since we became *homo sapiens* with the magnificent architecture and machinery of our modern bodies and the incalculable complexity of every single one of our brains. Our development, which began *long* before 300,000 years ago<sup>55</sup>, was enabled by clean air, clean water, and nutritious food. It is only *very* recently (the last 100 years or so) that we have begun a diet of *non-nutritious* food. The only reasons for that is the greed of Our Domestic Enemy, and our uninformed obedient willingness to permit their greed.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>55</sup> Maybe as long as 2.8 million years ago <u>https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Human</u>.

Monopoly is greed's hallmark; that's why your governments (federal, state, municipal, and local) do nothing to stop monopolies. It's no accident that you're only ever given a monopolistic 'choice' between a Democrat and a Republican – known as the duopoly (synonymous for monopoly).<sup>56</sup> It's no different with the food that you eat. What do we mean?

Four multinational giants (Cargill, Tyson Foods (a chicken producer that is also the biggest U.S. meat company by sales); JBS SA (*Brazil*-based), and National Beef Packing Co (controlled by *Brazilian* beef producer Marfrig Global Foods SA))<sup>57</sup> control **85%** of the beef we Decent Americans consume. That means four 'human beings' (at Cargill, an American man named Brian Sikes<sup>58</sup>; at Tyson Foods, an American man named John H. Tyson (a billionaire<sup>59</sup>); at JBS SA, a man named Gilberto Tomazoni<sup>60</sup>; and at National Beef Packing Co. a man named Tim Klein<sup>61</sup> who answers to Marfrig's non-American man named Marcos Antonio Molina dos Santos (a billionaire<sup>62</sup>).

These few individuals decide how much beef Americans will be able to eat and how much that beef (and chicken) will cost. These 'people' are monopolists whose greed is enhanced by lowering the nutritional value of

<sup>58</sup> Who doesn't have a Wikipedia page and whose net worth and annual salary are not easy to discern.

<sup>59</sup> <u>https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/John\_H.\_Tyson</u>.

<sup>60</sup> Probably not American, and almost certainly indecent, who doesn't have a Wikipedia page.

<sup>61</sup> Who doesn't have a Wikipedia page and whose net worth and annual salary are not easy to discern.

<sup>62</sup> <u>https://www.forbes.com/profile/marcos-antonio-molina-dos-</u> <u>santos/?sh=42c3292219c0</u> (who doesn't have a Wikipedia page).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>56</sup> Are billionaires anything more than money monopolists?

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>57</sup> <u>https://www.reuters.com/business/how-four-big-companies-control-us-beef-industry-2021-06-17/</u>.

the meat you eat. They have become monopolists in America by, among other things, prohibiting you from learning the truth. Food libel laws – laws that are anathema to American core values; freedom of speech being second to none in the meaning of *The Declaration of Independence's* command that laws in America can only be legitimate if they're written and enforced to "secure our lives" – which make it harder for people (usually journalists) to tell the truth, are currently enforceable in 13 States.

In 1989 formerly reputable 60 Minutes aired a piece about apple growers delivering the carcinogen daminozide to us.<sup>63</sup> The apple growers combined and sued under trade libel laws (food libel laws' parents). The apple growers lost. So, the food industry billionaires dispatched their veryhigh-paid lobbyists (maybe the best lobbyist portrayal was Aaron Eckhart's in the 2005 movie Thank You for Smoking, or was it Jessica Chastain's in the 2016 movie Miss Sloane?) to write food libel laws for State governments. Since the 60 Minutes piece aired, "thirteen U.S. states [] make it easier for food producers to sue their critics for libel. These thirteen states are the following: Alabama, Arizona, Colorado, Florida, Georgia, Idaho, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, South Dakota, and Texas." These laws should be immediately repealed as unAmerican. Presumably pleased with their success in getting food libel laws enacted, lobbyists across the United States (from Oklahoma to Florida to Michigan to Massachusetts) besieged cities and towns and got these towns and cities to enact laws prohibiting (sometimes with a threat to liberty through jailtime) Decent Americans from growing their own food.<sup>64</sup> Legally, in the 21<sup>st</sup> century, how can any American government legitimately prohibit you from growing your own food?

64

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>63</sup> <u>https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Food\_libel\_laws.</u>

https://www.earthisland.org/journal/index.php/articles/entry/local\_laws\_ban\_ front\_yard\_food\_gardens/.

These laws, and the monopolies that promote them, put concrete architecture to Henry Kissinger's famous quote "who controls the food supply controls the people."<sup>65</sup>

You might think that it is not possible to feed all 330,000,000 of us nutritiously, but we'd bet that with some quick consideration you'd re-think that conclusion (particularly if you take Mr. Pollan seriously). What if 80% of Decent Americans – no matter whether urban or rural – were daily able to afford to buy 80% of our food from farmers' markets? What if you could buy all spices in bulk (like you can at Guido's in Great Barrington, Massachusetts) which is *much* cheaper than having to buy a new bottle of pepper or cinnamon<sup>66</sup> every time you run out)? What if your governments subsidized and promoted small farmers and *prohibited* monopolists like Bill Gates (a non-farmer and high school dropout) from owning 270,000 acres of farmland?<sup>67</sup> Or, what if your government prohibited China from owning 384,000 acres of American farmland?<sup>68</sup>

If your imagination is not yet capable of seeing an America fed by nutritious food, consider, for example, what a group of motivated Americans called the Rajneeshi did in Wasco County, Oregon in the early 1980s as is depicted in the 6 episode 2018 documentary *Wild Wild Country*. The first half of episode 2 of *Wild Wild Country* documents how these people transformed a large barren portion of an 80,000 acre ranch. It had "never" previously been used, or been seen as usable, as arable land. These

<sup>66</sup> <u>https://www.masterclass.com/articles/a-list-of-the-27-essential-cooking-</u> <u>spices-you-need-to-know</u>.

<sup>67</sup> <u>https://apnews.com/article/fact-check-bill-gates-blackrock-788010130032</u>.

<sup>68</sup> <u>https://www.forbes.com/sites/emilywashburn/2023/03/01/how-much-us-farmland-does-china-really-own-more-than-bill-gates-and-less-than-17-other-countries/?sh=3d69299d421f.</u>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>65</sup> <u>https://www.azquotes.com/author/8103-Henry A Kissinger</u> even though Reuters (again! see footnote 14 above) recently – in February, 2023 – began to question the quote's accuracy based, surely without bias, exclusively on the documents located on Kissinger's own website, and on Kissinger's Press Officer Jessee LePorin's say-so <u>https://www.reuters.com/article/idUSL1N34J1RD/</u>.
Americans (less than 50 years ago) transformed the seemingly barren land into a farm capable of feeding 10,000 people, using "cutting edge environmentally conscious land reclamation, low water use, intelligent farming" and "literally turned the desert green." This kind of constructive and creative endeavor is possible all across America without anyone having to join a cult (if that's what the Rajneeshi were). There are thousands of Decent Americans currently running farms on regenerative principles. Maybe, just maybe, we could have an impact on our health, not to mention the health of the planet, by investing in our small and smaller farmers and educating us all about intelligent<sup>69</sup> farming for the 21<sup>st</sup> century?

Common sense dictates that any American government that fails to provide the Basic Needs, or just fails to promote the *possibility* of providing the Basic Needs to its citizens must be illegitimate, giving rise to our duty to alter or abolish those American governments that don't.

# The Next Step on Maslow's Pyramid Has Recently Been Scientifically Proven.

After our Basic Needs have been secured (centuries before Maslow, Americans described our Basic Needs as "unalienable Rights [including] Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness"), in order to approach 'selfactualization', we need to love and be loved; to have a sense of belonging.

We can be certain that pursuing greed and fame to the exclusion of all else in life that it means to be human cannot, in any reasoned, practical, logical or meaningful sense way be consistent with pursuing happiness. When you think more than superficially (i.e. beyond their photograph) of a greedy and/or famous person, do you believe they're happy? Of course you don't; rather, you think you'd like to have what they have because Our Domestic Enemy has corruptly and savagely convinced so many of us that greed and fame are the highest aims of human life. So-called "F--- you money" has become our societal aim, rather than 'f--- you conscience', 'f--you heart', 'f--- you soul', 'f--- you drive', and 'f--- you intelligence'. With a little thought, you and your family and your friends will, we *bet*, come to see

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>69</sup> By our definition, intelligent means humane.

that as clearly as you believe that the sun will rise tomorrow. Fame ("vainglory, or pride") and greed, after all, lead the seven deadly sins.<sup>70</sup> Decent Americans will recall that the seven deadly sins are defeated by the seven heavenly virtues – led by humility and charity and followed by, among others, gratitude, patience, and diligence.<sup>71</sup> American governments could do with a lot more of those virtues.

If rejecting the cults of greed and fame as a way of life is not already obviously necessary to you, consider the largest longitudinal study of what leads to human happiness in human history: The Harvard Study of Adult Development (the "Study"<sup>72</sup>), begun with 724 participants in 1938, and still going with over 1,300 relatives of the initial group. Writing in 2023, Robert Waldinger and Marc Schulz (the Study's Director and Associate Director) concluded:

"It's the longest in-depth longitudinal study on human life *ever* done, and it's brought us to a simple and profound conclusion: **Good** relationships lead to health and happiness. The trick is that those relationships must be nurtured. [emphases supplied]"<sup>73</sup>

Our Domestic Enemy knows about the Study, and they literally do nothing to promote it – which is profoundly *un*American. Instead of 24/7 coverage of genocide, war, tragedy and utter nonsense (mostly 'palace intrigue) in the news, why don't our newspapers, television sets, computers, phones, and favorite websites constantly promote the Study's findings and encourage us all to resolve disputes with our family members and friends? The Study's been going on since 1938, and we're willing to bet that few of you have ever even heard of it. Why? Because Our Domestic Enemy does not want you to know about it; if you knew about it, you'd – self-evidently – be less easy to divide. If you elevate close relationships above the next

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>70</sup> <u>https://www.britannica.com/topic/seven-deadly-sins</u>.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>71</sup> <u>https://www.britannica.com/topic/seven-heavenly-virtues</u>.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>72</sup> <u>https://www.adultdevelopmentstudy.org</u>.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>73</sup> <u>https://www.theatlantic.com/ideas/archive/2023/01/harvard-happiness-</u> study-relationships/672753/.

shiny object, or piece of trash entertainment (no matter how rich or poor you are), Our Domestic Enemy loses its power, in part because consumerism<sup>74</sup> – including, amongst other things, the deadly and antihuman, anti-planet, greed-driven planned obsolescence<sup>75</sup> – will die.

We need to do the hard work of building lasting relationships and then creating psychological and emotional tools that last – not an iPhone or computer that needs to be replaced every year or two. *That's theft and rape* (of us and the planet).

Our Obedience To Authority Is, Literally, Simultaneously Homicidal And Suicidal.

The 2015 movie *Experimenter: The Stanley Milgram Story* (starring Winona Ryder and Peter Sarsgaard) tells the true story of Decent American psychologist Milgram's early 1960s Behavioral Study of Obedience and is based on Stanley Milgram's 1974 book *Obedience to Authority*.

Milgram was a professor of psychology at Yale and according to a 2022 study, the "46th-most-cited psychologist of the 20th century."<sup>76</sup>

In his obedience experiment, Milgram sought to disprove that Adolf Eichmann (a high-ranking Nazi, and one of the major organizers of the Holocaust who was captured in Argentina on May 11, 1960) was possibly telling the truth at his (*televised*) trial in Jerusalem in 1961. Eichmann repeatedly testified that while perpetrating and overseeing slavery, torture and genocide during the Holocaust he was just being obedient. Eichmann testified that he was merely doing "his 'duty'...; he not only obeyed 'orders',

<sup>74</sup> Remember when George W. Bush told us to go shopping after 9-11? Here's Our Domestic Enemy's defense of Bush a decade or so later: <u>https://foreignpolicy.com/2013/04/17/now-i-remember-why-president-bush-urged-people-to-go-about-their-daily-lives/</u>.

<sup>75</sup> <u>https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Planned\_obsolescence</u>.

<sup>76</sup> <u>https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Stanley\_Milgram.</u>

he also obeyed the 'law"<sup>77</sup> Hannah Arendt, one of the most influential political theorists of the 20<sup>th</sup> century came, with vehement reluctance, to famously characterize Eichmann's barbarous obedience as the "banality of evil".<sup>78</sup>

Milgram's ingenious experiment was simple. He wanted to know how much authority was necessary to get us (Decent Americans) to obediently deliver a potentially lethal electric shock to another Decent American. Not much it turned out.

"Before conducting the experiment, Milgram polled fourteen Yale University senior-year psychology majors to predict the behavior of 100 hypothetical teachers. All of the poll respondents believed that only a very small fraction of teachers (the range was from zero to 3 out of 100, with an average of 1.2) would be prepared to inflict the maximum voltage. Milgram also informally polled his colleagues and found that they, too, believed very few subjects would progress beyond a very strong shock. He also reached out to honorary Harvard University graduate Chaim Homnick, who noted that this experiment would not be concrete evidence of the Nazis' innocence, due to the fact that 'poor people are more likely to cooperate'. Milgram also polled forty psychiatrists from a medical school, and they believed that by the tenth shock, when the victim demanded to be free, most subjects would stop the experiment. They predicted that by the 300volt shock, when the victim would refuse to respond, only 3.73 percent of the subjects would still continue, and they believed that 'only a little over one-tenth of one percent of the subjects would administer the highest shock on the board.'

Milgram suspected before the experiment that the obedience exhibited by Nazis reflected a distinctly German character, and planned to use the American participants as a control group before using German participants, expecting them to behave closer to the Nazis. However, the

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>77</sup> Citing Hannah Arendt's (a Holocaust survivor and one of the most significant political philosophers of the 20th century) book at p.135 https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Eichmann in Jerusalem.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>78</sup> <u>https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Eichmann\_in\_Jerusalem.</u>

unexpected results stopped him from conducting the same experiment on German participants. [emphasis supplied]"<sup>79</sup>

## The results are *terrifying*:

Milgram's "experiment found, unexpectedly, that a very high proportion of subjects would fully obey the instructions, with *every* participant going up to 300 volts, and **65%** going up to the full 450 volts. [emphases supplied]"

We did not want to, but we blindly and thoughtlessly trusted and assumed that the authority figure (a person we'd never met wearing a white lab coat at Yale) was behaving as we would expect ourselves to - i.e. by prioritizing another human being's safety. Thus, **65%** of us Decent Americans "displayed varying degrees of tension and stress before delivering potentially lethal shocks to another American. These signs included sweating, trembling, stuttering, biting their lips, groaning, and digging their fingernails into their skin, and some were even having nervous laughing fits or seizures."

In short, obedience to authority makes us do monstrous things – just like it did the Germans under the Nazis. We are obedient because we are social, but to be truly social we need to be disobedient to authority (how do you think children learn to move in the world?). Our consciences are socially constructed, so be fiercely obedient to your conscience and skeptically disobedient to authority. We don't think 10 year olds will be reading this pamphlet any time soon, and if there are such prodigies: listen to your parents!

How many of you recall, or ever knew in any detail, the My Lai massacre by the United States military during the Vietnam War on March 16, 1968<sup>80</sup>, or the atrocities of Abu Ghraib by the United States military during the Iraq War in 2003<sup>81</sup>? How many of you have seen the true story of innocent Mohamedou Slahi's imprisonment and torture in Guantanamo

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>79</sup> <u>https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Milgram\_experiment.</u>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>80</sup> <u>https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/My\_Lai\_massacre.</u>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>81</sup> <u>https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Abu\_Ghraib\_torture\_and\_prisoner\_abuse.</u>

Bay, for more than a decade, depicted in the 2021 movie *The Mauritanian* (starring Jodie Foster, Shailene Woodley, and Benedict Cumberbatch)? Each of these atrocities happened *after* WWI, *after* Nazism was defeated, *after* the Holocaust, and *after* Milgram's obedience experiments. Milgram's experiment was censored (the New York Times buried Milgram's results on page A11, and we're not aware of any other even nearly national publication that covered it). We can only find out what our loved ones will tolerate by being disobedient. And now we've been asked, by authority, to ignore a genocide in Ukraine and a genocide in Palestine.

We Decent Americans (particularly the poor and middle class amongst us) need much more disobedience to authority. We also need much more tolerance; enabled and driven by knowledge (the acquisition of which results in rapid fear diminution).

In this regard, consider the oratory of James Farmer Jr.<sup>82</sup> that closes, and secures victory in, the final debate in Denzel Washington's masterful 2007 directorial debut *The Great Debaters*. It tells the truish<sup>83</sup> story of Wiley College's<sup>84</sup> 1935<sup>85</sup> debate team victory over the then reigning (white, of course) U.S. national debate champions: U.S.C.'s Southern California Trojans<sup>86</sup> (depicted as Harvard in the movie). The subject of the movie's final debate, held within months of James Farmer, Jr. and his teammates having witnessed a lynching was: "**Resolved:** Civil **Disobedience is a** 

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>82</sup> <u>https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/James\_Farmer</u>.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>83</sup> <u>https://www.humanitiestexas.org/news/articles/wiley-colleges-great-debaters.</u>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>84</sup> <u>https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wiley\_University.</u>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>85</sup> Is it any surprise to you this happened at a point when Decent Americans found ourselves at one of our most vulnerable moments in our history (<u>https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Great\_Depression</u>)? Prior to the Great Depression, we Decent Americans had only faced greater vulnerability twice: in the Revolutionary War and the Civil War.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>86</sup> It seems Our Domestic Enemy has used time to successfully marginalize debate, but the U.S.C.'s Southern California Trojans still exist: <u>http://www.usctrojandebate.com</u>.

Moral Weapon in the Fight for Justice". These are Mr. Farmer's closing words:

"And who are we to just lie there and do nothing? No matter what he did, the law was the criminal. But the law did nothing, just left us wondering why? My opponent says nothing that erodes the rule of law can be moral. But there is no rule of law in the Jim Crow South, not when negroes are denied housing, turned away from schools, hospitals, and not when we are lynched. St. Augustine said 'An unjust law is no law at all,' which means I have a right, even a duty, to resist, with violence, or civil disobedience. *You should pray I choose the latter.*"<sup>87</sup>

Note the rhyme to our founding legal document's – *The Declaration of Independence*'s – admonition to us to alter or abolish a tyrannical government. This ought to cause every Decent American to think – *critically* think – about why we tolerate our government using our money to wage war across the planet in our name even though we don't want the wars. It ought to make us think about why we tolerate these psychopathic 'leaders'.

We ought to remember the quote usually attributed to Joseph Goebbels (Hitler's Minister of Public Enlightenment and Propaganda from 1933-1945):

"If you tell a lie big enough and keep repeating it, people will eventually come to believe it. The lie can be maintained only for such time as the State can shield the people from the political, economic and/or military consequences of the lie. It thus becomes vitally important for the State to use all of its powers to repress dissent, for the truth is the mortal enemy of the lie, and thus by extension, the truth is the greatest enemy of the State."<sup>88</sup>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>87</sup> <u>https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-3wxBJ9v7qM</u>. Undoubtedly those 'you' to whom Farmer is appealing are the members of America's then ruling class.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>88</sup> Propaganda, derived from the word propagation, was first formally institutionalized by the Catholic Church in 1622 with the Sacred Congregation for the **Propaga**tion of the Faith which (like Twitter (which changed its name to X in 2023) and Blackwater (which changed its name to Xe Services in 2009 and again to Academi in 2011) <u>https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Blackwater (company)</u>) apparently became *evangelical* in 2022 when the Catholic Church changed its name to the Congregation for

As one of the Russian intelligence service heroes in Tom Clancy's Jack Ryan concludes, decrying uncritical obedience to authority, after successfully averting war between Russia and the United States:

"[W]e will always be better than the institutions we serve, and that is what matters, when it matters most. There are no heroes in our profession, but occasionally there are good men. Men who act on what is right, not simply doing what they are told. I've not always lived my life with honor but perhaps I've done enough to die with it".<sup>89</sup>

Our overly generous stagnant obedience is easily weaponized by wolves to turn us into their sheep. The well-known *Candid Camera* elevator scene (apparently also devised by Milgram) well illustrates our social desire to conform to those around us.<sup>90</sup>

For the religious among you – particularly, perhaps, those of you who follow Christianity<sup>91</sup> – disobedience may appear contrary to your religion. We'd encourage you to think hard about this. Is the God to whom you are obedient a God that has been created by other people (bishops, priests, or ministers, perhaps) or is the God to whom you are obedient a God as you, personally, understand God, based on your own reading of the Bible rather than on someone else's (whether a church elder, or your parent)? Where in the Bible does it say anything about the Vatican, the Pope, the Archbishop of Canterbury, Catholicism, Episcopalianism, Evangelicalism, or any other Christian denomination having the right to say what God did, does, thought, or wanted from any particular person alive today? One might say that Jesus is the only human being to whom such a power had been granted by God, and yet the vast majority of those telling you who your God should be try hard not to teach Jesus' teachings, and they usually don't

the Evangelization of Peoples https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Congregation for the Evangelization of Peoples.

<sup>91</sup> <u>https://connectusfund.org/50-powerful-bible-scriptures-on-disobedience</u>.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>89</sup> Jack Ryan; Season 3, Episode 8 at 49:01.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>90</sup> <u>https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=TrTk6DsEJ2Q</u>.

*live* according to his teachings. Humility doesn't exude from such people. Understand that we do not write against God or Jesus here (particularly not Jesus, who should be far less controversial<sup>92</sup>), not at all, rather we write against those who tell other people that they somehow have a better interpretation of God than you do while *totally* ignoring the only human being that God seems to have entrusted with even the faintest possibility of actually knowing God. And it was Jesus' disobedience, after all, that rendered him a permanent, global household name.

There are millions and millions of us Decent Americans who accept – for any number of a wide variety of reasons, whether a lack of expertise, or a dislike of conflict, or responsibility avoidance, to name a few of many of our motives – corruption, dishonesty and injustice at many levels: from our bosses behaving like tyrants, to accepting Palestinian or Ukrainian or Yemeni or Iraqi genocide, to ignorantly ignoring (or often hating) Russians, to hating those who were opposed to vaccine mandates and those who were pro-vaccine mandates, to hating Trump supporters or hating Biden supporters, the list is endless. Think for yourself, and really try to figure out, based on who you are, whether you'd like to be thought of the way you may in your own mind characterize those Americans you feel deeply opposed to (just because of the way you think they think). There's only one category of American that sort of hatred actually belongs to, and by now you can predict who we're going to say that is: Our Domestic Enemy.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>92</sup> We're tired of the debate concerning god's existence. Of course god exists; there's a defined word for it: god. Just like souls, ghosts, dragons and unicorns exist for the same reason (whether you believe in them or not). The debate is a particularly unnecessary distraction in 21<sup>st</sup> century America since we have a well-founded legal separation of church and state and since no science is going to prove a god's or a ghost's or a soul's existence in any of our lifetimes. So let's stop arguing about it – particularly if we're only doing so for political or financial power – because there's likely no way, in *any* of our lifetimes, that we'll develop scientific instruments capable of definitively proving god's actual existence – no matter which god you know (in the thinking of Carl Jung). What do you say Sam Harris, Jordan Peterson, and Mohammed Hijab (or their American equivalents)? No one can deny that god, dragons, unicorns, ghosts or souls exist – we can each picture each one of them in our heads right this second (ok, harder for souls!).

To be human, particularly in 21<sup>st</sup> Century America, and particularly for you Decent Americans, is to obey your own conscience (and to do this you must first know who you are, as best you can), and while each of us learns who we are, we should politely refuse to obey authority unless that obedience comports with our common sense – especially where the authorities we obey are centralized, opaque, unaccountable, greedy, selfish, and petty (as all authorities and institutions currently operated by Our Domestic Enemy are). The problem is not the authorities and institutions; the problem is a tiny cabal of psychopaths and sociopaths who make the rules for, and run, the institutions. The institutions – particularly in the age of the always available camera and video phone and internet – will be relatively easily revitalized, with new Guards, to promote Decent Americans' happiness. The key is your willingness to consider, and then *believe* that.

If you need any more convincing that obedience to your conscience and disobedience to authority is a good thing for us Decent Americans and the whole of humanity, watch, or re-watch if you haven't seen it recently, the wonderful 1989 fictional movie Dead Poets Society (starring Robin Williams, Robert Sean Leonard, and Ethan Hawke). It is nothing short, in our view, of a beautiful depiction and description of why, and how, we should be disobedient to authority. Get into trouble, take some risks, have some fun; that's what disobedience to authority means; any authority that punishes such exploration in favor of a uniform dogma does not deserve to be an American authority. To the extent some of you Decent Americans currently find the word disobedient a little too challenging to adopt as a modus operandi, how about replacing it with the word irreverent? There's at least a little disobedience in 'irreverence'. Or if irreverence is still too much for you, try 'skeptical' or its little brother 'questioning', or their little sister 'curious'. Curiosity, until satisfied, despises obedience. That's why your children bombard you with unanswerable 'whys?"!

A real-life version of *Dead Poets Society* is the 2007 tear-inducing movie *Freedom Writers* (starring Hilary Swank as Decent American heroine Erin Gruwell<sup>93</sup> whose work resulted in the 1999 book *The Freedom Writers Diary: How a Teacher and 150 Teens Used Writing to Change Themselves and the World* 

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>93</sup> <u>https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Erin\_Gruwell</u>.

<sup>21</sup>st Century Common Sense 3.0 - edited March 26, 2024.

*Around Them*). Imagine how much more pervasive and useful Ms. Gruwell's style of education (meeting kids where they are) would have been if fewer of her fellow teachers would have been so steadfastly obedient.

Like the Decent Americans in Milgram's experiment, each of us would like to believe that there's *no way* that we as individuals would not be among the 35% who were disobedient and *refused* to administer electric shocks. However, as the experiment teaches us, statistically and categorically, we would likely be wrong (and the terrifying shame of it is we cannot know whether we're in the disobedient 35% or the obedient 65% until we're tested). Accordingly, we suggest that those Decent Americans unwittingly propagandized to be humanity-alteringly fearful of Covid-19 who called for people that *refused* to get a jab (can we all please stop calling it a 'vaccine') or *refused* to obey lockdowns to be isolated from society completely, be the first amongst us to examine their blind obedience to authority in the face of *very* recent history (you're **all** in the 65%). Just as those Decent Americans made deeply fearful of Russia or China are also likely in the 65% (do any Decent Americans who believe war with Russia or China might be a good idea for our future have any useful knowledge about the intentions or motivations or desires of the Russians or the Chinese?). If you lend the idea critical thought, you'll find increased obedience to authority is correlated precisely to increased fear, and if you can shed that fear just a little, perhaps you can stomach watching Tucker Carlson's recent historic interview of Vladimir Putin: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=fOCWBhuDdDo (if you don't enjoy listening to Tucker Carlson, just focus on the substance).

Why, on or after February 16, 2024, if you're American (not merely Russophobic) you'd care about Alexei Navalny's death more than Jeffrey Epstein's is likely inexplicable by you – but it is explicable by blind obedience. If you think you know who Alexei Navalny is, think again.<sup>94</sup> You might try to find the utterly "disgusting" video of Navalny acting as a dentist; the author had trouble locating it, but it's online somewhere. You might also look into whether Navalny's connections to the CIA are

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>94</sup> <u>https://www.bbc.com/news/world-europe-56181084;</u> <u>https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Ruv49PYBeds</u>.

accurate (don't we often advocate the death penalty for treason in America?). Why are you so incensed by Navalny's death (or Evan Gershkovich's fate) when Julian Assange remains in prison and a man called Gonzalo Lira was killed in Ukrainian prison on January 11, 2024 having been there for 8 months.<sup>95</sup> Gonzalo Lira, an American citizen, spent 8 months in Ukrainian custody before his death and your government did nothing – even though your government is (and always was) the Ukrainian's bank – while you fearfully bleat about a feckless Russian guy called Navalny? Ask Biden and Trump about Gonzalo Lira. Ask what they did to get Gonzalo rescued. No matter their response, as Americans, you should care more about what your government does (or does not do) to protect Americans than you do about what the Russian government does (or does not do) to protect Russians.

We should teach young adults of their likely tendency to obedience, but we don't. Instead, and it's only because it enables Our Domestic Enemy to maintain their power, they're taught a myth of individuality within a system of doctrinal obedience (whether to Republicans or to Democrats). So we *must* be much, much more disobedient to our governments (local, city, state, and federal), who, as a matter of fundamental black letter law, are *all* paid by and work for <u>*us*</u>, supposedly to protect our lives and liberties and promote our happiness. We could start with a third party.

# Excessive Income Inequality Is Anti-Natural; A Pareto Principle Theory. Our Domestic Enemy Lost The 'War on Poverty' Which Should Be Ended.

Are you one of the more than 23,000,000 people who have watched the 2m44s capuchin monkey inequality experiment conducted by Professor Frans de Waal (named one of the 100 most influential people in the world in 2007, and in 2011 by Discover as one of the 47 great minds of science<sup>96</sup>): <u>https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=meiU6TxysCg</u>?

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>95</sup> <u>https://www.helsinkitimes.fi/world-int/24744-the-tragic-end-of-gonzalo-lira-a-voice-silenced-in-ukraine.html</u>.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>96</sup> <u>https://www.emory.edu/LIVING\_LINKS/people/dewaal.shtml.</u>

In short, one capuchin monkey becomes instantaneously enraged when another capuchin gets a better reward (a grape, instead of a piece of cucumber the size of a grape) for performing the same task. The author doesn't know how much more energy will come from a grape than a piece of cucumber; or how much more nutritious the grape than the cucumber, but we know there's a vast discrepancy (the grape's sugar content alone proves that). The capuchin is instinctively and intuitively, commonsensically, perhaps, instantaneously enraged by the inequality. The capuchin monkey is not alone: apparently whatever animal the experiment is conducted on yields the same results, whether "dogs, birds, [or] chimpanzees".

We are required to remember, which we often seem to forget – somewhat ironically given our big brains – that we are animals, a part of nature, not above it. Yes, we are the most successful animal, but are we more successful than insects, trees, sea grass, or fungi?<sup>97</sup>

Certainly, we humans are the most consequential in nature – we are the only creature with the theoretical power to both destroy (by nuclear war, chemical war, or climate change for example) and *save* nature. Psychopathic warmongers will try to convince you that this power to destroy and save comes from the warrior side of us. Common sense dictates that we get that power from our unmatched capacity to *collaborate with each other*. We are the apex predator on the planet (above, say, wolves, lions, tigers, hyenas, and bears) **solely** due to our ability to collaborate and cooperate with each other and protect each other from more individually powerful animals. 93 million of us will understand animal collaborative power instinctively because we have watched a baby buffalo saved by its herd – literally from the jaws of crocodiles and lions wrestling over its

(https://www.middleeasteye.net/discover/mediterranean-posidonia-oceanica-seagrass-protecting-life), and fungi is nature's largest natural being (https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/strange-but-true-largest-organism-isfungus/).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>97</sup> Trees, which we often think of as the longest living natural being may not be: the oldest trees (the Jurupa Oak colony in California) are only estimated to be 13,000 years old while Posidonia oceanica (a sea grass near Ibiza, Spain) is estimated to be between 12 and 200 thousand years old

young meat in Kruger National Park

(https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=LU8DDYz68kM).

Human beings are *obviously* nature's apex predator – "at the top of the food chain" in other words<sup>98</sup> – and no amount of sophistry will alter the conclusion that we got to that position as a result of our brains' unmatched capacity to collaborate with each other.

The *only* predator that 99% of us human beings must be systemically concerned with are those predators amongst us who show indifference to, or contempt for, human suffering and human life. As we shall see, these human beings are not difficult to identify. In 2011, Occupy Wall Street<sup>99</sup> told us that it was 1% of Americans versus 99% of Americans.

Nature, as well as abhorring a vacuum, apparently abhors inequality. The question becomes how much inequality can nature (more precisely human beings as natural creatures) tolerate? More specifically, how much inequality *should* human nature tolerate?

There is a concept that economists, in particular, discuss called the "Pareto Principle"<sup>100</sup> widely disseminated by a man named Joseph Juran in 1941 and subsequently considered by some to be a *universal* principle. Roughly stated, the Pareto Principle asserts that 20%<sup>101</sup> of us are vital and 80% of us are useful. Set aside for a moment that this conclusion appears to be contradicted by Professor Sir Ken Robinson<sup>102</sup> (who 98 million of us know through 3 TED talks he gave about the importance of creativity in education), who concluded in 1 of the 3 TED talks (which 17 million of us

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>98</sup> <u>https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Apex\_predator</u>.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>99</sup> <u>https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Occupy\_Wall\_Street.</u>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>100</sup> <u>https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Pareto\_principle.</u>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>101</sup> This 20% may also correlate with the (apparently) 20% of us who supposedly have the 'explorer gene' (<u>http://chickadeestories.com/explorer-gene-pros-cons/</u>), or what the National Geographic calls the 'restless gene' (<u>https://www.nationalgeographic.com/magazine/article/restless-genes</u>).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>102</sup> <u>https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ken\_Robinson\_(educationalist)</u>.

#### have seen in its animated form

(https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=zDZFcDGpL4U)) that 98% of 1,500 kindergarten children tested have "genius level" thinking. Genius which is then, literally, 'educated' out of them (cruel and inhuman treatment in our view). Genius level thinking in these same children dropped to 30% by the age of 10, and dropped to 12% by the time they were 15 years old. George Land conducted the test in 1968<sup>103</sup> and wrote the 1993 book that Professor Robinson relied upon called *Breakpoint and Beyond*<sup>104</sup> with Beth Jarman.

Keeping in mind Professors Land's and Robinson's conclusion that 98% of us are born with genius level intelligence, let's focus on Pareto's 80/20 hypothesis. Here's our thesis: nature *herself* cannot withstand greater than 80/20 inequality. This would mean that as nature's beings, human beings cannot safely sustain a system that provides for greater income inequality than 80/20. At the moment, in the United States, we're at 99/1 (or likely worse). What do you think of this thesis for governance through resource distribution, *all* you professors at Florida A&M, Harvard, Spelman, Yale, Howard, Princeton, North Carolina A&T, Dartmouth, or – more importantly – what do you, the more than 20 million of you, fortunate enough to be currently enrolled in an undergraduate education across these United States think of the thesis?<sup>105</sup> Most importantly, what do you – the 77 million of you<sup>106</sup> – currently enrolled in high school in these United States think?

Imagine a world in which there are rich people, but no poor people. How hard is that to imagine – some estimates (based only on the rules of life established by Our Domestic Enemy) suggest it would take \$20-30

<sup>106</sup> <u>https://www.census.gov/newsroom/press-releases/2019/school-</u> enrollment.html.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>103</sup> See the section below *WTF Happened In 1971?* 

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>104</sup> <u>https://archive.org/details/breakpointbeyond00geor</u>.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>105</sup> <u>https://www.statista.com/statistics/235406/undergraduate-enrollment-in-us-universities/</u>.

billion per year<sup>107</sup> to end homelessness. Elon Musk (worth \$219 billion) could do that for several years and *still* have billions left over; by which time Mars will *still* not be colonizable. As could Jeff Bezos (\$177 billion), Bill Gates (\$129 billion), Warren Buffett (\$118 billion), Larry Page (\$111 billion), Sergey Brin (\$107 billion)<sup>108</sup>, Larry Ellison (\$106 billion), Steve Ballmer (\$91.4 billion), Michael Bloomberg (\$82 billion), and Mark Zuckerberg (\$67.3 billion).<sup>109</sup> Collectively, these 10 are worth \$1.2 trillion, and none of them have anything to do with Apple which is now worth \$3 trillion.<sup>110</sup> There's \$4.2 trillion in the hands of a few white men who publicly claim not to have slaves (politely calling some of them employees instead).

How do these people – or *any* billionaire – reconcile the 'contributions' of their own lives with rampant income inequality or the Pareto Principle? To make this less abstract, according to the way our government currently operates, if you make \$100,000.00 per year, your life is not 4x less important than Elon Musk's, it's 2,190,000x less important.<sup>111</sup> Even if you are a Tesla janitor (and you're likely not making \$100,000.00 per year as a Tesla janitor), don't you find it completely unnatural to

<sup>109</sup> <u>https://www.forbes.com/sites/kerryadolan/2022/04/05/americas-10-richest-billionaires-2022/?sh=7b271bb35f42</u>.

<sup>110</sup> <u>https://www.nytimes.com/2022/01/03/technology/apple-3-trillion-market-value.html</u>.

Even when we account for the annual salary versus net worth distinction, Musk is currently 52 years old. So let's say our hypothetical janitor has been making \$100,000.00 per year for 30 years and has managed to amass a net worth of \$3,000,000.00. Even with this adjustment, Musk's life would, according to Musk and those that permit his ownership, be 73,000 times more valuable than our janitor's.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>107</sup> <u>https://www.verifythis.com/article/news/verify/social-justice/20-billion-not-</u> enough-eradicate-homelessness/536-87f9cba3-5654-4f5b-845c-2f57716c8850.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>108</sup> It's worth focusing your mind on Brin – he was involved in creating a *free* internet search engine called Google to become worth \$107 billion.

conclude that 1 American's life is 2,190,000x more, or less, important than another's?

It's just a thesis, however, one that we think is driven by common human sense. Celebrated French economist Thomas Piketty has explored these ideas in a more academic manner in, according to Harvard, his "2013 landmark analysis of Western economic inequality" *Capital in the 21st Century* which "became a **must-read in both popular and academic circles**."<sup>112</sup>

There will always be rich and less rich in a well-functioning meritocracy, but in the 21<sup>st</sup> century we should give up Our Domestic Enemy's failed (by that we mean lost) War on Poverty and just eradicate poverty. This will require you, if you're financially rich, to stop believing that you're better or superior than someone who's financially poor, and require you, if you're financially poor, to stop believing that you have less ability(ies) than someone who is financially rich. Our culture, shaped by Our Domestic Enemy, will not let these deadly fictions die easily.

*Imagine* an America where there's only a middle class. A middle class with an upper, a middle, and a lower, with the middle being 80% of the population. As a nation, that's what we were successfully driving towards in the 1950s and 60s.

# We Love Technology and Forget What It Is.

Human beings love technology, and because of our unique collaborative abilities, our big brains and our magnificent bodies, we're better at technology than any other creature by a significant order of magnitude.

Very few, perhaps none, of us could survive anywhere today without basic technologies invented a long, long time ago in human history.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>112</sup> <u>https://news.harvard.edu/gazette/story/2020/03/pikettys-new-book-</u> explores-how-economic-inequality-is-perpetuated/.

<sup>21</sup>st Century Common Sense 3.0 - edited March 26, 2024.

We forget in the 21<sup>st</sup> century that everyday items – like the hammer or the knife – were once revolutionary technological advancements.<sup>113</sup> We also forget that *every* useful technology has the capacity to kill other human beings, as well as the capacity to be useful to other human beings. Smash another human being over the head with a hammer and that human being will likely die.

What is the greatest technology ever invented by human beings? We think that there is a viable competition between four technologies for the greatest – where the greatest is defined by the technological invention's capacity to advance humanity. The four, in temporal order, are: fire, the wheel, money, and the internet.

Do you 100 million high school and university students agree? What do your parents, teachers and/or professors think?

Of course, fire wasn't actually invented by humans – no more than earth, air, or water were – but the invention of our ability to harness fire (without which almost none of our day-to-day activities would be possible today) was achieved by our ancestry a long time ago, perhaps as long as 2 million years ago.<sup>114</sup> The wheel – definitely<sup>115</sup> invented by human beings – was perhaps invented as little as 12,500 years ago, but there is no consensus as to where, much less by who. It appears no one alive in recent history knows which individual human invented the fire or the wheel; much less

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>113</sup> Imagine the days when the ruling classes had a monopoly on who could own a knife or a hammer (there were such days); that's no different from the powerful deciding today who can have a lot of money or who can control what you can read or listen to on the internet.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>114</sup> <u>https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Control of fire by early humans</u>. Common sense, while curious about the question, doesn't care whether it was 2 million, or 790,000 years ago, or on what piece of land those human beings lived; it'd be fascinating to learn the truth, but in the 21<sup>st</sup> century likely unnecessary.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>115</sup> Because perfectly round things are, at the very least, rare in nature. <u>https://www.atlasobscura.com/articles/concretion-spherical-rocks;</u> <u>https://www.cmu.edu/mcs/news-events/2019/0314\_pi-day-perfect-circles.html</u>.

their gender (wouldn't you guess a female invented fire), sexuality, skin color, religion (or pagan ideology), or what country they were from.

You may balk at the idea that money was *invented*, or that its *invention* was a "technology". This might be an interesting debate, but a debate that is – today in the 21<sup>st</sup> century – about as useful as debating how many angels can dance on the head of a pin. As with fire, and the wheel, we *cannot* live our day-to-day lives without money. Some people believe it was invented roughly 3,300 years ago by using shells as money<sup>116</sup> - but like fire or the wheel for common sense in the 21<sup>st</sup> century, it doesn't matter much. Like fire and the wheel, money's invention was revolutionary – allowing humanity to create, learn, and develop in ways which are unimaginable without its invention. Here's a thought experiment to prove the point: how many chickens is a cow worth and how long would it take for the participants to decide? Money's invention enabled vast numbers of human beings to collaborate with each other; suddenly, across time and geography.

Which leaves the internet. We believe that the internet is humanity's greatest invention (while recognizing the internet wouldn't be possible without fire, the wheel, and/or money). If you take seriously the proposition that "knowledge is power"<sup>117</sup> (if it weren't, why would data be the most financially valuable commodity today?<sup>118</sup>), you must also take the logical conclusion that "all knowledge is all power" seriously. At the moment, the internet has the capacity to be the most serious weapon ever wielded in favor of humanity. Its knowledge dispersal ability is breathtaking. Thus in 2024, control of the internet (whether it will be by us

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>116</sup> Cowrie shells to be exact <u>https://www.britannica.com/story/a-brief-and-fascinating-history-of-money</u>. There are many theories as to when and where money was invented by human beings <u>https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/History\_of\_money</u>.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>117</sup> <u>https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Scientia potentia est.</u>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>118</sup> <u>https://www.economist.com/leaders/2017/05/06/the-worlds-most-valuable-resource-is-no-longer-oil-but-data</u>. Science fiction has played with the financialization of our *actual* most valuable commodity: time; for example in the 2011 movie *In Time* (portraying Klaus Schwab's and Larry Fink's wet dream?) starring Justin Timberlake.

- humanity, or by them - Our Domestic Enemy, a tiny number of venally frightened landlords) should be our most pressing issue.

## We Also Love Nature.

We don't think the conclusion that human beings love nature needs excessive exploration, though we welcome – as we do of all our conclusions – a challenge. Suffice it to say that we humans love nature profoundly, but far too few of us – particularly those of us who live in large cities, but even many of us who don't – experience nature enough. We think it magical to hear a symphony standing at the edge of a forest as the wind blows through the trees; the larger leaves a suite of cellos, the smaller leaves a suite of flutes. Even if you can't immediately hear the symphony, eventually you likely will, and in the meantime, you'll hear something in the trees, whether the gentle whisper of a breeze or the majestic roar of storm winds.

If you haven't seen the 2020 movie *My Octopus Teacher*, we think it well worth seeing as an example of how an individual human being can learn from nature. We know massive numbers of you love nature because by some measures David Attenborough's *Planet Earth II* is the most highly rated tv series in America, and the BBC's *Planet Earth*, David Attenborough's *Blue Planet II*, *Our Planet*, *Green Planet*, and *Frozen Planet II* are all in the top 20 tv series in America. *Breaking Bad*, *Band of Brothers*, *The Wire*, *The Sopranos*, and *Game of Thrones* (GoT perhaps lagging only because of that weak last season and atrocious final episode?) are all also in the top 20, but America, we love nature.

Let's try to get out in it a bit more – we still have much to learn from her.

We Also Love Sex (Natural and Essential As It Is); "Let's Talk About Sex Baby".

Surely no facts or arguments are necessary to prove this to you. Porn is a multi-billion dollar industry after all. xVideos.com is used more often viewed than Amazon.com while Pornhub.com and XNXX.com both follow immediately after TikTok.com.<sup>119</sup> If masturbation was a sin or terrible or something to be embarrassed about, then the vast majority of humanity has a problem. But because it's fun and harms no one, it's not.

Common sense – especially in the 21<sup>st</sup> century – should dictate to you that no one should have the ability to stop you from having consensual sex of whatever kind you want with another adult *except for* the person that you want to have sex with. If that's true, then why do we have (or have we ever had) *any* laws that impose upon the right to have consensual sex? We don't think that we're going out on a limb when we say that States should ban rape, pedophilia, and bestiality; does *anyone* disagree with that? Speak loud and publicly if you do. But consensual sex *of any kind* with another adult?

Lest you are too young to think this conclusion so obvious as to be unnecessary to write, it was only in 1967 – less than 60 years ago – that the United States of America banned laws (called anti-miscegenation laws<sup>120</sup>) that prohibited blacks and whites from having sex with each other or getting married. <u>25</u> states at the time had anti-miscegenation laws, criminalizing interracial consensual sex. The Supreme Court only finally banned these laws in *1967* in a case called *Loving v. Virginia*<sup>121</sup> which involved a white man (Richard Loving) and a black woman (Mildred Jeter). This is, of course, not the only example of 'elites' in the United States of America dictating to the rest of us who we can and cannot have sex with. What business of government is our most fun, intensely intimate, and most natural act?

Gay sex, the Supreme Court determined in 1986 – 37 years ago (in a case called *Bowers v. Hardwick*<sup>122</sup>) – *could* be criminalized (consider, in this regard, our government's mandated obligation with respect to individual liberty and our pursuit of happiness from our founding legal document).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>119</sup> <u>https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List\_of\_most-visited\_websites.</u>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>120</sup> <u>https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Anti-</u> miscegenation laws in the United States.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>121</sup> <u>https://supreme.justia.com/cases/federal/us/388/1/</u>.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>122</sup> <u>https://supreme.justia.com/cases/federal/us/478/186/.</u>

Americans could be jailed, in other words, for living happily after being born. The Supreme Court didn't outlaw criminalizing gay sex until **2003** in a case called *Lawrence v. Texas.*<sup>123</sup>

Your common sense should demand that you deeply question how a group of nine unelected elite lifetime yahoos with law degrees *ever* got the power to decide who you or your grandparents can have consensual sex with. That should be unthinkable anywhere, but most particularly under a government whose only purpose is to secure your lives, your liberties, and your pursuit of happiness.

As you ponder this issue, what has the Supreme Court done about the hundreds<sup>124</sup> of 'elites' – including Bill Gates, Bill Clinton, Donald Trump, RFK Jr., Les Wexner, Wexner's wife, and Alan Dershowitz (even though Dershowitz recently managed to get one of the Epstein tragedy's principal heroines Virginia Roberts Giuffre to provide him with some 'denial cover', though we *still* don't believe him) – who all cavorted with the pedophile Jeffrey Epstein and his pedophile madame Ghislaine Maxwell for decades? The answer: Nothing. Wouldn't a competent United States Supreme Court fast-track its first opportunity to expose Epstein's and Maxwell's child sex-trafficking ring? No, these people would rather police who *you* fall in love with, while permitting your children to be raped and trafficked by their friends and donors.<sup>125</sup> A legitimate United States

<sup>125</sup> The 2023 movie *Sound of Freedom* tells the true story of Homeland Security Investigations Agent Tim Ballard's (played by Jim Caveziel) battle against sextrafficking. The *Sound of Freedom's* epilogue informs us that: "Human trafficking is a \$150 billion a year industry. **The US is one of the top destinations for human trafficking** and is one of the top consumers for child sex. There are more humans trapped today in slavery than at any point in human history, including when slavery was legal. Millions of these slaves are children. [emphasis supplied]" UNICEF informs us that "considered one of the top destination points for victims of child trafficking and exploitation. Cases of human trafficking have been reported in all 50 U.S. States; anyone can be trafficked regardless of race, class, education, gender, age or citizenship

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>123</sup> <u>https://supreme.justia.com/cases/federal/us/539/558/</u>.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>124</sup> <u>https://www.ndtv.com/world-news/jeffrey-epstein-epstein-files-full-list-of-high-profile-people-named-in-unsealed-court-docs-4810003</u>.

Supreme Court would protect American children first and foremost. Epstein's pedophilia-trafficking is not an isolated incident, either. The Catholic Church has also sanctioned the rape of your children across America for decades; attached as **Exhibit C** is a series of screenshots from the end of the 2015 movie *Spotlight* (starring Michael Keaton, Mark Ruffalo, Rachel McAdams and Live Schreiber) which shows "well over" 1,000 children raped and/or sexually assaulted in Boston alone.

Recall that Alan Dershowitz and Kenneth Starr (you remember Starr – he was a judge on Washington D.C.'s highest court from 1983-1989, United States Solicitor General from 1983-1993, and prosecuted Bill Clinton (49 years old) for lying about having sex with Monica Lewinsky (22 years old) from 1994-1999<sup>126</sup>) **both** (together with some other highpowered lawyers) represented Jeffrey Epstein the first time we the People became aware of Epstein. Dershowitz and Starr got Epstein a sweetheart deal (ushered through by later Trump Secretary of Labor Alexander Acosta, a former law school dean(!), who was a United States Attorney at the time<sup>127</sup>) which literally permitted Jeffrey Epstein to continue raping our children while he was 'in jail'.

Is *that* a government that we, the American People, want to keep? Or should we alter and/or abolish it as *The Declaration of Independence* commands us? We, collectively, revere its principal draftsman, Thomas Jefferson, who thought (likely because he could imagine the fruition of human technological developments that were beyond his imagination) the Constitution should be altered every 20 years.<sup>128</sup>

when forcefully coerced or enticed by false promises."

https://www.unicefusa.org/what-unicef-does/childrens-protection/child-trafficking While the United States Supreme Court appears not to think that the United States should use its full power to fight child slavery and trafficking (see pp.18-19 above), we're certain that you, the American People, disagree.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>126</sup> <u>https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ken Starr</u>.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>127</sup> <u>https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Alexander Acosta.</u>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>128</sup> <u>https://classroom.synonym.com/founding-father-wanted-constitution-change-</u> <u>20-years-11735.html</u>. While it may come as a surprise to the nearly 20,000,000 New

When tv star (not journalist) Amy Robach discovered that another news outlet (she worked as a cohost of *Good Morning America* at the time<sup>129</sup>) broke the Jeffrey Epstein story, Robach told us, in full makeup (Robach's full statement begins at 2m35s of

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=C59P2etVX3o<sup>130</sup>, and Alan Dershowitz is (again) implicated at 3m04s<sup>131</sup>), how she had the full story from Virginia Giuffre Roberts 3 years earlier and ABC prohibited her from telling you. This is *no different* to when Ronan Farrow complained that NBC would not run his stories about Harvey Weinstein.<sup>132</sup> You can't have already forgotten what a monster Harvey Weinstein is. Harvey Weinstein and Jeffrey Epstein mingled intimately with, we'd bet, *all* of the super-rich, and if not all, certainly most of them. Just as the Cardinals of the Catholic Church do.

In other words, ABC and NBC decided that we should not know that our children were being raped by exceedingly wealthy friends of those

<sup>129</sup> <u>https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Amy\_Robach#Jeffrey\_Epstein\_story;</u> <u>https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=C59P2etVX3o</u>.

<sup>130</sup> Sam Seder unfortunately revealed rank bland partisanship (anti-truth, that is) when the first thing he says, after showing his audience the full impact of Amy Robach's statement, chose to ridicule the source of the video (James O'Keefe who at the time was at Project Veritas). Michael Brooks, though, was his regular brilliant self. RIP Michael (1983-2020).

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Michael\_Brooks\_(political\_commentator)).

<sup>131</sup> Look carefully at the same clip run on Fox News which, at 1m06s, clips Robach's assertion regarding Alan Dershowitz out

<u>https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=vjwf9F\_v5cI</u>. Imagine if you had the power to get a national news outlet to edit your name out of a story – now wonder whether anyone *should* have that power? Whaddya say Dersh?

<sup>132</sup> <u>https://www.vanityfair.com/news/2019/10/how-nbc-killed-its-weinstein-</u> story.

Yorkers, the New York State Constitution "mandates that the question of whether to hold a convention be submitted to the [voters] every twenty years." <u>https://www.archives.nysed.gov/research/constitutions-and-constituonal-conventions</u>

'news' outlets' owners. Why on earth would you trust what those 'news' outlets have to say on *any* other subject?

We need to learn how to be less fearful of, and better educated about, sex – particularly associating *any* personal shame concerning who we want to have consensual sex with (unless, of course, an adult wishes to have sex with a child). There are numerous shows – cheesy and silly as some of them may be – trying to teach us about sex. Maybe our parents should get better at teaching our children about sex, rather than outsourcing that part of parenting to other people (like teachers at schools, and/or other children). We need better sex education for everyone. Consider the story of Mark O'Brien and surrogate-partner therapist Cheryl Cohen Greene as told in an article by Mark O'Brien<sup>133</sup> and depicted by John Hawkes and Helen Hunt with William H. Macy acting as Mark O'Brien's trusted Catholic priest Father Brendan in the 2012 movie *The Sessions* (which won the Audience Award Special Jury Prize for Ensemble Acting at the Sundance Film Festival, received highly positive reviews from critics, and earned Helen Hunt an Oscar nomination<sup>134</sup>).

So, Let's Talk About Sex Baby.<sup>135</sup>

We Also Love Drugs; Therefore Our Domestic Enemy Fabricated, Then Decisively Lost, A 'War on Drugs' Which Should Be Immediately Rethought.

We love drugs so much that we often fall addicted to them – nicotine and alcohol (which have been legal for a very long time) being perhaps the most common addictions. If addiction is so terrible, why are alcohol and nicotine (not to mention sugar<sup>136</sup> and caffeine<sup>137</sup>) *legal* drugs? It is not, and

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>133</sup> <u>https://thesunmagazine.org/issues/568/on-seeing-a-sex-surrogate-issue-568</u>.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>134</sup> <u>https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/The Sessions (2012 film)</u>.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>135</sup> Salt-N-Pepa, 1991: <u>https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ydrtF45-y-g</u>.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>136</sup> <u>https://www.healthline.com/health/food-nutrition/experts-is-sugar-addictive-drug#What-is-an-addiction</u>?

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>137</sup> <u>https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Caffeine</u>.

never should be, a criminal offense to use nicotine or alcohol, much less sugar and caffeine.

But why should any other drug be illegal? *Marijuana??!!* Addiction, or the threat of addiction, is Our Domestic Enemy's justification for illegality. Just as it was during Prohibition<sup>138</sup> (of alcohol, by constitutional amendment (the 18<sup>th</sup> in 1919) and its repeal by constitutional amendment (the 21<sup>st</sup> in 1933)). Note the speed with which constitutional amendment can take place when We The People are directly interested in, and informed about, the question.

Are you one of the tens of millions of us that has heard of Rat Park<sup>139</sup>? What if everything you think you know about addiction is wrong<sup>140</sup>? Rat Park was designed in the late 1970s by an American psychology professor named Bruce Alexander who wondered whether the rat cages (nothing but rat, cage, water and floor) might skew the addiction results. In the initial addiction study, the rats were given only one choice clean water or drugged (morphine or cocaine) water? Unsurprisingly, the rats chose the drugged water, because they had no opportunity for purpose. When the rats were given a life in which they were given the tools to pursue happiness in Rat Park ("200 times the floor area of a standard laboratory cage[, ...] 16–20 rats of both sexes in residence, food, balls and wheels for play, and enough space for mating"), together with a choice of clean or drugged water, "[e]ven when the [rats] did imbibe from the drugfilled bottle, they did so intermittently, not obsessively, and never overdosed. A social community beat the power of drugs. [emphasis supplied]"<sup>141</sup> Carl L. Hart, Decent American psychologist and neuroscientist, working as the Mamie Phipps Clark Professor of

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>138</sup> <u>https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Prohibition in the United States.</u>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>139</sup> <u>https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Rat\_Park.</u>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>140</sup> <u>https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=PY9DcIMGxMs</u>.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>141</sup> <u>https://www.psychiatrictimes.com/view/what-does-rat-park-teach-us-about-addiction</u>.

Psychology (in Psychiatry) at Columbia University<sup>142</sup>, is a truly remarkable voice enabling a 21<sup>st</sup> century understanding of recreational drug use.<sup>143</sup>

Now imagine if all Decent Americans had their Basic Needs met and were free to pursue the happiness that most suited them. Almost certainly, a desire for, much less addiction to, mental and emotional stimulants would decrease (not disappear, just decrease; progress, not perfection). That seems like common sense to us – do you disagree? If so, why? And as you answer, try to leave the hopeless fear that may be stamping upon your imagination out of the equation entirely. In 2020, Stanford Professor of psychiatry and behavioral sciences Keith Humphreys proved, scientifically, that Alcoholics Anonymous ("AA") is the "most effective path"<sup>144</sup> to recovering from alcohol addiction. "AA works because it's based on social interaction, Humphreys said, noting that members give one another emotional support as well as practical tips to refrain from drinking." This sounds no different to the conclusion of the Study (pp.29-30, above). "In addition, most studies showed that AA participation lowered health care costs."

If all that is true, why doesn't every psychology and psychiatry professor and every therapist and life coach across America teach their students and patients that if they have a patient or client with an addiction they should advise them, as persistently as feasible, that the best way is a 12 Step program – which has the added benefit of being free *and* voluntary?

Alcoholics Anonymous is based on great American Bill Wilson's 12 Step program<sup>145</sup>, first published in 1952. That program gave birth to successful programs designed to combat different addictions of all sorts:

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>142</sup> <u>https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Carl Hart.</u>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>143</sup> <u>https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=C9HMifCoSko</u>.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>144</sup> <u>https://med.stanford.edu/news/all-news/2020/03/alcoholics-anonymous-most-effective-path-to-alcohol-abstinence.html</u>.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>145</sup> <u>https://www.aa.org/the-twelve-steps</u>.

Gamblers Anonymous<sup>146</sup>, Sex Addicts Anonymous<sup>147</sup>, Narcotics Anonymous<sup>148</sup>, Overeating Anonymous<sup>149</sup>, and even Violence Anoymous.<sup>150</sup>

The 12 Steps, which are suggested for recovery, are:

"1. We admitted we were powerless over \_\_\_\_\_ — that our lives had become unmanageable;

2. Came to believe that a Power greater than ourselves could restore us to sanity;

3. Made a decision to turn our will and our lives over to the care of [the Power] as we understood it;

4. Made a searching and fearless moral inventory of ourselves;

5. Admitted to [the Power], to ourselves, and to another human being the exact nature of our wrongs;

6. Were entirely ready to have [the Power] remove all these defects of character;

7. Humbly asked [the Power] to remove our shortcomings;

8. Made a list of all persons we had harmed, and became willing to make amends to them all;

9. Made direct amends to such people wherever possible, except when to do so would injure them or others;

10. Continued to take personal inventory and when we were wrong promptly admitted it;

https://	/www.na.org/	admin/includ	le/spaw2/	/uploads/	/pdf/hand	dbooks/	IGG.pd
1	<u> </u>		- <u>1</u>	1	1		

- <u>f</u>.
- <sup>149</sup> <u>https://oa.org/about-us/</u>.
- <sup>150</sup> <u>https://violenceanonymous.org</u>.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>146</sup> <u>https://www.gamblersanonymous.org/ga/content/recovery-program</u>.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>147</sup> <u>https://saa-recovery.org/our-program/the-twelve-steps/</u>.

<sup>148</sup> 

11. Sought through prayer and meditation to improve our conscious contact with [the Power] as we understood [It], praying only for knowledge of [Its] will for us and the power to carry that out; and 12. Having had a spiritual awakening as the result of these Steps, we tried to carry this message to [other sufferers], and to practice these principles in all our affairs."

It's a simple, but highly effective and demanding program requiring rigorous honesty – first and foremost with yourself (recall the Oracle's mandate). In our experience, it makes human beings better human beings who unfortunately often take far too long (for their own life's happiness) to admit to themselves that they have a problem. How many of you believe that you have a problem controlling your emotions (hint: you probably do)? Lois Wilson, who was married to Bill, started a program based on the same 12 Steps called Al-Anon – which later became Al-Anon/Alateen – for people who suffered from emotional difficulties as a result of their living with an alcoholic (whether the alcoholic is a spouse, significant other, or parent).<sup>151</sup>

Instead of learning from this vast array of American experience (free and voluntary programs work, and prohibition does not), Our Domestic Enemy instead punishes us with measures like the Controlled Substances Act in May 1971 (see *WTF Happened in 1971?*, pp.76-86 below) which put marijuana in the same 'danger' category as heroin, thereby starting the "War on Drugs." Millions of us knew that was stupid – by virtue of our own experience with both marijuana and alcohol – when it was done. How's the war on drugs worked out? Have we won yet? Or did we just enable mass slaughter and mass enslavement by creating the drug trade? You also make a serious error believing that Our Domestic Enemy cares about protecting us from addiction. If they did, President Reagan wouldn't have started a crack epidemic to fund the Iran-Contra War. If you don't know what we're talking about, read great investigative journalist Gary

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>151</sup> <u>https://al-anon.org/for-members/the-legacies/the-twelve-steps/</u>.

Webb's piece on the subject<sup>152</sup>, or watch Jeremy Renner's portrayal of Gary Webb in 2014's movie *Kill The Messenger*.

Drugs are an integral part of many indigenous cultures.

We should educate ourselves how to use drugs safely and effectively; one of the reasons Dr. Hart's teaching and voice is so remarkable. Millions of us are currently experimenting with marijuana, DMT, mesclun, ayahuasca, psilocybin, LSD, and more. As long as we do no harm to others while high (for which ordinary criminal penalties would apply in any event), who does the government think it is telling us we can't ingest these substances – any more than the government could ban alcohol?

"Humans, not just rats, need to be part of a community, encouraged to relate and experience the support of others. This is about as basic a psychological truth as exists, yet does it find application in clinicians' offices?"<sup>153</sup>

While this pamphlet is focused on Decent Americans who we believe will be hard pressed to seriously dispute what it means to be human in the 21<sup>st</sup> century, we believe these ideas apply with almost equal force (though with some variations) to the Chinese People, the Russian People, the Iranian People, the Venezuelan People, the English People, the French People, the German People, the Palestinian People, the Israeli People, the South African People, the Malian People, and the People everywhere else on the planet; yes, even the People of North Sentinel Island (though this last group is stated with less confidence).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>152</sup> Originally published in the San Jose Mercury News in 3-parts and then turned into a book of the same name: *Dark Alliance* published in 1998 (https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Dark\_Alliance\_(book)).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>153</sup> <u>https://www.psychiatrictimes.com/view/what-does-rat-park-teach-us-about-addiction.</u>

# NOVEMBER 15, 1777 – JUNE 21, 1788 (*The Codification of The Declaration of Independence*).

November 15, 1777.

Shortly after the Revolutionary War began, the Founding Generation began working on a formal legal framework – the pre-cursor to the Constitution – for their humanity-level-novel confederation of 13 independent States (July 4, 1776's *The Declaration of Independence*). Adopted on November 15, 1777, this document, which governed the United States until the ratification of the Constitution in 1789 (including being the basic law of the United States during the 6 years of peace following the Founding Generation's defeat of the British imperialism and colonialism on September 3, 1783<sup>154</sup>) was called the Articles of Confederation.<sup>155</sup>

The Founding Generation were almost all confederates (though there were some dissenters, called Loyalists<sup>156</sup>) and President George Washington, before the Revolutionary War was won, was an insurrectionist (as were all the founding parents and almost all the Founding Generation). As you decry January 6, remember that you were founded in insurrection by insurrectionists.

The 13 Articles of Confederation, drafted in the first year of the Revolutionary War, could not be expected to augment life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. There was a war for freedom to be won. *But* the Articles clearly contemplated freedom and the pursuit of everyone's happiness only being possible during peace and thus spelled out:

"No vessels of war shall be kept up in time of peace, by any state, [unless deemed necessary "in the judgment of the united states"]; but every state shall always keep up a well regulated and disciplined

https://hsp.org/sites/default/files/attachments/Plain%20Truth%20excerpt.pdf.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>154</sup> <u>https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/American\_Revolutionary\_War</u>.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>155</sup> <u>https://www.archives.gov/milestone-documents/articles-of-confederation</u>,

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>156</sup> Like James Chalmers of Maryland who initially wrote under the pseudonym Candidus

militia, sufficiently armed and accoutred, and shall provide and constantly have ready for use, in *public* stores, a due number of field pieces and tents, and a proper quantity of arms, ammunition, and camp equipage. [emphasis supplied]" (Article VI)

September 3, 1783 – May 25, 1787.

The Revolutionary War was officially ended with the execution of the Treaty of Paris on September 3, 1783<sup>157</sup> although the British had been defeated by the founding generation in 1782<sup>158</sup> (just like Ukraine lost the war a long time ago, but there has just not been an officially recognized end). The Treaty makes clear that British residents remained "Subjects" of King George III, while American residents in the "free sovereign and Independent States" became "Citizens."

The Founding Generation knew what they'd fought, bled, died, and were traumatized for – freedom from *any* government's overreach into them living their lives as healthily, securely, and happily as possible. The Founding Generation did not intend for a ruling class to simply usurp the tyrannies exercised by the British that led to the Revolutionary War in the first place.

In June 1783, soldiers in the Founding Generation "demanded payment as contractually required for their service" and engaged in the Pennsylvania Mutiny<sup>159</sup> to secure what the wealthy owed them. These were our revered soldiers, responsible for securing the promises of *The Declaration of Independence*. George Washington (the former insurrectionist) fought <u>against</u> his soldiers' rights; in the 20<sup>th</sup> century, Major General

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>157</sup> <u>https://www.archives.gov/milestone-documents/treaty-of-paris</u>. Do not take anyone's word for what the Treaty of Paris says or means without reading it for yourself – the original source documents are the only documents that should inform your common sense until you can trust another to be interpreting source documents honestly.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>158</sup> <u>https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/American Revolutionary War</u>.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>159</sup> <u>https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Pennsylvania Mutiny of 1783.</u>

Smedley Darlington Butler (as we shall see) did the opposite. While we are constantly told to revere our soldiers, those who have stolen the ability to pay them consistently refuse to do so. About 150 years later in 1932, the wealthy treated the WWI veterans of the Bonus Army exactly the same way – in service of the wealthy's own finery.<sup>160</sup> *These* thieves are Our Domestic Enemy that must be permanently removed from power. Lest you think the word 'thieves' too harsh, in 2018 Our Domestic Enemy <u>admitted</u> to stealing *\$47 trillion* from us over the past 50 years, as we'll explore later in this pamphlet (see pp.76-86 below).

The American citizenry in the founding generation continued to demand the freedoms promised by *The Declaration of Independence*. One of the most famous examples of this was 1786-1787s Shay's Rebellion<sup>161</sup> in Massachusetts – the people's violence prompted and provoked by their failure to persuade bought and kowtowing, self-interested politicians. At the same time, the Exeter Rebellion<sup>162</sup> took place in New Hampshire with the same cause – financial degradation of the masses by those more interested in their own luxuries than their fellow citizens' pursuit of happiness.

"In May of 1787, the Constitutional Convention assembled in Philadelphia to revise the Articles of Confederation. They shuttered the windows of the State House (Independence Hall) and swore secrecy so they could speak freely. By mid-June the delegates had decided to completely redesign the government. After three hot, summer months of highly charged debate, the new Constitution was signed, which remains in effect today."<sup>163</sup>

And that is what a handful of 'Americans' – now become Our Domestic Enemy – have done ever since: shuttered information and swore

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>160</sup> <u>https://taskandpurpose.com/news/marine-medal-of-honor-smedley-butler-bonus-army/; https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ralneHEMiCM.</u>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>161</sup> <u>https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Shays%27\_Rebellion</u>.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>162</sup> <u>https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Paper Money Riot.</u>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>163</sup> <u>https://www.archives.gov/milestone-documents/articles-of-confederation.</u>

secrecy to each other so as they can speak freely against our interests and in favor of their own corrupt and tyrannical ends. Just in case you doubt the rampant corruption in our system of government – whether you're a believer in Bill Gates, Mark Zuckerberg, Elon Musk, George Soros, Bill Ackman, 1 of the other 900 Billionaires, AIPAC,<sup>164</sup> Planned Parenthood, or the NRA – legalized corruption is, obviously, not new (and it doesn't have to stay that way). In 1939, 2 years before America entered WWII, Frank Capra released Mr. Smith Goes to Washington with Jimmy Stewart (in his breakout role) as the eponymous Jefferson Smith. We, The People, have always understood the degradation of our lives by wealthy corruption, but we've never had a knowledge dissemination tool that could coordinate our objection. Mr. Smith Goes to Washington "angered the political establishment but won wide acclaim from the *public* and film industry" [emphasis supplied]. "The film's essential belief in the power of democracy was highlighted when, in 1942, several cinemas in France chose it as the final English-language motion picture to be shown before a Nazi-ordered ban was imposed."165

Because we have always been engaged in an Information War against Our Domestic Enemy, and Our Domestic Enemy has always had a stranglehold on the dissemination of information, we have always been subject to their corrupt and tyrannical ways. If enough of us emerge in 2024, the internet has the power to permanently change that degrading balance of power in America. If knowledge is power, and all knowledge is absolute power, in America there is only 1 legitimate repository of that knowledge and power: We, the People.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>164</sup> Which should, if truth and accuracy were American ideals, be called AZPAC – the American Zionist Political Action Committee.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>165</sup> <u>https://www.britannica.com/topic/Mr-Smith-Goes-to-Washington.</u>

## June 21, 1788.

The United States Constitution was ratified on June 21, 1788.<sup>166</sup> Entirely avoiding the legal obligations of the new government to secure the equality of all the newly American people to their "unalienable Rights" of "Life, Liberty and the Pursuit of Happiness" as mandated by *The Declaration of Independence* (our founding legal document), the Constitution's framers watered *The Declaration of Independence*'s soaring English rhetoric down, to near dissolution, to: "We the People of the United States, in Order to form a more perfect Union …" There's not another word in the Constitution that approximates securing your birthright to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

*Every* serious scholar and objective reader of the Constitution knows that the framers detested democracy; that is, 1 person 1 vote. Behind shuttered windows so as the people couldn't know their actual intentions, the framers did everything they could to minimize your power. Pursuant to the Constitution, *nobody* other than wealthy white men could hold office; no women and no blacks and no Native Americans – a stark challenge to The Declaration of Independence's irreversible guarantee of equality. Professor Peterson, we agree with you wholeheartedly and instinctively – American equality means equality of *opportunity* and has *nothing* to do with equality of outcome. Logically, for hundreds of millions of us to have equality of opportunity, that tiny corrupt cabal who have stolen the vast majority of our wealth will by definition and necessity have far less luxurious outcomes (and once their crimes have been proven, maybe no luxurious outcome at all). Ask Professor Peterson if he sees a problem with that, and if he does, force him to answer why in simple declarations that a 10 year old could understand.

No sophistry can persuade anyone in the 21<sup>st</sup> century that the phrase "all men are created equal" "endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights" was intrinsic to a Constitution that excluded 50% of the population – even after you adjust for historical niceties – just by virtue of their sex, and even more just by virtue of their skin color. Similarly, no

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>166</sup> The author is an insufficiently informed scholar to know, on writing this sentence, the exact date. Some say in 1789 and some say on June 21, 1788.

sophistry can persuade anyone that democracy motivated the framers who saw fit, and this comes as a surprise to many of us, *not* to ratify the right to vote. So antagonistic were they to the right to vote that the Constitution does not have *a single word* protecting it. You can have all sorts of arguments about what a democracy should or could be, but if the democracy doesn't *first* zealously protect the right to vote, is that system worthy of the name?

In addition, *only* landowners could hold office. How many landowners and their children fought and died or suffered permanent physical or psychological injury during the Revolutionary War (1-5%, maybe)? How much would you bet that the vast majority of physical and psychological death and injury suffered during the Revolutionary War was suffered by those of the Founding Generation who owned *no* land?

"[T]he right to vote, was granted exclusively to white, land-owning men."  $^{\rm 167}$ 

While American poor whites, women, and blacks eventually – through massive emancipatory struggle – secured the "right" to vote through political pressure, Our Domestic Enemy, using the United States Supreme Court since 1976 (*Buckley v. Valeo*<sup>168</sup>) has intentionally and consistently frittered away that hard-earned right by making your vote's power contingent upon the amount of money you have.<sup>169</sup> How many Senators' and Supreme Court Justice's mansions can a Billionaire afford?<sup>170</sup> If you can't understand why money in politics is disastrous for democracy, you don't care about your own freedom. In 2010, the United States Supreme Court destroyed democracy (until enough of us wake up) in the

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>167</sup> <u>https://education.nationalgeographic.org/resource/voting-rights-throughout-history/</u>.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>168</sup> <u>https://supreme.justia.com/cases/federal/us/424/1/</u>.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>169</sup> Sounds historically consistent, right? <u>https://citizenstakeaction.org/supreme-</u> <u>court-decisions/#6</u> (this is a good history of the Supreme Court's recent approach to money in politics).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>170</sup> Hint: *all* of them.
*Citizens United v. FEC*<sup>171</sup> decision. Senator Mitt Romney explained this most clearly when he famously responded to our demands in 2011 that corporations pay taxes stating: "Corporations are people, my friend ... Of course they are ..."<sup>172</sup> Why would corporations pay taxes or facilitate your right to vote when they – as people, Senator Romney – write the tax codes and the voting laws for all Federal and State governments (just like their precursors did after the Civil War and WWI)?

We the People didn't even get to vote for United States Senators for **125** years following the Constitution's ratification; we didn't get that right until the ratification of the 17<sup>th</sup> Amendment in 1913. Pressure amongst We The People had neared boiling point, and the landlords knew it. "[T]he Senate was seen as a 'millionaire's club' serving powerful private interests. The rise of the People's Party, commonly referred to as the Populist Party, added motivation for making the Senate more directly accountable to the people."<sup>173</sup> That sounds just like today, and just as it was in 1939 – as portrayed to massive public approval in *Mr. Smith Goes To Washington*.

Don't get us wrong. There is genius in the Constitution's system of checks and balances, but in our view that genius was accidental – it was occasioned only by the landlords' mistrust of *each other*. How would a Southern landlord trust a Northern landlord (not to mention a New York landlord another New York landlord) not to be aiming to screw them in the future? They couldn't, because each knew that the other would screw their best friend or daughter if it meant another dollar in their pockets. So (behind shuttered windows and closed doors) they came up with an elaborately conceived system to check each other's power. Most of all, though, the landlords didn't trust (or like) *you*.

Another anti-democratic feature wrought in the Constitution by omission, notwithstanding its elaborately and creatively devised system of checks and balances, was *who* determined the meaning of the Constitution.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>171</sup> <u>https://supreme.justia.com/cases/federal/us/558/310/.</u>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>172</sup> <u>https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=KlPQkd\_AA6c</u>.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>173</sup> <u>https://www.archives.gov/legislative/features/17th-amendment.</u>

There is only one legitimately American answer to that question: *We The People*. How could it be any other way if the Constitution's and government's sole legitimacy for the exercise of any power comes from *Us*; as *The Declaration of Independence* has now taught us: "Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed". If you consider yourself to be amongst the governed, we urge you to stop voting for the lesser of 2 evils – because you're voting for evil either way, and you will see the blood on your hands once the carefully crafted illusion of contemporary democracy has been wiped from your eyes and unblocked from your ears. "If the doors of perception were cleansed everything would appear to man as it is, infinite."<sup>174</sup>

If you think that democracy came under some sort of serious threat on January 6, your emotions are clearly hiding history from you. Set aside the anti-democracy baked into the Constitution for a moment. Don't you think that your democracy was much more obviously stolen from you on J.F.K.'s assassination in 1963? Or if you choose to persist with questions about who might have been responsible for that assassination, how about in 2000 when the United States Supreme Court, in the future infamous Bush v. Gore<sup>175</sup>, moronically installed the cleverly moronic rich-kid George W. Bush as president (if you doubt the cleverly bit, watch Sam Rockwell's depiction of W. in Adam McKay's tour-de-force 2018 movie Vice (with Christian Bale portraying Cheney and Steve Carell portraying Rumsfeld)). What immediately followed the United States Supreme Court's moronic Bush decision? 9-11, the Patriot Act, the Afghanistan War, and the Iraq War. Do you seriously think the events of January 6 more confrontational to democracy than the assassination of a President and the installation, by 9 unelected 'lawyers', of another?

Beware the "military-industrial complex" President Dwight D. Eisenhower warned us in his farewell address (a few years before Kennedy's assassination), stating: "The potential for the disastrous rise of

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>174</sup> <u>https://ypn.poetrysociety.org.uk/features/william-blake-and-the-doors-of-perception/</u>.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>175</sup> <u>https://supreme.justia.com/cases/federal/us/531/98/</u>.

misplaced power exists and will persist."<sup>176</sup> Military-industrial complex? Sounds like a Supreme Court that ratifies the killing of a Commander in Chief to ensure war (Vietnam) *and* installs a Commander in Chief to overlook and oversee a violent attack on our country and then lie us into two disastrous wars as a result – wars which slaughtered way more innocent human beings than the number of Americans who died on 9-11<sup>177</sup> and cost *you* **\$8 trillion**<sup>178</sup>.

These 'people' are *still* holding all the levers of power. Are you awake yet? Your fear and ire should be aimed at the powerful – not your neighbors who are struggling just as hard to make sense of, and live, their lives as you are (no matter whether they are Republicans or Democrats).

How did we come to believe that it is the Supreme Court, rather than us, that gets to decide what the Constitution means? In 1803 the Supreme Court itself simply told us that it had that power in a case called *Marbury v. Madison*.<sup>179</sup> And the then President and Congress just accepted it. In light of what may be beginning to dawn on us, does it come as any surprise that the *only* unelected (you don't get to vote for them) branch of the 3 branches of government<sup>180</sup> established by the Constitution is the same branch that now gets to decide what the Constitution means (and to flip-flop on that meaning constantly)? Is it a surprise to you that the Supreme Court is more culturally powerful than the President or Congress? If the Supreme Court decided that military aid to Ukraine or Israel or Saudi Arabia (or anywhere

<sup>177</sup> <u>https://www.statista.com/statistics/303472/us-military-fatalities-in-iraq-and-afghanistan/</u>.

<sup>178</sup> <u>https://www.brown.edu/news/2021-09-01/costsofwar</u>.

<sup>179</sup> <u>https://www.law.cornell.edu/supremecourt/text/5/137</u>.

<sup>180</sup> Article I of the Constitution establishes the Executive branch (headed by the President) who you vote for; Article II of the Constitution establishes the Legislative branch (made up of Congress (the Senate and the House of Representatives)) who you vote for; and Article III of the Constitution establishes the Judicial Branch (headed by the Supreme Court) who you *don't* vote for.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>176</sup> <u>https://www.archives.gov/milestone-documents/president-dwight-d-eisenhowers-farewell-address</u>.

else) were unconstitutional (which it is), don't you think America would listen? In a non-hypothetical, when the Supreme Court decided abortion was a federal constitutional question, didn't we listen? We did. That is until the Supreme Court flip-flopped and decided that abortion was not a federal question; at which point we listened to that. Just like we listened to the infamous 1857 *Dred Scott* decision that slaves weren't entitled to any protection, and we currently listen to another future infamous decision, 2013s *Shelby County v. Holder*<sup>181</sup>, which decided that racism in America was no longer an issue (?!) and that *our* 'representatives' in the Senate were wrong even though they had voted **98-0** to re-authorize the Voting Rights Act (the quintessential piece of Civil Rights legislation (the "VRA")) *less than 10 years earlier* in 2006.<sup>182</sup>

Set aside whether you think it appropriate that the unelected Supreme Court should have the power to determine for all 330,000,000 of us whether racism was still an issue in America. Focus on the fact that 5 of those 9 unelected individuals – for whom you did not vote, not even close – overrode your millions of votes when you 'elected' the 98 Senators who voted for the VRA. 5 people overriding 98 people in turn overriding millions – do you continue to think that the operatic MSNBC production of January 6 played *any* role in the theft of American democracy?

We still need a Constitution, and we still need an Executive, a Legislative, and a Judicial branch, though with checks and balances defined and delineated by us – in a more perfect union – to secure **Our** lives, liberties, and our pursuit of happiness. It is time to "alter" our government, as *The Declaration of Independence* gives us all the moral and legal authority to

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>181</sup> <u>https://www.law.cornell.edu/supremecourt/text/12-96</u>.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>182</sup> <u>https://www.nytimes.com/2006/07/21/washington/21vote.html</u>. It's not like the Supreme Court didn't know that before the 98-0 vote on the VRA some members of the House of Representatives (doesn't matter whether they were Democrats or Republicans) vehemently objected to the VRA because they claimed it "unfairly singled out Southern states for special federal oversight when they have eradicated the rampant discrimination that spurred enactment of the law in 1965." The question that should concern us is: how many members of the Supreme Court knew in 2006 that they would soon come to ratify the desires of the dissenting House members?

insist upon. A simple change in American incentives can achieve this quickly. Greed is the problem, and always has been; the Bible taught us this long ago:

"For the *love* of money is the root of all evil: which while some coveted after, they have erred from the faith, and pierced themselves through with many sorrows. [emphasis supplied]"<sup>183</sup> 1 Timothy 6:10; King James Version.

Money, just a very useful tool (see pp.44-47 above), is not the problem. The *love* of money (greed) is the problem.

# IN THE 21<sup>ST</sup> CENTURY, AMERICANS MUST FINALLY LEARN THAT "WAR IS A RACKET"; AND A FULL-FRONTAL ASSAULT ON COMMON SENSE.

It is not difficult to conclude that there have only been two 'necessary' American wars – the Revolutionary War and World War II. The first of those wars, which gave us birth, is the only American war that can unreservedly be characterized by war's only legitimate justification: selfdefense. *Yet* there have only been 15 years in our nearly 250 year history that America has not been at war somewhere.<sup>184</sup>

Why? Because war is the most effective mechanism for Our Domestic Enemy to satisfy their greed and maintain their anti-democratic, anti-meritocratic and thoroughly anti-American status. Put more succinctly, *War is a Racket*, which is the title of United States Marine Major General Smedley Darlington Butler's 1935 speech and 12 page *free* book.<sup>185</sup> Smedley Butler died 5 years later in 1940 (more on his death below) with 16 medals.

<sup>183</sup> 

https://www.biblegateway.com/passage/?search=1%20Timothy%206:10&ver sion=KJV.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>184</sup> <u>https://medium.com/traveling-through-history/only-15-years-of-peace-in-the-history-of-the-united-states-of-america-c479193df79f</u>. And yet some people persist in fantasizing that the military-industrial-complex is a conspiracy theory.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>185</sup> <u>https://ratical.org/ratville/CAH/warisaracket.pdf</u>.

He was the most decorated Marine in United States history – 5 medals were for heroism. Smedley Butler is 1 of 19 men to receive the Medal of Honor twice; 1 of 3 to be awarded both the Marine Corps Brevet Medal and the Medal of Honor, and the only Marine to be awarded the Brevet Medal and 2 Medals of Honor, all for separate actions.<sup>186</sup> Butler is also 1 of 265 Americans included in Great American Robert Shetterly's portrait series *Americans Who Tell The Truth*.<sup>187</sup>

Butler's 12 page book has 5 chapters which are titled War Is A Racket; Who Makes The Profits?; Who Pays The Bills?; How To Smash This Racket!; and To Hell With War! You can read *War is a Racket* here.<sup>188</sup> If you're interested in finding ways to remove Our Domestic Enemy, we believe you'd do well to take a few moments to read *War is a Racket* rather than having us say any more about it.

While there is much to know about Smedley Butler, we want to focus on only 3 incidents in his celebrated life. In 1932 Butler appeared in support of the Bonus Army<sup>189</sup> (a group of 43,000 starving World War I United States veterans who wanted to be paid as they were promised, so as they could eat) days before their Washington D.C. demonstration was burnt to the ground by their brethren in the United States military on President Herbert Hoover's order to General Douglas MacArthur.

In 1933, in a fascist plot known to history as the Business Plot<sup>190</sup>, some members of America's then ruling class attempted to recruit Smedley

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>186</sup> <u>https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Smedley\_Butler</u>.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>187</sup> <u>https://americanswhotellthetruth.org/portrait-gallery/</u>. We've never heard of many of Shetterly's Americans, and question his inclusion of some (particularly some of the recent political operatives), but what do *you* think? Among others, we'd urge Robert Shetterly to add, among others, Scott Ritter, Diane Sare, José Vega and Kshama Sawant.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>188</sup> <u>https://ratical.org/ratville/CAH/warisaracket.pdf</u>.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>189</sup> <u>https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bonus\_Army.</u>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>190</sup> <u>https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Business Plot.</u>

Butler to overthrow President Franklin Delano Roosevelt with military force and proclaim himself dictator. Following Congress' investigation of Butler's allegations, they issued a report concluding:

"There is no question that these [fascist] attempts were discussed, were planned, and might have been placed in execution when and if the financial backers deemed it expedient."

Yet you likely haven't heard of the Business Plot, don't know any of the names of the people involved, and no one ever went to jail – for straight up treason. Just like no one ever went to jail for the assassination of J.F.K. '*But Lee Harvey Oswald*', you may fearfully scream about the "patsy". Well, no one ever went to jail for Abu Ghraib either; and thus we can't hear the screams for Lynndie England<sup>191</sup> (a 21<sup>st</sup> century patsy) quite so loudly as for Lee Harvey Oswald. Indeed, Gina Haspel got promoted to CIA Director, at least in part, for destroying documents related to America's torture program in Iraq.<sup>192</sup> Hopefully by the end of this pamphlet you'll be laughing at yourself if you screamed (or even thought of) Lee Harvey Oswald moments ago.

At the surprisingly young age of 58 in June 1940, Smedley Butler, the most-decorated Marine, became sick from an unidentified illness and died 2 weeks later, never having been able to drive his brand new car – perhaps a 1940 Buick Roadmaster Convertible<sup>193</sup>(?) – which his family brought to the hospital so as he could look at it from his hospital room window and look forward to driving it home. A natural death?

While you may not yet be convinced of the truth of Smedley Butler's *War is a Racket*, here's Professor Jeffrey Sachs explaining it recently: <u>https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=dlKuQ3r3Mwk</u>.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>191</sup> <u>https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Lynndie England.</u>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>192</sup> <u>https://nsarchive.gwu.edu/briefing-book/intelligence-torture-archive/2018-04-26/gina-haspels-cia-torture-file</u>.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>193</sup> <u>https://i.redd.it/lzgg25u1mbj51.jpg</u>.

President Eisenhower – who had surely read *War is a Racket* – warned us in his farewell address:

"In the councils of government, we must guard against the acquisition of unwarranted influence, whether sought or unsought, by the military-industrial complex. The potential for the disastrous rise of misplaced power exists and will persist.

We must never let the weight of this combination endanger our liberties or democratic processes. We should take nothing for granted. Only an alert and knowledgeable citizenry can compel the proper meshing of the huge industrial and military machinery of defense with our peaceful methods and goals, so that security and liberty may prosper together."<sup>194</sup>

If Eisenhower's stark warning, based on his institutional knowledge, is insufficient to convince you of the fact that war is a racket, particularly when combined with the assassination of his successor JFK nearly three years later, perhaps the second concrete fact will:

War – we bet every Decent American citizen (you, that is) will wholeheartedly agree – is *only* appropriate or even thinkable in selfdefense. If that's the case, then why do your tax dollars go so massively to a war budget that is \$1 trillion per year? That budget apparently doesn't even secure our borders. Meanwhile, that \$1 trillion is more than the next ten (10) largest war budgets (yes, both China *and* Russia are in those 10) in the world <u>combined</u>. In other words, if you add up the war budgets of the next ten (10) largest war budgets – all ten (10) don't equal the amount spent by the United States. China's is the next largest (about one third of ours) at \$292 billion<sup>195</sup>, and China has a population that is roughly four times the size of ours – and we *still* can't win a war with China over Taiwan (ask

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>194</sup> <u>https://www.archives.gov/milestone-documents/president-dwight-d-eisenhowers-farewell-address</u>.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>195</sup> <u>https://www.axios.com/2023/04/24/global-military-spending-2022-us-china-russia-list</u>.

Scott Ritter, Douglas McGregor, Larry Wilkerson, Ray McGovern, John Mearsheimer, or many others for the source documents for that conclusion (that is if your common sense doesn't already draw that conclusion because Taiwan is more than 7,000 miles away from us!). Russia's war budget is the next largest, after China's, and is **one tenth (1/10<sup>th</sup>)** the size of the United States' war budget and we have just decisively lost a war with Russia (whether you believe we've lost yet will depend on whether you listen to mainstream media or independent journalism, but plenty of highly knowledgeable people have been saying for a long time that there was never any way that Russia could lose (much less Ukraine win) this war). That makes the delivery of, so far, \$100 billion to Ukraine since the war's start on February 24, 2022 even more interesting in light of Hunter Biden's laptop.

Russia smashed us to pieces with an \$86 billion annual war budget. Why? Because war is a racket. America's military must be modernized and re-vamped for self-defense. Enough of this imperialist, colonialist superiority-complex driven savagery.

## FEBRUARY 20, 1939 – JULY 20, 1945 (Hitler's and Nazism's Defeat).

What was Nazism? Simply put, it was the belief that one type of people (white, preferably tall, blonde-haired and blue-eyed, and preferably non-religious – the so-called "Aryans"<sup>196</sup>) were superior to *every other* type of person; that therefore the Aryans should control the world, and that anyone who disagreed should be censored, and if that didn't work, tortured, and if that didn't work, experimented upon, and if that didn't work, enslaved and exterminated. Nazism brought us the Holocaust as it's "final solution." *Never forget* that.

We are told that the United States defeated Hitler and Nazism in WWII. And we celebrate the fact that the United States defeated Nazism and Hitler in WWII.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>196</sup> <u>https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Aryan\_race</u>.

While we should remain proud of our role in defeating Nazism in WWII, we should also become proud of, and celebrate, Soviet Russia's role in Nazism's defeat. Why? While the United States lost nearly 420,000 (420 thousand) brave, proud, and patriotic citizens, the Soviets lost 27,000,000 (27 *million*) brave, proud, and patriotic citizens.<sup>197</sup> Why did so many Soviets, as opposed to Americans die defeating Nazism? Because Russia has a border with Ukraine – through which the Nazis marched – and the United States does not.

We *maybe* haven't had a President (as opposed to an anti-democratic wannabe Dictator (all dictators, whether Mussolini or Hitler or any other, need a large number of influential minions around them)) serve a full term in office since the term Nazi, in 1926, became associated with Adolf Hitler.<sup>198</sup>

We should not forget that there were many wealthy Americans – 20,000 with the kind of power necessary to take over New York City's Madison Square Garden and hold a Nazi rally – who were fully supportive of Hitler and Nazism. Watch the 16 minute video (https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=O2-E5DHQMbY&t=44s)<sup>199</sup> which includes footage from inside Madison Square Garden on February 20, 1939 while Hitler was concluding construction of his sixth concentration camp in Europe. As well as a group called the German American Bund, Hitler had famous and powerful friends in America like Henry Ford of whom Hitler said in 1923: "We look to Heinrich Ford as the leader of the growing Fascist movement in America".<sup>200</sup> And Charles Lindbergh – yes, *that* 

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>197</sup> <u>https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/World War II casualties</u>.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>198</sup> If you're interested in source material, according to the not-so-trustworthy Wikipedia (<u>https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Nazism</u>), this fact is taken from "Goebbels, Joseph (1927) 'The Nazi-Sozi', translated and annotated by Randall Bytwerk, Calvin College German Propaganda Archive". Calvin Coolidge was President of the United States from 1924-1928.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>199</sup> Clips are from 2017's Oscar-nominated short film *A Night At the Garden* <u>https://anightatthegarden.com/#post-67</u>.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>200</sup> <u>https://mickeyz.substack.com/p/if-you-ever-start-trusting-us-businessmen</u>.

Charles Lindbergh – who was decorated with a medal by his good friend Hermann Göring (the head of Hitler's air force, the Luftwaffe).<sup>201</sup> American Roman Catholics, infamously like Father Charles Coughlin (with a radio audience of tens of millions of Americans<sup>202</sup>) was also a Nazi sympathizer, apparently on the Nazi payroll.<sup>203</sup>

On July 20, 1945, months before the official end of WW II, the then American ruling class sanctioned and initiated Operation Overcast which was renamed and is now better known to millions of us as Operation Paperclip.<sup>204</sup> For those of you who still don't know, Operation Paperclip was the United States government's top secret classified immigration of at least 2,100 *Nazi* scientists and their families with changed names and manufactured histories. A reasonable guesstimate is that 5,000 Nazis were secretly infiltrated into American society (surely most of those scientists had a wife and children). We hear you wail that this can't be true. To begin to dispel this cry, let's look at a fact that more of us do know: Wernher Von Braun<sup>205</sup> was a high-ranking Nazi scientist who is celebrated in America as a result of his work at NASA in connection with the Apollo moon mission.

It wasn't until 2014 that we Decent Americans learnt from investigative reporter Annie Jacobsen's book *Operation Paperclip* that thousands of Nazi scientists and their families were secretly brought to these United States and renamed – so as they could infiltrate amongst us. We have no idea whether Simon Wiesenthal<sup>206</sup> knew about Operation

- <sup>202</sup> <u>https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Charles Coughlin</u>.
- <sup>203</sup> <u>https://historynewsnetwork.org/article/168206</u>.
- <sup>204</sup> <u>https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Operation Paperclip</u>.
- <sup>205</sup> <u>https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wernher\_von\_Braun</u>.
- <sup>206</sup> <u>https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Simon Wiesenthal</u>.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>201</sup> <u>https://www.historynet.com/hermann-goring-preens-charles-lindbergh/</u>.

Paperclip, but through his work at the Simon Wiesenthal Center, he knew that Nazis needed to be hunted in America.<sup>207</sup> Al Pacino's portrayal of Wiesenthal in Amazon Prime's 3 season (2020-2023) series *Hunters*, doesn't do justice to the historical reality because it doesn't make clear that it's based on historical reality (in significant part by changing Wiesenthal's name to Meyer Offerman).<sup>208</sup>

You might believe the story spun to us – that America needed Nazi scientists to beat the Soviet Union in the space race – but if you do, you may come to hang your heads in shame. While the United States *was* the first to land on the moon (Apollo, 1969), the Soviet Union was: (i) the first to put an artificial object into earth's orbit (Sputnik I, 1957); (ii) the first to put a living being, Laika the dog into earth's orbit (Sputnik II, 1957); (iii) the first to put a man in space (Yuri Gagarin, 1961); (iv) the first to put a woman in space (Valentina Tereshkova, 1963); and (v) the first to have a human being walk in space (Alexei Leonov (1965). It is true that the Soviet Union also brought Nazi scientists to the Soviet Union after WWII, but they were not "legitimized" with changed names and fabricated histories, and were returned to Germany – mostly before 1954 – once the Soviet Union understood that the German scientists were no more advanced than their scientists.<sup>209</sup>

In the brilliant 2022 movie *Amsterdam*, Robert De Niro plays General Gil Dillenbeck – a character based on Major General Smedley Darlington Butler.<sup>210</sup> It seems strange, at first, that De Niro – such a central figure of

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>207</sup> We must continue and expand that hunt. We the People should fully review the archives of the C.I.A. and the Simon Weisenthal Center so as we can *precisely* determine who the descendants (children, grandchildren, and great grandchildren) of the Nazi scientists are, and *ensure* that Nazism no longer informs their ideologies as Americans.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>208</sup> Just like Major General Smedley Darlington Butler's name was changed to General Gil Dellenbeck in the 2022 movie *Amsterdam* (see below).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>209</sup> <u>https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Operation\_Osoaviakhim.</u>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>210</sup> <u>https://slate.com/culture/2022/10/amsterdam-movie-true-story-real-history-business-plot.html</u>.

the ruling class – would be in such a movie. But then we remembered that De Niro's brain (like many of ours) was broken by Trump, so he perhaps thought that he was making an anti-Trump, pro-Democrat movie without realizing that he was making an anti-ruling class movie.<sup>211</sup> We wonder whether De Niro now regrets his vocal support of Biden (after Ukraine and Israel)? How about Margot Robbie, Christian Bale, John David Washington, Chris Rock, Mike Meyers, or Michael Shannon (all *Amsterdam* co-stars); what do they think of Our Domestic Enemy? Once America's hopefully digested this pamphlet, it might be worth asking these, and all other, influential actors. While some reviews of *Amsterdam* were critical of its historical inaccuracies, we thought the movie made its point – and Smedley Butler's – quite well, including with some wonderfully whimsical photographs of the principal characters just before the closing credits hammering that point home.

## WTF HAPPENED IN 1971? (Our Domestic Enemy's Ensuing Theft of \$47 Trillion From Us).

In September 2020 the RAND Corporation – a pre-eminent 'think tank' of Our Domestic Enemy<sup>212</sup> – bragged that between 1974 and 2018 **47** *trillion dollars (\$47,000,000,000,000)* of American wealth was transferred from the 99% (us, Decent Americans) to the 1% (Our Domestic

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>211</sup> Here's footage (<u>https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=74wrX8rKtzw</u>) of Smedley Butler which De Niro acts at 56m35s of *Amsterdam*. Here's footage of Smedley Butler decrying foreign war: <u>https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=VagL88f7mk8</u>.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>212</sup> Great American Daniel Ellsberg, may he rest in peace, worked for the RAND Corporation when he released their documents – The Pentagon Papers in 1971 – which began the end of the Vietnam War because Decent Americans became educated about that war <u>https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Daniel\_Ellsberg</u>. For those of you unfamiliar with The Pentagon Papers **and the criticality of a free press**, watch Tom Hanks and Meryl Streep in the 2017 movie *The Post*.

Enemy).<sup>213</sup> Put differently "had the more equitable income distributions of the three decades following World War II (1945 through 1974) merely held steady, the aggregate annual income of Americans earning below the 90th percentile would have been \$2.5 trillion higher in the year 2018 alone. That is an amount equal to nearly 12 percent of GDP—enough to more than double median income—enough to pay every single working American in the bottom nine deciles an additional \$1,144 a month. Every month. Every single year."<sup>214</sup>

How has Our Domestic Enemy's theft of \$47 trillion from you since 1974 affected your lives?

Not well, as the website wtfhappenedin1971 (<u>https://wtfhappenedin1971.com</u> ("*WTF*")) details and charts.

Between 1948 and 1971, your productivity increased by 90.84% and your compensation (your wages (what Our Domestic Enemy pays you to give them luxury)) grew roughly equally. Between 1971 and 2017, your wages grew by about 25% while your productivity grew by about 156%. Both parents of children are now working. In 1971, in roughly 2% of American households, only the wife worked; by 2010, that was up to 7%. In 1971, in roughly 38% of American households, only the husband worked; by 2010 that was down to 21%. In 1971, in roughly 47% of American households, both spouses worked; by 2010, that was up to 66%.

In 1971, a new house cost \$25,200.00, a new car cost \$3,560.00, Harvard cost \$2,600.00 per year, average rent was \$150.00 a month, a movie ticket was \$1.50, a gallon of gas was \$0.40, a stamp was \$0.08, milk was \$1.17 a gallon, eggs were \$0.45 per dozen, and a loaf of freshly baked bread was \$0.25. In 2023, the median cost of a home is \$382,000.00,<sup>215</sup> the average cost of a gallon of milk is \$3.04 (\$5.98 in Hawaii), and the average cost of a gallon of a gas is \$3.27.<sup>216</sup> Radio ads tell us we spend \$5,000.00 per

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>213</sup> <u>https://www.rand.org/pubs/working\_papers/WRA516-1.html</u>.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>214</sup> <u>https://time.com/5888024/50-trillion-income-inequality-america/.</u>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>215</sup> <u>https://www.forbes.com/advisor/mortgages/real-estate/median-home-prices-by-state/</u>.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>216</sup> <u>https://www.finder.com/gas-prices</u>.

year each on gas now. In other words, cumulative inflation has risen from 306.12% in 1971 (having been roughly 0% in 1913) to a staggering 2,326.58% in 2015 (see *WTF*). In 1971, it took roughly 2.4 years to save for a house, which shot up to 6.9 years in 2020. If you consider home ownership central to Decent American lives (which we did until very recently when we were suddenly told that we "will own nothing, and be happy"<sup>217</sup>), these numbers will be alarming you. Today, house ownership for young adults in America is usually inconceivable.

Since 1971, the ideological positions of the Democrats and the Republicans has dramatically diverged, having steadily converged between 1900 and about 1960 (see WTF "Ideological Positions of the Major Parties" graph). Don't be misled, the divergence is designed polarization – Our Domestic Enemy keeps us divided so as we're easier to conquer. The vast majority of registered Republicans and Democrats agree on what America's future should be. In other words, when Decent Americans had a say in their futures – with the emergence of the largest 'middle class' in human history to that point – ideological viewpoints were minimized. By stoking polarization, Our Domestic Enemy manipulates the tried and tested tactic of dictatorship: divide and conquer. Between 1971 and 2015, the number of people who deeply cared about "being very well off financially" rose from just over 35% to about 82%, while the number of people who cared about "developing a meaningful philosophy of life" dropped from nearly 80% to about 46%. The numbers of lawyers rose exponentially between 1971 and 2010, perhaps proving Stalin correct. Stalin was apparently asked, after Yalta in 1945, whether he feared making a deal with the Americans, and responded: "Why should I fear them? Their lawyers will destroy them."

Between 1925 and 1971, the number of Americans in jail remained roughly constant. Between 1971 and 2014 the number of Americans in jail rose exponentially (see *WTF "Incarceration rate of inmates"*). The percentage of 18-29 year olds living with their parents in 2023 is higher than at any point in American history, even higher than during the Great Depression

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>217</sup> <u>https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=omAk1gMyw7E</u>.

and WWII – the highest prior points. Since 1971, the median age of first marriage has also risen exponentially, from about 21 for women and 23 for men to, in 2019, about 28 for women and 30 for men. Divorce amongst Decent Americans rose exponentially after 1971, having shown a steady – but incremental – rise since 1950.

Between 1971 and 2012, the number of Decent American single parent families with children in "Official Poverty" rose exponentially, while the number of Decent American married-couple families with children in "Official Poverty" remained relatively consistent. While the number of children born to unmarried women was growing in these United States between 1930 and 1971, the numbers leapt after 1971 to an average of 40.6% with a high of 28.6% for white women and a high of 72.3% for black women by 2008. If there's any part of you that believes those numbers are a result of anything other than policies designed by Our Domestic Enemy, we beg you to re-examine that conclusion. It *does not* have to be this way.

Obesity has also risen dramatically since 1971 (see WTF "Trends in obesity among children and adolescents aged 2-19 years"). The growth of administrators in health care (people paid by insurance companies to minimize pay-outs by insurance companies) in the United States versus actual physicians (people who supposedly take the Hippocratic Oath<sup>218</sup>) between 1971 and 2009 is – literally, to us – breathtaking: a roughly 100% rise in the number of physicians, and a roughly 3200% rise in the number

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>218</sup> <u>https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Hippocratic\_Oath</u>, part of which states "To hold my teacher in this art equal to my own parents; to make him partner in my livelihood; when he is in need of money to share mine with him; to consider his family as my own brothers, and to teach them this art, if they want to learn it, without fee or indenture" before the Psychotic Ruling Class determined to minimize the Hippocratic Oath's primary rule: "*First do no harm*". Thousands of years ago this basic concept was rendered in Latin, not English

<sup>(</sup>https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Primum non nocere). Doctors living in luxury today have adopted, and adapted to (for their own luxurious gain), the Psychotic Ruling Class' notion that your health is first and foremost *profitable*. We're not sure we need to point out that human health (yours) is grounded in *you* having access to clean air, clean water, nutritious food, and shelter.

of administrators. When we pay our most-expensive-in-the-world health insurance, and they rip us off at every single tiny moment, our money is paying these administrators – probably 3,000% of which are completely unnecessary and superfluous. And unsurprisingly, our diet has gotten worse, unhealthily worse – we're eating more chicken, grains, processed seed oils and sugars (see *WTF*). Our Domestic Enemy is the owner *and* middle man in *every* aspect of our lives. Remove Our Domestic Enemy from authority, DRAIN THE SWAMP, and nearly every problem that you think is a problem today will coherently (not like magic) disappear.

In 1952, Bill Wilson (selected by Time Magazine as 1 of the 100 most important thinkers of the 20<sup>th</sup> century) wrote his belief that:

"Poverty will disappear, and there will be such abundance that everybody can have all the security and personal satisfactions he desires. The theory seems to be that once everybody's primary instincts are satisfied, there won't be much left to quarrel about. The world will then turn happy and be free to concentrate on culture and character. Solely by their own intelligence and labor, men will have shaped their own destiny."

That future was fully visible, almost inevitable, to a Decent American in 1952 – and it was on track through the 1960s. Our Domestic Enemy has worked hard, concertedly, and consistently (not to mention ruthlessly and savagely), to ensure that imagined future stopped dead in its tracks. They have made that future (which once seemed inevitable) extremely difficult for many of us to even imagine. All we need in 2024 is to let our imaginations – for a better future for ourselves, our children, our friends, and our neighbors – loose.

The thesis of *WTF* is that the five decades long degradation of your lives was enabled exclusively by President Nixon taking the United States off the gold standard in 1971 (which *actually* resulted in the French sending a warship into New York Harbor to, unsuccessfully, retrieve their gold<sup>219</sup>). We think, that with a little exercise of your common sense, you'll come to see that while Nixon's executive action was certainly significant, context as always requires a broader historical understanding, and Nixon's executive

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>219</sup> <u>https://www.huffpost.com/entry/august-15-1971 b 4284327</u>.

action was only one of numerous events that explain the past 50 years' immiseration of your lives by Our Domestic Enemy:

JFK was assassinated in 1963 (as depicted in Oliver Stone's 1991 movie JFK, with Kevin Costner portraying the courageous Jim Garrison<sup>220</sup> who led the charge to reveal those who actually conspired to assassinate JFK). Malcolm X was assassinated in 1965 (as depicted in Spike Lee's 1992 movie Malcolm X with Denzel Washington portraying Malcolm X). RFK was assassinated in 1968 (as depicted in Emilio Estevez's 2006 movie Bobby starring Anthony Hopkins, Demi Moore and Sharon Stone). Doctor Martin Luther King was assassinated in 1968 (watch the documentary King: A Filmed Record which "was shown in movie theaters for one night only in March 1970"<sup>221</sup>). In order to get a more precise understanding of why MLK was assassinated, watch the 2021 documentary MLK/FBI. Fred Hampton was assassinated in 1969 (as depicted in Shaka King's 2021 movie Judas and the Black Messiah with Daniel Kaluuya portraying Fred Hampton). The point is that just before President Nixon took us off the gold standard in 1971, the five most consequential voices in America, *including the sitting President JFK*, and MLK who was known as "America's moral leader", who were advocating for your enhanced pursuit of happiness through enhanced peace and enhanced prosperity were assassinated by Our Domestic Enemy.

In 1968, during the Democratic National Convention in Chicago, Illinois<sup>222</sup> hundreds of protesters were injured in what became known as a "police riot" by Chicago Mayor Richard Daley's Police Department. "According to journalist Barbara Ehrenreich: 'In a rare moment of collective courage, the editors of all the nation's major newspapers

(https://www.rottentomatoes.com/m/king\_a\_filmed\_recordmontgomery\_to\_memp\_his).

https://www.history.com/topics/1960s/1968-democratic-convention.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>220</sup> <u>https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Jim Garrison</u>.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>221</sup> <u>https://www.cosmopolitan.com/entertainment/movies/a42447205/martin-luther-king-jr-movies/</u>. *King: A Filmed Record* by many audiences, has a 100% score on Rotten Tomatoes

telegrammed a strong protest to Mayor Daley.' National NBC newscaster Chet Huntley announced to the nation on the evening news that "'the news profession in this city is now under assault by the Chicago police'."<sup>223</sup> In 1970, unarmed students were murdered on the Kent State University (Ohio) campus by the Ohio National Guard for protesting the Vietnam War in what is now known as the Kent State Massacre.<sup>224</sup> The heroic Citizens' Commission to Investigate the FBI<sup>225</sup> was established in 1971 and exposed the FBI's COINTELPRO<sup>226</sup> program by breaking into an FBI office in Media, Pennsylvania. In 2015, these heroic citizens' (like Bonnie Raines and Keith Forsyth) stories were told, and honored, in the documentary *1971*.<sup>227</sup>

Collectively, are the assassinations (JFK, King, Hampton *et al*), massacres, riots, local revolutions, and Nixon's withdrawal from the gold standard sufficient to explain wtf happened in 1971? We don't believe so. While there may also be numerous international events that contributed to the fifty year immiseration of Decent America, the 6 day war launched on June 5, 1967 by Israel<sup>228</sup> and the resulting UN Resolution 242<sup>229</sup> will surely be considered one of the most significant by future historians.

<sup>223</sup> https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/1968 Democratic National Convention prote <u>sts</u>. 224 https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Kent State shootings. 225 https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Citizens' Commission to Investigate the FBI. 226 https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/COINTELPRO. 227 https://www.pbs.org/independentlens/documentaries/1971/; https://whyy.org/articles/how-to-break-into-the-fbi-50-years-later-media-burglarsget-local-honors/. 228 https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Six-Day\_War. 229 https://peacemaker.un.org/sites/peacemaker.un.org/files/SCRes242%281967

We also believe two pieces of tectonic technology, and one piece of business and political chicanery are necessary to give a fuller explanatory scope to how 1971 appears to be the year that began the systematic stalling of America's greatest ever engine of prosperity: America's middle class.

The first tectonic technology was 1960's introduction of the birthcontrol pill<sup>230</sup> which allowed a sudden transformation in the relationships of men and women which technological transformation, as far as we know, has not been studied in any systematic depth. Using a modicum of critical thought will tell you why this shift – laudably altering sex and work relations between human beings for the first time in human history – will come to be seen as tectonic. The second tectonic technology was the invention and patenting of the first microprocessor (by Intel - the Intel 4004) in 1971.<sup>231</sup> We, as a nation, were not educated about the microprocessor and its ramifications before it became such an integral factor in all of our daily lives, and believe it promoted Arthur C. Clarke's conclusion that "any sufficiently advanced technology is indistinguishable from magic."<sup>232</sup> Here's Arthur C. Clarke predicting our future (what we live today which was then collectively unfathomable) in 1964.<sup>233</sup> As we approach the second quarter of the 21<sup>st</sup> century, we need to educate ourselves about how these tectonic technologies (and others if you think there are others from the 60s and 70s) enabled gross concentrations of wealth by a tiny cabal. The one piece of political and business chicanery was a man named Lewis Powell.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>230</sup> <u>https://www.verywellhealth.com/a-brief-history-on-the-birth-control-pill-</u> 3522634.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>231</sup> <u>https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Intel 4004</u>.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>232</sup> <u>https://en.wikiquote.org/wiki/Arthur C. Clarke</u>.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>233</sup> <u>https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=YwELr8ir9qM</u>.

#### Lewis Powell's Famous Memo.

Lewis F. Powell, Jr., a lifelong Democrat and legal champion of the tobacco industry, was asked in 1971 by a friend (the Chairman of the Education Committee of the lobbying powerhouse the U.S. Chamber of Commerce) to write a memorandum on how corporations could fight back against what they perceived to be the disastrously uncontrollable humanity. Powell confidentially (meaning you didn't get to know about it until years later, after the damage had been wrought) sent his friend what is now known as the "Powell Memo"<sup>234</sup> on August 23, 1971.<sup>235</sup> The Powell Memo - in flowery, non-threatening language to be sure - lays out precisely how corporations would plot and combine to control us. The Powell Memo was the blueprint used by Our Domestic Enemy to spread the hidden stranglehold its military wing had on the American government - the "military-industrial complex" - to all aspects of American government. The Powell Memo was reasonably characterized in 2012 as "A Call to Arms for Class War: From the Top Down".236 Knowing this was a long-term project - the upheaval and reversal of growing unity amongst us - Powell wrote: "Strength lies in organization, in careful long-range planning and

implementation, in consistency of action over an indefinite period of years, in the scale of financing available only through joint effort, and the political power available only through united action and national organizations."

234

<sup>&</sup>lt;u>https://www.thwink.org/sustain/articles/017\_PowellMemo/PowellMemoRep</u> roduction.pdf.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>235</sup> Klaus Schwab also founded the World Economic Forum in 1971 (https://www.weforum.org/agenda/2023/12/world-economic-forum-davos-at-50history-a-timeline-of-highlights/) and the Trilateral Commission was established in 1973 (https://www.britannica.com/topic/Trilateral-Commission).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>236</sup> <u>https://www.counterpunch.org/2012/05/11/a-call-to-arms-for-class-war-from-the-top-down/.</u>

<sup>21</sup>st Century Common Sense 3.0 – edited March 26, 2024.

Powell was handsomely rewarded for his treacherous conspiracy design with a position as an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States by Nixon, less than 2 months after secretly distributing the Powell Memo, on October 21, 1971. After all, Powell wrote in his Memo: "Under our constitutional system ... the judiciary may be the most important instrument for social, economic and political change." And in 1982 the Federalist Society - Our Domestic Enemy's jurisprudence assassin – was duly formed at Yale University by a group of students from Harvard, Yale, and the University of Chicago law schools.<sup>237</sup> For those of you who don't know, the Federalist Society today is the principal vetter of judges nominated to the federal courts. Put differently, the Federalist Society "Changed American Politics".<sup>238</sup> "I sense," Ted Olson, then an assistant attorney general and later Solicitor General of the United States, presciently declared at the inaugural meeting of the Federalist Society, "that we are at one of those points in history where the pendulum may be beginning to swing in another direction."<sup>239</sup> Olson was talking about the pendulum swinging away from individual liberty and towards total control of us.

Powell, using rigidly controlled disinformation, was lionized nationally as a moderate<sup>240</sup> while his career was anything but. Powell was a zealot in a class war against you. His judicial record was consistently antagonistic to your ability to hold Our Domestic Enemy accountable for anything – from slavery, to child sex-trafficking, to murder, to daylight robbery.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>237</sup> <u>https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Federalist\_Society</u>.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>238</sup> <u>https://www.politico.com/magazine/story/2018/08/27/federalist-society-yale-history-conservative-law-court-219608/</u>.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>239</sup> <u>https://www.politico.eu/article/the-weekend-at-yale-that-changed-american-politics-federalist-society-scalia-gorsuch-robert-bork-conservative-politics/</u>.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>240</sup> <u>https://www.truthdig.com/articles/the-right-wing-legacy-of-justice-lewis-powell-and-what-it-means-for-the-supreme-court-today/page/1/.</u>

Powell undoubtedly knew, and was perhaps even an architect of, the early 1970s plan (recounted in 1994) by John Ehrlichman<sup>241</sup> (a senior criminal in the Nixon administration), to keep us divided and controlled:

"The Nixon campaign in 1968, and the Nixon White House after that, had two enemies: the antiwar left and black people. You understand what I'm saying? We knew we couldn't make it illegal to be either against the war or black, but *by getting the public to associate the hippies with marijuana and blacks with heroin, and then criminalizing both heavily, we could disrupt those communities.* We could arrest their leaders, raid their homes, break up their meetings, and vilify them night after night on the evening news. Did we know we were lying about the drugs? Of course we did." [emphasis supplied]<sup>242</sup>

Yet, in 1971, they started the war on drugs anyway (see p.76 above)

Our Domestic Enemy's 2 enemies remain the same: the anti-war (no longer just 'left') and black (no longer just black) Americans. Though now they've added just about everyone else who has any interest in freedom from Our Domestic Enemy's maniacal control – most particularly Russians, carefully manipulating our Russophobia and Muslims, carefully manipulating our Islamophobia.

## QUI BONO?; OR WHO, EXACTLY, IS OUR DOMESTIC ENEMY THAT HAS STOLEN \$47 TRILLION FROM US IN 50 YEARS? (Roughly Identified and Numerically Quantified).

Where a society promotes and lionizes greed (and fame) above all other pursuits (as ours does), it is axiomatic that the worst people in that society will be the greediest (and most narcissistic). It is hard to imagine more ruthlessly greedy people than Billionaires (who are mostly born that

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>241</sup> <u>https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/John Ehrlichman</u>.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>242</sup> <u>https://www.vox.com/2016/3/22/11278760/war-on-drugs-racism-nixon</u>.

way by inheritance<sup>243</sup>). Before we permit Billionaires to continue to own billions, make *them* (not their highly paid lawyers, politicians, lobbyists, and journalists) explain themselves. What good for America did the Billionaires think it would do to steal \$47 trillion from us and make their already luxurious lives inhumanly more luxurious? It'll just take a little of our imagination and courage to demand they speak. And if they won't speak, they can move to Ukraine or Israeal or Taiwan (which they all obviously care so much more about than America).

### One Billion Is A Brain-Alteringly Large Number.

Before we pay any closer attention to the parasitic individuals in this stratospheric level of the Ruling Class, we think it's worth trying to shed light on, and crystallize in our minds, just how <u>big</u> the number 1 billion is.

Our brains have difficulty in comprehending just how absurdly rich having 1 billion dollars is. 1 billion = 1,000,000,000; that's 1 *thousand m*illion. As you're reading this, you almost certainly don't have \$1 *m*illion. Now just imagine your life with \$1 *m*illion – **not** 1 billion. Can you imagine a life in which you don't have to worry about the cost of rent or gas or electricity, or your child's education, a world in which you don't have to worry about the cost of eggs or milk, a world in which inflation may sting but not destroy you, a world in which your stress levels based on financial discomfort don't exist? Now imagine having *1,000* times that; it's difficult to imagine, right? Put differently, the difference between 1 billion dollars and 1 million dollars is *999* of those first 1 million. Yet with Billionaires galore (the "*job creators?*"), more than 100 million of us live paycheck-topaycheck<sup>244</sup> and can't afford a \$400 emergency<sup>245</sup> (with only \$1 *m*illion you'd likely not sweat a \$400 emergency).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>243</sup> <u>https://www.vox.com/2024/1/22/24043104/billionaire-get-rich-people-parents-generational-wealth-transfer-trust-fund</u>.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>244</sup> <u>https://www.forbes.com/advisor/credit-cards/survey-living-paycheck-to-paycheck/</u>.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>245</sup> <u>https://fortune.com/2023/05/23/inflation-economy-consumer-finances-americans-cant-cover-emergency-expense-federal-reserve/</u>.

<sup>21</sup>st Century Common Sense 3.0 - edited March 26, 2024.

Let's look at the number 1 billion, compared to 1 *m*illion, in different perspectives so as to help us magnify and conceptualize its grotesque enormity:

1 million seconds, in days, is roughly 11.57 days; 1 billion seconds in days is roughly 31.7 *years*.

If you made \$15.00 per hour, working an 8-hour day, 5 days a week, your salary would be \$31,200.00. To make \$1 *m*illion would take you roughly 31 years; to make \$1 billion would take you roughly *32,051* years.

If you stacked 1 million \$1 bills on top of each other (assuming a thickness of 0.0043 inches) it would reach the top of a 30-story building. If you stacked 1 billion \$1 bills on top of each other (same assumption) it would be roughly 130 times the tallest building on the planet (the Burj Khalifa in Dubai), or 67 miles.

1 billion is a staggeringly large number, and perhaps no accident that the calculator on your iPhone will not permit you to do this math yourself because it will only allow you to type in 1 *tenth* of 1 billion – 100 million. 1 billion is so obscenely large that our brains – the most magnificent of nature's (or God's, if you see it that way) creations – have not yet learnt to conceptualize the word. This is not our fault – until recently (in evolutionary terms), we haven't had the need to understand the word. The word billionaire is shrouded in mystery (or is it mysticality) by those who speak and act for Billionaires, perhaps like the words of kings, queens, and priests of yore.

1 billion dollars will buy an enormous amount of silence (2,000 voices if each gets \$500,000.00), thereby permitting an enormous amount of billionaire conspiracy.

#### How Many American Billionaires Are There?

There are likely no more than 900 American Billionaires. The Billionaires and their families (let's assume there are 900 and that they all have a spouse and three children) thus comprise 3,600 individuals (or 0.001% of the American population).<sup>246</sup> How would you like to be 1 of

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>246</sup> 900x4=3,600. 3,600/330,000,000x100=0.001%.

those 3,600 with 330,000,000 of us angry at them? **Not** violently angry (assuming they don't provoke Us beyond Our breaking point). If you were 1 of those 3,600 reading  $21^{st}$  Century Common Sense and you simultaneously learnt that: (a) over the years, political scientists have estimated that successful **non-violent** resistance against a government, resulting in a government's capitulation or disintegration, requires about 15% of the population<sup>247</sup> to become aware and to summon the courage to be heard (though recently, that 15% has been considered too high, with the actual number being only  $3.5\%^{248}$ ); and (b) that between 1900 and 2006, non-violent civil resistance has been **twice** as effective and successful as violent resistance;<sup>249</sup> don't you think terror would grip you as a Billionaire? How would you begin to justify your systematic internal destruction of the United States to the remaining 330,000,000 of us?

The 25 wealthiest Billionaires *each, individually,* have (at least as of January, 2022) more than **200 times** \$1 billion.<sup>250</sup> The *3* wealthiest Billionaires – Elon Musk, Jeff Bezos, and Bill Gates – alone are worth almost \$600 billion. This is more than the combined wealth of the bottom half of us Decent Americans, or roughly *165,000,000* people. Put

<sup>248</sup> Which is approximately 10,000,000 of us Decent Americans in February 2024. https://www.nonviolent-conflict.org/resource/success-nonviolent-civil-resistance/ If you live in Mississippi, you're in a population of nearly 3,000,000 (https://worldpopulationreview.com/states/mississippi-population) which means it only takes a few more than 100,000 of you (according to Professor Erica Chenoweth) to effectuate meaningful political change. If you live in New York City, you're in a population of roughly 9,000,000. 15% of New Yorkers is approximately 1.5 million of you, and 3.5% is only 350 thousand of you (New York City is picked because it has the highest concentration of Billionaires anywhere in the world). The same calculation can, of course, be performed whatever State or City you live in.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>247</sup> That's approximately 50,000,000 of us Decent Americans in February 2024.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>249</sup> <u>https://news.harvard.edu/gazette/story/2019/02/why-nonviolent-resistance-beats-violent-force-in-effecting-social-political-change/</u>.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>250</sup> <u>https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List of wealthiest Americans by net worth.</u>

differently, 1% of the greediest Americans own more than the bottom 90% (that's roughly 3,300,000 Americans owning more than 327,700,000 of us). The combined greed of these 25 so-called Americans is nearly \$3,000 billion or \$3 *trillion*. Because our individual brains have a difficult time conceptualizing \$1 billion, rationally conceptualizing \$1 trillion is nigh on impossible; artistic Decent Americans, prove us wrong!

America's 50 richest families, according to Forbes (which doesn't seem to think that Elon Musk's, Jeff Bezos', or Bill Gates' families belong on the list), are worth a combined \$1 *tr*illion, 165 *b*illion. While every one of these 50 families deserve Decent Americans' close scrutiny, we randomly begin your focus on 3 of them: (i) the Walton family (Walmart) whose patriarch Sam grew up in the Great Depression and apparently forgot what that was like before he decided his own personal greed was more important than Decent Americans' small community-based businesses (leaving 3 of his successors amongst the wealthiest 25 Americans today with a combined \$211 billion)<sup>251</sup>; (ii) the Pritzker family<sup>252</sup>; and (iii) the Koch family.<sup>253</sup>

Roughly 27 of the 900 Billionaires have between \$10 billion and \$40 billion, and roughly 110 of them have between \$4 billion and \$10 billion. So that leaves approximately 738 Americans with a greed of between \$1 billion and \$4 billion. The Billionaires are the factual amalgam of Sauron and Gollum in *Lord of the Rings* (whether the books, the movies, or the tv series).

So let's do some rough math and find out how much money we Decent Americans could use to try and further Our American Dreams (which, according to our founding legal document is <u>not, absolutely not</u> to get as obscenely rich as quickly as possible and create unmovable, permanent American ruling dynasties), recouping some, if not all, of the \$47 trillion stolen from us.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>251</sup> <u>https://www.businessinsider.com/walmart-stock-sam-walton-family-wealth-billionaires-musk-rich-list-2024-2?op=1</u>.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>252</sup> <u>https://www.forbes.com/profile/pritzker/?sh=3be5fe8970f2</u>.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>253</sup> <u>https://www.forbes.com/profile/koch/?sh=5a8691695a5b</u>.

Let's posit a scenario where, through our collective agreement, we allow each billionaire to keep *\$1* billion (recall what a ridiculously absurd amount of money that is, and therefore how irrationally generous it would be for us the People to permit it), assuming there are 900 American billionaires, that would be us permitting these greedy life-takers to keep \$900 billion. What would be left over to help build 21<sup>st</sup> century American infrastructure, to get us clean water and clean air, to feed us nutritionally and house us comfortably, to work and nurse us back to physical, psychological and emotional health, and to educate and inform us as is needed in the 21<sup>st</sup> century if we are going to compete with China and Russia and India (and many other countries)? By us, of course, we mean the roughly 330,000,000 of us who are *not* billionaires.

If each of the richest 25 billionaires were permitted to keep \$1 billion dollars, and their total greed worth is \$3 trillion, that's \$2 trillion, 975 billion that we can spend improving all of our lives. If the next category of billionaire (\$10-40 billion) were permitted to keep \$1 billion and there are 27 of them and we give these 27 'people' an assumed average greed value of \$20 billion each, then we would add an additional \$515 billion to what we will use to improve the life, liberty, and happiness of all of us. If the next category of billionaire (\$4-10 billion) were permitted to keep \$1 billion dollars and there are 110 of them and we give these 110 'people' an assumed average greed value of \$6 billion each, then we would add an additional \$550 billion to what we will use to improve the life, liberty, and happiness of all of us. If the next category of billionaire (\$1-4 billion) were permitted to keep \$1 billion and there are 638 of them and we give these 638 'people' an assumed average greed value of \$1.5 billion each, then we would add an additional \$932 billion to what we will use to improve the life, liberty, and happiness of all of us. So what are we left with to begin building the competitive, co-operative<sup>254</sup> first class healthy society on the

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>254</sup> If you balk at the word co-operative, try to rationally argue with the following proposition: human beings are *only* the apex predator on the planet because of our ability to cooperate with each other. If we didn't have that ability, the apes, the bears, the lions, the snakes, the mosquitoes, the locusts, the bacteria, the fungus, and the viruses would be dominant (or at least competing for dominance over us).

planet – even leaving these 900 'people' with \$1 billion each – we'd have nearly five trillion dollars (\$5,000,000,000,000).

And that's a fraction of what they owe us (only one tenth  $(1/10^{\text{th}})$  of the \$47 trillion they've stolen from us over the past 50 years).<sup>255</sup>

Obviously, the Billionaires are the rulers of Our Domestic Enemy, the parasitic and psychopathic Ruling Class; American kings, queens, and dictators. We, the People, have put up with the Billionaires and those who feast tastelessly and mercilessly at the troughs just beneath the Billionaires' tables – we call these pigs the Billionaires' Minions – for far too long.<sup>256</sup>

### Who Are The Billionaires' Minions?

The Billionaires' Minions are mostly comprised of eye-wateringly well paid parrots, all but devoid of truth, honesty, humility, or integrity, who mostly call themselves: (i) CEOs, CFOs, COOs, or just 'board members' of some national, but mostly multi-national or global corporations; (ii)

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>255</sup> We'll leave it to you to ascertain the validity of what – if proved – would be the largest accounting fraud in United States history at the Department of Defense and the Department of Housing and Urban Development. Dr. Mark Skidmore, a Michigan State University economics professor, released a report in 2017 revealing a **\$21 trillion** shortfall in a Pentagon audit <u>www.mark-skidmore.com</u> (it should come as no surprise that most Billionaire financial rape of us is through the racket that is war). The *massive* Pentagon budget which, among many others, wrought disaster in North Korea, Vietnam, Iraq, Afghanistan, Syria, Yemen, Libya, Ukraine, Israel, and Palestine was *never* – until 6 years ago – audited. So, neither we the American taxpayers, nor any of our Senators or Congressmen (who all obviously knew what we did not, and kept their mouths shut because they were paid by the Billionaires to keep silent) are able to follow the money once it goes to the Pentagon. *Qui Bono*, indeed?

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>256</sup> Economists call this the Cantillon Effect – essentially, the closer you are to the money supply, the richer you'll be <u>https://www.masterclass.com/articles/cantillon-</u> <u>effect</u>. Sounds pretty obvious – the fattest pigs will be those closest to the trough. Gentler put, by the Adam Smith Institute: "This results in arbitrary benefit to some who have not created any economic value and detriment to others who have not destroyed anything of economic value by destroying savings for example." <u>https://www.adamsmith.org/blog/the-cantillion-effect</u>

politicians; (iii) judges; (iv) lawyers; (v) generals; (vi) lobbyists; (vii) administrators; (viii) doctors; (ix) scientists; (x) academics; or (xi) intelligence analysts. The Minions are those that have wealth that allows them to live in a luxury that permits them to orbit the Billionaires – by never saying no to Billionaires (hence Minions; if Billionaires are humanity's ultimate parasites, their Minions are humanity's ultimate sycophants). Minions will sometimes (more often than you'll care to believe on first reading this) be your favorite most famous sports stars, your favorite most famous ministers, your favorite most famous singers, or your favorite most famous actors.

The Minions all either: (a) understand how and why the Billionaires tell so many lies and loudly promote those lies (these will usually be the best-known politicians (at least on a federal or state level), and least known lobbyists, lawyers and doctors) in order to maintain and increase the status quo of their wealth; or (b) are too self-involved or stupid, or just plain scared, to begin to understand the Billionaires' system that they're supporting and strengthening. The richer they are, the more likely they are to fit into category (a) and the more likely dangerous they are; these are the Minions worth more than \$100,000,000.00 (the centimillionaires). The Category (b) Minions that we need to concern ourselves with in 2024 are likely worth between \$50 and \$100 million. It's hard (almost, but impossible, non-heroically) to be worth more than \$50 million in 2024 America and not be driven by the notion that one's life is not very, very, very much more important than the life of someone who they pay to perform a service for them. Once people get a net worth of above somewhere between \$50 and \$100 million<sup>257</sup>, they don't like mingling with those of lesser means (unless that is, the those (of us) they're mingling with are carrying their bags, cooking their meals, driving for them, or are their doctors attending to their health, or their lawyers attending to their wealth). Most of these category (b) Minions and centimillionaires also believe strongly in their own superiority over you (as strongly as the Billionaires

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>257</sup> Obviously, there may be people worth this amount of money (\$50-100 million) who may be doing their best to subvert the Billionaires' system of control and return it to the People, but it's highly unlikely, wouldn't you agree?

do) – a belief which has spelt disaster for America's domestic and foreign policy.

There may be 50,000 Minions worth more than \$50 million. There are less than 10,000 centimillionaires<sup>258</sup> (people worth \$100 million or more) and we'd guess the maxim number of category (b) Minions can't be more than 40,000. So let's give these people each a spouse and 3 children – as we estimated for the Billionaires – which gives us a total of approximately 203,600 Billionaires and Minions (152,700 of whom are spouses and offspring).

At its largest conceivable size, therefore, Our Domestic Enemy (the Billionaires and their Minions) comprises  $0.06\%^{259}$  of our population, the vast majority of whom are mere Minions, not quite born into astronomic inheritance, or savage enough to be Billionaires, but proud of being Minions (believing themselves, inaccurately, to be superior and better educated than us (that's why they call some of us 'deplorables').<sup>260</sup> Against more than 330,000,000 of us? Whose side would you want to be on in a fight? They know this math well – which is why they work so hard to divide us and cement those divisions in our emotional psyche. That's why, in the 21<sup>st</sup> century, they've ruthlessly and systematically divided us over *everything*. Divide and rule<sup>261</sup> is a *very* old concept of ruling classes. There is one antidote – unity amongst those divided. That unity will be relatively easy to secure in 21<sup>st</sup> century America – first because we're Americans,

<sup>259</sup> 203,600 / 330,000,000 x 100.

<sup>260</sup> Challenge Our Domestic Enemy and the rules (they call these laws) that they impose upon us, and they'll crumble. Just like their friends in England did when they were forced to play soccer fairly against us, as is entertainingly depicted in the 2020 Netflix series *The English Game* 

<sup>261</sup> <u>https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Divide and rule</u>.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>258</sup> There are only 25,490 of these megalomaniacs *in the world*, 38% of whom live in these United States

https://www.thenationalnews.com/business/money/2022/10/18/us-has-highestnumber-of-super-wealthy-worth-100m-or-more/. So when we say less than 10,000, we mean – more precisely – 9,686 (25,490 x 38%).

born *not* to have a ruling class and to install governments that do nothing but secure our lives and liberty and promote our pursuit of happiness; and second because we have an information dissemination tool at our disposal that is unique in human history: the internet. There's a third – perhaps more powerful reason – that our unity (MAGA and Blue-No-Matter-Who Decent Americans setting aside their differences) should be *easy* to attain. Because a very young child can understand it. Unity against a powerful aggressor suffuses our children's literature. One prominent example is Leo Linni's poignant 1963 classic *Swimmy*.<sup>262</sup>

Astonishingly, Our Domestic Enemy is still able to convince us that we should be divided over race – even though we, as a population, learnt better decades ago.<sup>263</sup> It's an easy scar to keep aggravating, though, particularly if they let millions of poor and starving and persecuted immigrants into the country illegally.<sup>264</sup> Because our hard-earned education has diminished the power of division over race, Our Domestic Enemy has found other methods of dividing us. By way of limited example: (i) Our Domestic Enemy has divided us over Muslims (war is a racket, and if we weren't divided over Muslims, they couldn't continue to send our money to their Middle East slaughters) – Islamophobia is a scourge that will be lifted out of us exactly the way race began to be educated out of us in the 1950s and 1960s; (ii) Our Domestic Enemy has divided us over Russians (war is a racket, and if we weren't divided over Russians, they couldn't continue to

#### <sup>262</sup> <u>https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Swimmy (book)</u>.

<sup>263</sup> This education is well documented in many books, articles, and movies, but we think the 2006 movie *Glory Road* starring Josh Lucas as basketball coach Don Haskins (<u>https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Don\_Haskins</u>) leading the University of Texas at El Paso (as it's now named) to victory in the 1966 NCAA University Division Basketball Championship depicts the stupidity of any division over race as well as how to educate ourselves above it (that small number of us who still need the education that is). Watch the 2021 documentary *MLK/FBI* to understand just how assiduously Our Domestic Enemy despised Martin Luther King Jr.

We're only referencing the last few years of the odious DHS Secretary Mayorkas in the Biden administration's policy that permits millions(?) to pour over the border <u>https://www.snopes.com/fact-check/million-migrants-border-biden/</u>. send our money to their Ukraine slaughter) – Russophobia is a scourge that will be lifted out of us exactly the way race began to be educated out of us in the 1950s and 1960s; (iii) Our Domestic Enemy has divided us over China (war is a racket, and if we weren't divided it they couldn't continue to send our money to possible war over their Taiwan project) – Sinophobia is a scourge that must be lifted out of us exactly the way race began to be educated out of us in the 1950s and 1960s.

It is, of course, not just groups of people with different skin color or nationalities that they divide us over. They divide us over abortion, gun rights, gay rights, and even the completely novel category 'transgender' rights. Our Domestic Enemy divides us over *everything* they can in order that they can continue to rule, control, and immiserate our lives (which you now truthfully and accurately know to be the opposite of their obligations as Americans with political power). Hell, they've even got us divided over the meaning of words, basic words like man and woman, and less basic words like vaccine. What responsible government interested in its people's future security and happiness would obfuscate the definition of English words – the English language, not Judeo-Christianity, is the framework of our culture<sup>265</sup> – amongst its citizens?

<sup>265</sup> If you doubt this proposition, consider a few ideas. How much more of an influence has Shakespeare had on the way you think as opposed to the Bible? Have you ever read the Bible in any language other than English (if not, there's zero way you can be certain that it was accurately translated because it certainly wasn't written in English)? How much more influence has Taylor Swift or Mohammad Ali or Eva Cassidy or Ghandi or the Dalai Lama or your favorite actor or sports star had on the way you think as opposed to the Bible? Or any of your favorite novels, movies or tv shows (or, dare we say it, video games)? Our culture is grounded in, and supported by, the English language and given the global capacity for the English language's still unique capacity to spread information around the world, it seems worth celebrating and protecting (the history of a past struggle to protect the English language is well told in Simon Winchester's 1998 book The Professor and the Madman which was made into an engaging movie of the same name in 2019 starring Mel Gibson and Sean Penn). That we are an English language culture, and not Judeo-Christian is particularly true in America which was born with such religious diversity that the Founding Generation demanded that no government in the United States of America could tell its citizens which God to worship. *That* has been a major contributor to America's global influence in our nearly 250 years – because it encourages American unity as

Our Domestic Enemy also divides us over sex and sexual preferences even though we all love sex (see above) and couldn't care less (unless, that is one of us has a demented voice amplified way beyond its natural volume by mainstream media) what someone does consensually in the privacy of their own home; and even though we *all* know that all men in a community should unify (and confront) a man who uses physical force (sexual or otherwise) against a woman in that community. It's perfectly easy (with a little imagination) to achieve this non-violently: ostracize the pathete who beats his wife or girlfriend, and teach the beaten woman that there are better alternatives out there, and that time will heal her of her belief (for whatever reason) that she must put up with the violence. Whatever path your community chooses, politics should play little role and we should not be dictated to by the Billionaires and their Minions on the subject (or any other subject).

Some good news: because the vast, vast, vast majority of us still have both at least a modicum of sanity and self-interest left, are not racist (sincerely believe one race to be superior than another), and are not sexist (sincerely believe women superior to men or men superior to women), the only way Our Domestic Enemy can convince us otherwise is to allow the most preposterous voices to scream at us (whether those voices are calmly paid Minions who do so on Fox News or MSNBC or are just hungry for attention from the streets). All we have to do is stop listening to the insanely amplified voices of the demented and listen to those who we go to a concert with, go to a game with, go to a movie with, have coffee, a drink or eat with, speak on the phone or zoom with, or even just text with.

We're Americans in the 21<sup>st</sup> century – we know that racism and sexism are both stupid and intolerable. How do we know we know this? Because none of you sit at a breakfast, lunch, or dinner table (at home or out) with other people (family, friends, colleagues, or strangers) and discuss with other people your own superiority because of your sex or your own superiority because of your race. You only fear that other people do – why? Because Our Domestic Enemy tells you that nearly half the country thinks

Americans. What makes us American is what rights we were born with; not our beliefs about God or abortion or anything else.

the precise opposite way to you by making the most obnoxious voices loudest and most memorable. That's why we have a propagandaic mainstream media. And deep down, particularly with the exercise of a little common sense or logic or critical thinking (call it what you will), you know that in 21<sup>st</sup> century America, there aren't even hundreds of thousands (much less millions) of people talking about how they believe they're superior to you (or anyone else) because of their race or sex.

Many of you may momentarily believe that you're superior to another human being because of your education or your hard work or your care for humanity or your care for the planet or your love for strangers or animals or art. It is this glancing, non-ideological judgmental lack of humility and compassion (we've never walked in another's shoes) that we don't really concern ourselves with that the Billionaires and their Minions weaponize in their Information War against us. They take these insignificant human frailties and magnify them into a difficult to shake conviction – driven by amplifying our fear - that those who you disagree with politically have totally different core values. We don't; at least 90% of us don't – we believe that hard work, creativity, playing by the rules, being kind (which still doesn't cost any of us a dime), trying not to harm a fellow human being and having some laughs along the way is the way to live. 90% of us think this because we're American. We all have those values as Americans – apart from the Billionaires and their Minions who genuinely believe that they're superior and therefore entitled to dole out pain, torture, and death as they see fit.

Any doubt that Our Domestic Enemy weaponizes these subtly, unintrusive fears into collective (sometimes rage-filled) screams of racist! or sexist!, merely using them in an Information War against us, can surely be dispelled by even a cursory consideration of how Nixon, Ehrlichmann, Powell et all achieved their aims in the late 1960s and early 1970s (see pp.76-86 above).

We don't *naturally* suffer from Sinophobia or Russophobia or Islamophobia or Abortionobia. These are mainstream media concoctions built upon what the Billionaires and their Minions perceive to be your ignorance. Most of us probably don't have one, much less many, Chinese, Russian, or Muslim friends (in fact, most of us probably don't even know any Chinese, Russians, or Muslims). It used to be that we didn't have many black friends (unless we were black) and they managed to convince us that we should be scared of our black neighbors (otherwise NIMBY<sup>266</sup> wouldn't have happened). Well, Chinese, Muslims, or Russians don't usually become our neighbors, so we have little opportunity to get to know them. The Billionaires and their Minions use that lack of opportunity to luxuriate in their unfathomably sick perpetual assault on your peace through war.

Less than 100 years after our Declaration of Independence, at the end of what some historians believe to be the most important battle during the Civil War,<sup>267</sup> in his infamous Gettysburg Address delivered on November 19, 1863, President Lincoln reminded us – in an effort to persuade Confederates and Unionists that they were American first – what it was (and still can be) to be so lucky to be an American:

"Fourscore and seven years ago our fathers brought forth on this continent, a new nation, conceived in Liberty, and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal.

Now we are engaged in a great civil war, testing whether that nation, or any nation so conceived and so dedicated, can long endure. We are met on a great battle-field of that war. We have come to dedicate a portion of that field, as a final resting place for those who here gave their lives that that nation might live. It is altogether fitting and proper that we should do this.

But, in a larger sense, we can not dedicate - we can not consecrate we can not hallow - this ground. The brave men, living and dead, who struggled here, have consecrated it, far above our poor power to add or detract. The world will little note, nor long remember what we say here, but it can *never forget* what they did here. It is for us the living, rather, to be dedicated here to the unfinished work which they

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>266</sup> <u>https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/NIMBY</u>.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>267</sup> If you think civil war is desirable in the 21<sup>st</sup> century, you will be quickly disabused of that stupid notion (only maintainable by morons who haven't been to war) if you do any one of three things. Read Margaret Mitchell's *Gone With The Wind* (published in 1936) *or* imagine you live in Ukraine (after watching at least two hours of real footage from Ukraine) *or* imagine you live in Palestine (after watching at least two hours of footage from Palestine (from before or after October 7, 2023)).
who fought here have thus far so nobly advanced. It is rather for us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us - that from these honored dead we take increased devotion to that cause for which they gave the last full measure of devotion - that we here highly resolve that *these dead shall not have died in vain* - that this nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom - *and that government of the people, by the people, for the people shall not perish from the earth*."<sup>268</sup> [emphases supplied]

In 2024, our unity is much more achievable than ever before. Just give your neighbor a chance to reveal themselves, and give yourself a chance to reveal yourself to them. You're almost certainly going to find 100 similarities for every major difference between you.

21<sup>st</sup> century Americans (whether born here or more newly American), recalling the history of their nation, must make sure that no future American generation ever has to write a new, 21<sup>st</sup> century, version of the Gettysburg Address, and *never again* has to fight again to build an America that lives up to the ideals and rights permanently embedded in *The Declaration of Independence*. It's time, isn't it, for America to self-actualize – as Maslow put it.

Our Domestic Enemy's – The Billionaires' and Their Minions' – Weak And Easily Alterable Societal Architecture ("The Billionaires' System").

The Billionaires' System (who else's?; the Billionaires are the unquestionable rulers of Our Domestic Enemy), which controls and rules us all, is not robust (it only appears and feels that way because we've put up with it for so long). As Thomas Paine's *Common Sense* has hopefully by now taught all of us:

"A long habit of not thinking a thing *wrong* gives it a superficial appearance of being *right*, and raises at first a formidable outcry in defense of custom. But the tumult soon subsides." [bold supplied]

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>268</sup> <u>https://voicesofdemocracy.umd.edu/lincoln-gettysburg-address-speech-text/</u>.

The Billionaires' System will crumble quickly with just a little of your thought, common sense, and action (even if your action is little more than talking to your family, friends, colleagues, and neighbors). The Billionaires' System is not robust mostly because it is dumb, but also because it is only physically protected and enforced by a small fraction of us. For the vast majority of us 330,000,000 Decent Americans, the system only presides because we've lacked the courage and imagination to confront it with anything other than momentary bursts of boiling anger (common sense's arch enemy) because it has "a superficial appearance of being *right*." Every single one of us knows it's not right.

It might continue to sound scary to you to directly confront and remove Our parasitic Domestic Enemy. *That* fear – which FDR most correctly taught us – is the only thing you have to fear. In some important sense, fearing your own fear rather than fearing someone else, will give us the courage to see. The fear we have to overcome is the fear that we can't do anything to improve our lives in any measurable, tangible sense. Well, why can't we? Why can't you? The Billionaires' System has surreptitiously been imposed upon us over the past 50 years; why can't we – all of us – undo it in the next 5 years and get it back to where it was giving us the economic opportunity to improve our lives. Why, in 5 years or less, shouldn't we able, with the aid of the cooperative and informative power of the internet, shouldn't we able to rebuild a robust Decent American Middle Class – the engine of America's greatness.

So, let's try to identify the Billionaires' System in terms of the human beings (the vast majority of whom are your family, friends, and neighbors) who, probably mostly unwittingly, keep it going and enable it to warp our righteous minds.

There are 535 members of Congress (federal legislators). There are 50 State governors, and 7,410 State legislators. All but 70 of those 7,410 are either Democrats or Republicans<sup>269</sup> (the monopoly/duopoly), Our Domestic Enemy's political parties.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>269</sup> <u>https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List of United States state legislatures</u>. So less than 1% of *every one* of your state legislators is from a party that is not Demican or Republicrat, and less than 1% own everything and 63% of **you** say you want a viable third party. Wrap common sense or critical thought around *that* in a democracy.

There are 788 federal judges (which include the 9 unelected groomed tyrants currently sitting at the top of the federal judiciary on the United States Supreme Court) and, perhaps, 50,000 state judges in the State judiciaries across this nation.<sup>270</sup>

These are the 58,783 people who have – in the vast majority – most culpably forgotten what it means to be American. They enjoy an intellectual challenge, but had an American obligation to remember at all times that their job is one and one only: to secure our lives and liberty and promote our pursuit of happiness. We're sure there are at least 2,000,000 ready, willing, and able Americans across this country (that's only 0.6% of our great population, who reside in every State, and every City, and every Town) who can instantaneously take the oath of office, adhere to that oath while in that office, and replace every 1 of the 58,783 who needs to be replaced. Judge Lewis Kaplan, and others on the Southern District of New York's bench, should be among the first to leave and go directly to jail.

Your fear may be persisting because you're wondering why, if altering the Billionaires' System is so easily achievable, it hasn't already happened in the decade or so since Obama's movement of hope and change (remember how hopeful you felt?<sup>271</sup>), the Tea Party Movement (remember how hopeful you felt?<sup>272</sup>), or Occupy Wall Street<sup>273</sup> and its birth of the Bernie Sanders movement (remember how hopeful you felt?<sup>274</sup>) or the Trump

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Tea Party movement. The Tea Party got us people like Scott Brown, Christine O'Donnell, Sharon Angle, Carl Paladino, Joe Miller, Nikki Haley, and Marco Rubio https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Electoral history of the Tea Party movement. How

<sup>273</sup> <u>https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Occupy Wall Street</u>.

have they performed in improving your day-to-day lives?

<sup>274</sup> How have the more than 10,000,000 of you who voted for Bernie Sanders against Hilary Clinton lives changed. Bernie told us the problem was the Billionaires,

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>270</sup> <u>https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/State\_court\_(United\_States)</u>.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>271</sup> In the 15 years since President Obama promised systemic hope and change, how have your lives improved?

movement in 2015/16 (remember how hopeful you felt?<sup>275</sup>) arose in America. Put simply, it's because Our Domestic Enemy, the parasitic and corrupt Billionaires and their Minions have – through their mainstream information and entertainment delivery systems – taught (brainwashed) you to hero worship. As a direct and proximate result, we took all our hopes and placed their implementation into one person. We did this whether we are on the 'right' or the 'left'.

How did all that hope, creativity, courage, and drive get sucked out of you? Obama took all of your grassroots energy and put it into Organizing for America<sup>276</sup> where it died. The Tea Party made some noise and got a few feckless people elected<sup>277</sup> and then that hope died. Sanders took all of your grassroots energy and put it into Our Revolution.<sup>278</sup> The Trump movement remains strong, but unless there's credible opposition, credible hope and change, Trump's movement will go the same way as Obama's, the Tea Party's, and Sanders' and at best our lives will be further degraded and at worst civil war will break out. Civil war really would be the disastrous (for every American) end; see footnote 267 above.

The Billionaires and their Minions have a state monopoly on violence (because they purport to own the state). Our fear of intelligent, non-violent confrontation of the Billionaires and their Minions is also likely propped up by the Billionaires' and their Minions' federal, state, and local police forces

and once he got removed and comfortably silenced himself, did you forget how absolutely certain you were that he was correct?

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>275</sup> It's true that the degradation of your lives slowed a little, or stagnated, while Trump was in office, but did your lives actually improve? Was your liberty expanded? Did Trump enable tens of millions of us to pay greater attention to our pursuit of happiness, or is it just the same and steadily getting worse?

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>276</sup> <u>https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Organizing\_for\_America</u>.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>277</sup> There are seeming exceptions, like Senator Rand Paul, but he's likely just a Bernie Sanders from the other side of the aisle (left and right don't mean anything in America any more, and never should have meant much in America in the first place).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>278</sup> <u>https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Our\_Revolution</u>.

operating across the United States who they control (paying them with your taxes of course). These might reasonably be characterized as Our Domestic Enemy's domestic army – paid (usually not handsomely) to do Our Domestic Enemy's ruthless bidding. It's hard to get a precise number on how many people comprises Our Domestic Enemy's army, but we estimate (which you can verify by checking online) that there are roughly 200,000 federal law enforcement officers and 800,000 state and local law enforcement officers.

The vast majority of American law enforcement (all of whom have taken, or should have taken, an oath to defend the American People against all enemies foreign *and* domestic) are your parents, sisters, brothers, friends, and neighbors. These officers, not living in a luxury that's worth killing, torturing, or dying for, will – with a little knowledge from us – turn their ire on the Billionaires and their Minions. We'd guess that their mothers, sisters, daughters, and girlfriends will be the most persuasive.<sup>279</sup> If you're reading this and you know a law enforcement officer's family, begin a conversation with them about it.

There's still one large group that, since 2011, we now need to be troubled with thanks to President Obama.

Although the *Posse Comitatus* Act<sup>280</sup> **should** prohibit the use of the United States military by Our Domestic Enemy against us Decent Americans on American soil, and the Writ of *Habeas Corpus*<sup>281</sup> **should** guarantee that you, as a Decent American, cannot be detained indefinitely without access to a lawyer, President Obama, with the stroke of a pen near midnight on New Year's Eve 2011, reversed 800 years of Western legal progress to our freedom<sup>282</sup> (accomplishing what George W. Bush was

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>279</sup> 86.7% of law enforcement officers are men <u>https://www.statista.com/statistics/195324/gender-distribution-of-full-time-law-enforcement-employees-in-the-us/</u>.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>280</sup> <u>https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Posse Comitatus Act.</u>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>281</sup> <u>https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Habeas\_corpus.</u>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>282</sup> <u>https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Magna\_Carta</u>.

unable to), by creating the 'legal' ability for Our Domestic Enemy to weaponize the United States *military* (on American soil) against us Decent Americans. The "law" President Obama signed is Section 1021 of the 2011 National Defense Authorization Act titled: "Affirmation of authority of the Armed Forces of the United States to detain covered persons pursuant to the Authorization for Use of Military Force."<sup>283</sup> Thus, because of President Obama (also ignominiously the first American President to extra-judicially assassinate an American citizen<sup>284</sup>), we also *now* need to ask how many members of the United States military are there? It's roughly 2,000,000.<sup>285</sup>

This makes it seem that *if* Our Domestic Enemy, and the entirety of its potential domestic army (military and police forces), weaponize against Decent Americans, there will be a roughly 3,000,000 person army commanded by the Billionaires and their Minions. The overwhelming majority of the 3,000,000 Americans in the police and military are *not* Our Domestic Enemy. Most of them, like law enforcement officers, are our husbands, wives, parents, sons, daughters, friends, and neighbors. Before they can be convinced that they have any authority to detain, torture, or kill

Anwar al-Awlaki was an American citizen who was in Yemen at the time (https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Anwar\_al-Awlaki), and President Obama – not satisfied with just murdering Mr. al-Awlaki – decided it was appropriate to also murder Mr. Al-Awlaki's 16 year old son Abdulrahman al-Awlaki https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Killing\_of\_Abdulrahman\_al-Awlaki; https://www.theguardian.com/world/2014/jun/23/us-justification-drone-killingamerican-citizen-awlaki. How do you think the former constitutional law professor President Obama would justify that under *The Declaration of Independence* or the Constitution? He never has, so let's just ask him (we predict 'terrorism' will suffuse his answer if he's man enough to answer our question). President Obama?

<sup>285</sup> <u>https://www.statista.com/statistics/232330/us-military-force-numbers-by-service-branch-and-reserve-component/</u>.

https://www.congress.gov/112/plaws/publ81/PLAW-112publ81.pd; https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Hedges\_v.\_Obama; https://www.thenation.com/article/archive/obama-and-indefinite-detention-uscitizens/; https://www.aclu.org/documents/talking-points-2012-national-defenseauthorization-act-ndaa.

Americans on American soil, they must be convinced not to. If you know *anyone* in a police force or the military, tell them to stand down.<sup>286</sup> Warn them that after the non-violent revolution is over, we will hold every police or military personnel *fully* accountable for murder, torture, or illegal detention.

Even if, *absolutely inconceivably*, all 3,000,000 of the military and law enforcement personnel in America refuse our call, and mindlessly and robotically follow blatantly unlawful orders from the Billionaires and their Minions (who we will also hold *fully* accountable) to slaughter more Americans on American soil, math dictates their swift defeat. Even at their absolute largest, here's *still* more than 100 of Us for every 1 of Them, and many of Us Decent Americans are (sometimes heavily) armed.

It is a fight they *could not win*, no matter how much they're incentivized with Our Domestic Enemy's money. What proportion of those 3,000,000 American law enforcement and military personnel do you think would be comfortable, today – right now, killing, detaining, or torturing, their own family, friends, and neighbors? How much smaller do you think that number will be when they can clearly see a different and better future? We cannot guess, but we'd *bet* that if you pass this on to most of your loved ones, friends, and colleagues in law enforcement or the military, you'll find that they, like you, believe that America is headed in the wrong direction, and they're part of the *sixty-three percent (63%)* <sup>287</sup> of you

<sup>287</sup> <u>https://news.gallup.com/poll/512135/support-third-political-party.aspx</u>.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>286</sup> This goes for *any* "white supremacist and militia groups" – who Trump reduced to "the Proud Boys" and told to merely "stand back and stand by" <u>https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=JZk6VzSLe4Y</u>. Your ideology (whatever relatively small group of you there are) will no longer be tolerated in 21<sup>st</sup> century America. America will no longer be supremacist anything. Feel free to speak your minds though, and explain why any of what we say is inaccurate or – more importantly – intolerable to you. We suspect that your leaders will just return to their basements – because at least you. Can do math, and there's well more than 328 million of us Decent Americans ready to jail you if you do any further harm. Watch the 1988 movie *Mississippi Burning* (starring Gene Hackman and Willem Dafoe) if you need to understand what Decent Americans will not tolerate happening again in 21<sup>st</sup> century America.

who believe that a new third-party is not just desired but absolutely essential.

#### CONCLUSION.

Proving that time makes more converts than reason, and (hopefully) that wisdom can be learned, the author publishes 21st Century Common Sense fully cognizant that it is incomplete and imperfect (though it is as good as we can get it now), driven by the concept that we must not let the perfect be the enemy of the good – and that as 21<sup>st</sup> century Decent Americans we know that all we can do is seek progress, not perfection. Not a one of us is God, and not a one of us knows God beyond their individual, highly personal, conception. Wake up America; A.I. (which should stand for "Automated Idiocy") could not write 21st Century Common Sense not only because A.I. is programmed by other human beings (unlike your brains if you use them properly), but because A.I. does not feel or understand hunger, pain, love, anger, compassion, fear, hope, or *any* other human emotion. Your phones and computers are little more than highly advanced calculators that you should never consider an alternative to your brains, and should never be treated as more useful than a library or cinema – in all their pre-internet majesty.

We don't think 21<sup>st</sup> Century Common Sense is particularly radical, though on first glance you might, and we're **certain** it's less radical than Thomas Paine's Common Sense. Apart from anything else, Thomas Paine's 18<sup>th</sup> century cry for resistance and abolition mandated death and destruction through war; while 21<sup>st</sup> Century Common Sense</sup> mandates diligent and consistent **non-violent** resistance driven by our conscience. Other than drastically improved (back to 1971 levels and beyond), we don't think that Decent Americans' day-to-day lives will be particularly different than they are today. We'll keep the electricity on, the gas flowing, the supermarket shelves filled, and we'll do so while watching more movies, listening to more music, and having more fun, however we do that. It's only our thinking of possibilities that needs to change. It's an Information War we have to win – and the way to win one of those is by educating ourselves; open to the possibility that we've been wrong about some deeply held beliefs.

We quoted Thomas Paine in the opening of this pamphlet, and we now quote him again: time makes more converts than reason. The only question is how much more time will we unnecessarily suffer before our reason converts us?<sup>288</sup> Most of the rest of the world – no pressure(?!) – is (often literally) dying for our Decent American reason to return. We were once the envy of the world, and now *everyone* (other than, at most, less than half of the populations of Israel and Ukraine and Taiwan, that is) despises us. With good reason, though they all likely also understand that we are the victims of an insidious propaganda; perhaps the most insidious propaganda ever delivered to a population in human history (the last worst time was Hitler's propaganda machine in Germany). The difference now is that it will lead to civil (not global) war unless we quickly wake the hell up.

> February 27, 2024 New York

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>288</sup> Who will play the role of 21<sup>st</sup> century **Candidus** 

<sup>(</sup>https://www2.umbc.edu/che/tahlessons/pdf/historylabs/Should\_the\_Colo\_studen t:RS07.pdf)? We'd bet not an A.I. bot. Can Biden or Trump or Haley or West? RFK Jr. or Vivek Ramaswamy at least seem to have a little more than cotton wool between their ears (no matter how insincere they, too, appear), will they, any of them, step up?

# EXHIBIT A

#### Re: New York City Bar Event Yesterday

From: Mark Moody (mwm@mwmoody.com)

To: mwm@mwmoody.com

Date: Thursday, February 29, 2024, 06:41 PM EST

----- Forwarded Message -----From: Mark Moody To: Noam Chomsky Sent: Sunday, April 16, 2023, 06:04:37 AM EDT Subject: Re: New York City Bar Event Yesterday

Dear Professor Chomsky:

Thank you for considering answering my questions. I believe there is something special about the way you think (as I believe there is something special about the way we are all capable of thinking), though the truth of your response resonates.

And thank you for answering the 'first language' question too - food for my thought; it's been a thrill for me to correspond with you.

On the off-chance that you might feel like answering 1 of my questions that you find more interesting, I attach them again.

Mark

On Saturday, April 15, 2023, 11:15:02 PM EDT, Noam Chomsky wrote:

Unfortunately, the attached questions seem to have disappeared. At least, I can't find them. On "how I think," and similar questions, I doubt that I'll have much to say. Nothing special that I'm aware of. I'll be guided next week by the questions Diane sends. If these come up, will try -- but my own focus of attention is on the kinds of things I talked about and others like them.

Noam

On Sat, Apr 15, 2023 at 2:14 PM Mark Moody wrote: Dear Professor Chomsky:

Yes, you do have a blurb on the Graeber-Wengrow jacket - I hadn't noticed that before.

And you're right, there is essentially no overlap of my questions (apart from the added topic) with what you talked about. When Diane and I first discussed it, the interview was presented to me as a blank slate - hence I went where I wanted.

I suppose, if you were to make me choose, what I'm most interested in is how you think, and how that might be teachable; so if you're willing, I'd like to know how you'd respond to the opening tranche of 6 questions which were guided by your conversation with Daniel Ellsberg and David Foster Wallace's - in my view - astounding commencement speech.

I'm glad to hear you're doing a follow-up with Diane; I think she's terrific (even if I don't know her so well), with an inspiring activist soul.

Sincerely yours,

Mark Moody

On Saturday, April 15, 2023, 01:46:36 PM EDT, Noam Chomsky wrote:

Graeber-Wengrow is very important. I think my blurb may be on the jacket. Gives some insight about the last 10-20,000 years, but that's the tail end of human development. The best sources are pretty technical, and presuppose a lot. And won't bear on your question for the reasons mentioned.

Thanks for the questions. I see there's essentially no overlap with what I was talking about. One of the problems with formal talks. It's what the speaker finds important, not necessarily what's in the mind of the audience. There are some interesting issues raised. Too much for a letter but if there are some you think are particularly important, would be glad to have a look.

Diane's scheduled a replay next Thursday, just for discussion

On Sat, Apr 15, 2023 at 4:31 AM Mark Moody wrote:

Dear Professor Chomsky:

Thank you so much for responding to me so quickly; I can't imagine how you do it.

There was NO misunderstanding on your part (I'm sorry if I made it appear that way; I didn't intend to), and you have nothing to apologize for - certainly not to me.

Attached is a slightly edited version of the first draft of questions I wrote for Diane for the New York City Bar Event. If it's not already obvious, I feel a privilege, beyond the many privileges I have already had, to get the opportunity to ask.

Notwithstanding, thank you for your answer regarding our first language; but can you point

me to what you consider to be the best sources of "our best understanding today"? I wonder if you've read Graeber and Wengrow's Dawn of Everything (having little to do with language of course, but in my view revolutionary in a related field of thought)?

Sincerely yours,

Mark Moody

Mark Warren Moody, Esquire

#### **M W MOODY LLC**

43 West 43rd Street New York, New York 10036

Confidentiality. This e-mail message may contain legally privileged and/or confidential information. If you are not the intended recipient(s), or the employee or agent responsible for delivery of this message to the intended recipient(s), you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this e-mail message is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please immediately notify the sender and delete this e-mail message from your computer.

IRS Circular 230 disclosure: To ensure compliance with requirements imposed by the IRS, we inform you that any U.S. federal tax advice contained in this communication (including any attachments) is not intended or written to be used, and cannot be used, for the purpose of (i) avoiding penalties under the Internal Revenue Code or (ii) promoting, marketing or recommending to another party any transaction or matter addressed herein.

On Saturday, April 15, 2023, 01:04:31 AM EDT, Noam Chomsky wrote:

Sorry about the misunderstanding. I was told the format was about 30 min talk and then discussion, so kept to that.

Please do send your questions. I'll be happy to try to respond.

On the question you raise at the end, our best understanding today is that the human language faculty emerged pretty much along with anatomically modern humans, Homo sapiens, in the range of 2-300,000 years ago -- very recently in evolutionary time. There's genomic evidence that the small number of humans

began to separate about 125,000 years ago, plus or minus. There are some differences among the surviving languages. The first group to split are all and only the languages with rich use of clicks. But the core systems seem the same. There is, however, no way to find out what the languages were that were spoken more than a few thousand years ago -- some specialists would argue earlier, but nowhere near the appearance of Homo sapiens, our species.

#### Noam Chomsky

On Fri, Apr 14, 2023 at 11:20 AM Mark Moody <<u>mwm@mwmoody.com</u>> wrote:

Dear Professor Chomsky:

My name is Mark Moody. I'm a member of the New York City Bar and a lapsed litigator. It's only a small snapshot of who I am, but I was so incensed at not being able to vote for Bernie in the 2016 Democratic primary (because I was registered as an Independent, already sick of Democratic Party lies) that I sued the New York City and State Boards of Election. I continue to believe that, as a matter of functioning law, I should have won on the merits. Here's an article: <u>https://nypost.com/2016/05/02/ny-primary-results-stand-but-judge-questions-closed-system/</u>, and here's a memorandum of law I wrote in support of obtaining a preliminary injunction: <u>https://www.scribd.com/doc/310850890/Moody-vs-New-York-State-Board-of-Elections-Lawsuit-PDF#</u>. I now less naively understand that my lawsuit never had a chance before it was killed by the First Department (interestingly, after the Court of Appeals).

Originally, Diane Fener and I were going to conduct an interview of you together (which is why I have your email address, and I hope you won't think me presumptuous or rude for using it). I wrote a first rough draft of a series of interview questions for you for Diane that we ultimately decided not to pursue because we had very different visions of the purpose or utility of an interview of you. I have long greatly admired your work; I imagine it might be boring for you to hear such sentiments from people you don't know by now. Perhaps my admiration is best illustrated by the fact that one of my favorite Hollywood moments is when the Cash family celebrate Chomsky Day on your birthday instead of Christmas in 2016's Captain Fantastic. Priceless.

It is with this preface that I wrote the following question to the panel (which you may have seen) roughly 36 minutes into yesterday's hour long New York City Bar Event: "Wasn't this supposed to be a conversation, rather than a speech? Chomsky's very interesting, brilliant, and a long time remaining hero of this audience member, but to learn from him, his ideas have to be tested not swallowed. That's supposed to be America's beating soul - an educated citizenry, not a lectured obedient one." My inspiration for the draft interview that I wrote was your remarkable conversation with Daniel Ellsberg - I've never seen you (or him (and very few others)) do an interview like that: 2 old friends with profound mutual respect talking unscripted about matters of interest to the public. It was, for me a breath of fresh air, and showed me a side of you that I'd never had access to. It has appeared to me that even in friendly interviews, you're often prepared for combat rather than dialogue

- which is unsurprising to me given the treatment you have received for 40 years at the hands of ideologues posing as journalists.

I don't wish to interview you (that is why I declined co-host status), but I do wish to learn from you (which is why I initially agreed to be involved in crafting questions), including on 2 questions where I have a profound disagreement with you. The vast majority of the interview I drafted, however, was my interest in getting your take and learning from you. So why am I writing to you? If you're willing, I'd like to edit and finalize the draft questions I wrote and send them to you for you to consider answering. Should you think it necessary, I am willing to sign a document prohibiting me from publishing them; I'm solely interested in understanding your methodologies as well as your thinking on a few precise areas. At present, the draft questions are only 4 pages long, and if you agree, I will limit myself to no more than 5 pages. There's only 1 topic I'd like to add after the New York City Bar Event yesterday - of course there are hundreds of issues and topics that I could add, curious about your thoughts, but my project at the moment is specific.

In being unable to get on the same page as Diane, I knew that an opportunity of a lifetime (for me) was passing me by, hence my willingness to risk being construed as rude or presumptuous for sending this email.

I hope that you'll agree to my request, but even if you won't, perhaps you could point me in the right direction to answer a question which (I'm embarrassed to say) only sprang to my mind in the last couple of weeks and was unrelated to the draft interview: what was humanity's first known language, and what is the best research and/or writing supporting that conclusion (if there is one)?

Sincerely yours,

Mark Moody

PS I have also copied your wife on this email.

Mark Warren Moody, Esquire

#### **M W MOODY LLC**

43 West 43rd Street New York, New York 10036

Confidentiality. This e-mail message may contain legally privileged and/or confidential information. If you are not the intended recipient(s), or the employee or agent responsible for delivery of this message to the intended recipient(s), you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this e-mail message is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please immediately notify the sender and delete this

e-mail message from your computer.

IRS Circular 230 disclosure: To ensure compliance with requirements imposed by the IRS, we inform you that any U.S. federal tax advice contained in this communication (including any attachments) is not intended or written to be used, and cannot be used, for the purpose of (i) avoiding penalties under the Internal Revenue Code or (ii) promoting, marketing or recommending to another party any transaction or matter addressed herein.



Chomsky-Questions.docx 26.4kB

## Part 1. How Chomsky thinks/AI.

Q1. I saw an interview you recently recorded with your very dear friend Daniel Ellsberg (a man who I consider to be 1 of the very most important figures of contemporary America).<sup>1</sup> The format of the interview was new for you, I believe (as it was for me, and may be for many people watching or listening to this), in as much as you and Mr. Ellsberg were not moderated; instead, you moderated each other. In other words, you just had a conversation with each other. It struck me as a startlingly effective format for disseminating information; perhaps because the information imparted by you both came alive as part of your lives rather than information being imparted solely for the sake of facts. To some extent, perhaps the information was transformed from expertise to humanity. When I asked myself why the conversation was so effective, I came to the conclusion that it was because the exchange allowed those of us who haven't attained such significant renown as you or Mr. Ellsberg to understand that good ideas are most effectively communicated to the world when they are clothed with integrity. It occurred to me that Joe Rogan's youtube success might be largely attributable to this giving an audience a fly-on the-wall perspective. The obvious lack of a script lent the interview between you and Mr. Ellsberg a profoundly human credibility, like a small window into how a parent teaches their child, both consciously and subconsciously; a small window, perhaps, into how human beings most effectively learn. Does my description of the interview resonate with you, and was the format of that interview planned between Paul Jay, Mr. Ellsberg, and you, or did it happen suddenly, without preparation, as Paul Jay suggested it did?

Q2. If you could do other conversational interviews with anyone who might already willing to be in the public eye and sit down for a conversation with you, who would you do such interviews with?

Q3. Are you familiar with David Foster Wallace's 2005 commencement address to Kenyon College

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Daniel Ellsberg passed away on June 16, 2023.

(https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=DCbGM4mqEVw&t=143s) where he gives a – speaking for me personally – life-altering explanation of how to think as a free human being. He makes the point that the most obvious and important realities are often the hardest to see and talk about. Do you agree? If so, why? Do you have any personal examples of this happening to you?

Obviously, this question was crafted without knowing whether you'd seen Wallace's commencement address, but with the link supplied, I'd love to know what you think having watched it (it's about 22 minutes long).

Q4. Is it your experience that your thinking gets clearer when you remember that you are not the center of the universe (as Wallace explains), i.e. your humility keeps your ego at bay? What I mean by that is that because we all – every single one of us – are at the center of our individual lives, the only person who is always with us, seeing what we see, and the only person who can know for certain whether we're telling the truth, whether to ourselves or others, is the individual.

Q5. Is it, in your experience, possible to teach a friend or a student to pay attention to the very obvious, and if so, how?

Q6. On March 8, you wrote an NYT opinion piece about AI. You appeared to marvel at AI as a staggering achievement of technology ("marvels of machine learning" you called it) while simultaneously pointing out AI's clunkiness when compared with each and every individual human brain. You wrote "the human mind is a surprisingly efficient and even elegant system". Can you explain for me, as though I was 15 years old, and of average education, what you think makes the human mind efficient and possibly elegant? If you could, and please don't use the child learning language example that you used in your piece, talk about the mind's architecture (and other examples) that compel you to your conclusion.

### Part 2. Anarchism

Q1. I want to stay away from the theory, or definition, of anarchism, George Orwell, Hemingway, and Christopher Hitchens having, in my view, written well and expansively on the subject (if there are other accessible thinkers on the subject, who are they?) and focus on its practicalities. In your view, what are the most successful human efforts, in the last 500 years, to create anarchist societies, and do you have a sense of what organizational structures made those societies successful?

Q2. This is a 3 part question. First, is it conceivable to you that the United States could become an anarchy? If so, how, organizationally, can you conceive of that transition taking place? And third, if the United States were to do so, what would daily life look like? Would there still be a president and 50 governors, a Supreme Court of the United States and 50 state supreme courts?

Q3. In an anarchy, are there laws as we understand them in contemporary America, and if so, how do they get written and what would they cover?

Q4. Are there areas of human existence where law, in your view, should play no role? If so, what are they, and why?

### Part 3. Vaccines

Q1. As a semiotician, do you think that the definition of words change organically and without educational manipulation, and if so, what fosters that process, and has your research revealed a rule of thumb as to how fast a word's meaning can change without manipulation by the hunter knowing that the lion can't tell its story?

Q2. What do you think is a workable definition of the word vaccine?

Q3. With the benefit of hindsight, and the additional information that comes with it (from the malign pharmaceutical companies and those

injured by their vaccines), do you see any need to retract your support for vaccine mandates?

Q4. How does a sudden governmental medical mandate, potentially violating the only thing we truly own (our bodies) square with your conception of anarchy, understanding that society can collectively, and over time, develop proven appropriate collective mandates (e.g. polio, rubella, measles etc)?

Q5. What research (please provide all sources that you relied upon), had you done into the science underpinning the Covid-19 vaccine before taking the – in my view – extraordinary step of supporting a mandate?

Q6. Is there any part of you that believes the conclusion that you reached with respect to vaccine mandates – given that your age places you, and your wife, and many of your friends presumably, atop the group of people most vulnerable to Covid-19 – was driven by fear?

Q7. If so, do you think it possible that in your own slightly altered words, your consent was manufactured?

Q8. Have you done any research into the claim that the pharmaceutical companies did not test to see whether the 'vaccine' prevented transmission before claiming it did and releasing it to the public with FDA approval? If so, what did you conclude, and what information did you rely upon to reach that conclusion?

Q9. Would you be willing to have a public discussion with Jay Bhattacharya, Martin Kulldorff, or Sunetra Gupta?

## Part 4. Donziger

Q1. Are you familiar with Steven Donziger? Could you give us a brief outline of your understanding of Donziger's case?

Q2. The reason I had to ask whether you were familiar is – and I've noticed this with lots of controversial topics – that when you type "noam chomsky steven donziger" into google or duckduckgo (or any other search engine), the first 20-30 results are about Steven Donziger from corporate news organizations like Reuters, none of those several results which I clicked on contained any comment by you about Donziger. Is this because you've never publicly commented, or is it because the search engine algorithms are manipulating the results? Whether you've commented or not, do you know how search engines can be programmed to do this in a way that would be comprehensible to a young person who is not a computer programmer?

Q3. What did you make of the recent Supreme Court decision that – for now – legitimates corporate prosecution across America?

### Q4. The 2 justice dissent

(https://www.law.cornell.edu/supremecourt/text/22-274) denying *certiorari*, written by Justice Gorsuch and adopted by Justice Kavanaugh does no justice to the actual history of Donziger's case. 3 stark examples of this are: (i) the fact that Donziger spent over 900 days under house arrest pursuant to a criminal statute that has a maximum sentence of 180 days; (ii) the fact that the private law firm appointed by the federal judge to prosecute Donziger had previously represented Chevron; and (iii) the fact that Judge Kaplan hand-picked Judge Preska to preside over Donziger's contempt trial. Do these strike you as startling omissions from the dissent's scanty narrative, and are you aware of the Supreme Court of the United States omitting startling facts in other cases? If so, which ones?

Q5. Justice Gorsuch's most stirring language in support of freedom and liberty, hinting at the rancid danger that is currently the law in this land – that private companies can lawfully take a citizen's liberty – in my view comes too late (in the last paragraph of the dissent), and too little (Gorsuch wrote: "the prosecution in this case broke a basic constitutional promise essential to our liberty. In this country, judges have no more power to initiate a prosecution of those who come before them than prosecutors have to sit in judgment of those they charge.") Do you agree that this is too

little too late, and if so, could you describe what you may see as the current dangers of this non-decision?

Q6. Do you believe that Justices Gorsuch and Kavanaugh were used to author the dissent in order to persuade – within the context of manufacturing consent – democrat minded, and leaning, voters to ignore the dissent, or at the very least to interrupt such voters' capacity to understand just how clearly the Supreme Court should do the opposite of what it did?

Q7. Under what circumstances, if any, should a private company ever have the power to take away a citizen's liberty?

## Part 5. This is the added topic I referred to in my email Professor Chomsky

Q1. Presumably you agree that voting for the lesser of 2 evils means that a voter – as an individual – is nonetheless voting for evil?

Q2. If that's the case, and the Republican and Democratic parties keep vomiting up evil candidates (while Trump is evil, Biden's near half-century track record is surely just less ostentatiously mimetic), isn't an educated citizen (like you) obligated – no matter the potential invitation of greater or lesser evil – to place themselves in staunch opposition, no matter the (thus far) historical failure of third parties? I ask this because it seems to me that you continue to draw a distinction between the duopolistic parties, and it makes no sense to me (idealist as your life's work has proven you to be). Your own analysis suggests that *every* president since at least Eisenhower is a war criminal.

# EXHIBIT B

#### **INTERESTING AUTHENTIC KNOWLEDGEABLE VOICES Reliable Chroniclers of the Peaceful American Revolution** (2024-July 4, 2026)<sup>1</sup>

Julian Assange – Freed (charges dropped because they're blatantly unconstitutional; don't think he needs a pardon, he hasn't been convicted of anything, so Merrick Garland, drop the charges, get him wherever Julian and his family choose to go (we understand that 90% of Australian citizens want Julian home), and if a further hair on his head is harmed, you and everyone in Britain responsible for additional harm will be held *fully* accountable (and yes, there is a large army of dedicated Julian supporters in Britain (as there are all over the world)), And when he's healthy again Julian will be entitled to honorary American citizen<sup>2</sup> (he's earned at least that if he wants it) and a cabinet position in a new cabinet formed specifically designed to promote ease of internet use and reliable security for the American people;

Edward Snowden – Freed (charges dropped because they're blatantly unconstitutional), And a return trip to Hawaii unless he wants to stay in Moscow; and a cabinet position in a new cabinet formed specifically designed to promote ease of internet use and reliable security for the American people;

Noam Chomsky – Designated a National Hero, or Treasure (as he pleases) for his work chronicling the Billionaires' foreign policy over 80 (?!) years, together with Daniel Ellsberg, may he rest in peace; every municipal and state government should consider erecting statues or buildings dedicated to these men – Assange, Chomsky, Ellsberg, and Snowden. Stephen F.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> There are likely thousands of Decent American (and other) voices omitted from this list because the author has not come across such voices or has forgotten them. If you are one of those voices, introduce yourself by sending an email to <u>betabilitarian@protonmail.com</u>.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> As will all non-American truthtellers around the world should they want it. America will know who you are.

Cohen, may he also rest in peace, (and perhaps others) should be considered for this designation too; Steve Jobs – may he, the calligrapher, visionary, and programmer, rest in peace – deserves great posthumous American honor; Omali Yeshitela – Charges dropped<sup>3</sup> (because they're blatantly unconstitutional)

Scott Ritter Jeffrey Sachs Ray McGovern Larry Johnson Larry Wilkerson Andrew Napolitano Kshama Sawant Chris Smalls Norman Finkelstein (given Ben Shapiro's and Douglas Murray's fear of debating Professor Finkelstein, Ben and Doug can email questions and follow-ups to ask the Professor) Michael (Mikey) Weinstein Douglas McGregor Chas Freeman Professor Martin Kulldorf Professor Jay Bhattacharya Gabor Maté Garland Nixon Craig Mokhiber Christina Biloti Ralph Nader Carl Hart Daniel L. Davis Senator Roy Black

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Every other political prisoner in the United States will have the charges dropped or be Pardoned, together with *every* non-violent drug offender (at least that's what State governments should do)

Paul Craig Roberts Joe Lauria Craig Murray **Bill Binney** Scott Ritter Diane Sare José Vega Kynan Thistlethwaite Dennis Kucinich Jill Stein Cornel West Claudia De La Cruz Larry Sharpe Kit Cabello Angela McCardle Killer Mike Tim Ballard Afeni Shakur (Tupac's mother) Chris Hedges Dave Smith Andrei Martyanov Russel Brand Matt Taibbi Glenn Greenwald Lee Camp John Pilger's entire archive, may he Rest In Peace Comfortably. Randy Credico Afshin Rattansi Max Blumenthal Aaron Maté Jordan Peterson Professor Noam Chomsky Katie Halper Briahna Joy Gray Jimmy Dore Matt Rife

Bret Weinstein Eric Weinstein Russell Dobular Keaton Weiss Nick Cruse Sabby Sabs Alastair Crooke John Kiriakou Rainer Shea Bassem Youssef Simon Ateba Michael Hudson Alexander Mercouris Alex Christoforou George Szamuely Peter Lavelle Larry Sharpe Glen Diesen **Richard Medhurst** Mark Laita Stephanie Gibaud Ali Abunimah Stephen Donziger Marty Garbus Ron Kuby Gil;bert Doctorow Miko Peled Nils Melzer Stephen Gardner Danny Haiphong Joe Rogan Graham Hancock Phil Giraldi Michael Franzese Sammy Gravano **Richard Wolff** 

**Dialogue Works** Niko House Kurt Metzger Craig Jardula Stef Zamorano Michael Shellenberger Colonel Tony Shaffer Judge Andrew Napolitano Graham Elwood Professor Jay Bhattacharya Professor Sinetra Gupta Doctor John Campbell Michael Saylor Adam Back Pete McCormick Harry Suddock Mike Rictenwald Lawrence Tribe (on Aaron Swartz) Lee Fang Clare Daly Kim Iversen Paul Jay Dr. Robert Epstein Dr. Robert Malone Ros Nealon-Cook Dan Cohen James O'Keefe Yanis Varoufakis Vijay Prashad Dave Smith Dr. Gerald Horne Daniel Immerwahr Annie Jacobsen David Talbott Ilan Pappé

Adam Cohen (author of the 2012 book Supreme Inequality: The Supreme *Court's Battle For a More Unjust America*) Professor Kathleen Stock Fiorella Isabella Yousef Munayyer Lex Fridman Michael Malice Talia Baroncelli Dan Kovalick Joe Lauria Thomas Massie Rand Paul Ron Paul Zachary Foster Kevin Gosztola Ralph Nader Andrew Tate (though we think he's too impressed by himself, too greedy, and thus not a great role model for young men; we find the Parkour guys like: STORROR DOM TOMATO PHAT, or MOTUS PROJECTS *better* role models for young men and women?) Professor Christy Wahls Jackson Hinkle Friends of Socialist China Whitney Webb Yeshayahu Leibowitz (an Israeli writer who knew there were what he called "Judeo Nazis" throughout the Israeli government and, before his death, predicted that Gaza would become a concentration camp)

We<sup>4</sup> consider all of these people friends even though we've never met any of them. We'd like to. Hopefully we can do that. We imagine (and sincerely hope) that all those listed already consider each other friends and allies.

Malcolm Burn (Malcolm is the first person we've named who is already a friend and we'd think it worth listening to *anyone* Malcolm interviews on his terrific radio show *The Long Way Round*: <u>https://open.spotify.com/show/5qiV5qNSXUhKNMfgVMRVc0</u>)</u> Diane Sare (already a friend, thanks to Malcolm's introduction) and we also think you should listen to anyone Diane talks to at her Friday night Symposium: <u>https://www.sareforsenate.com/new\_york\_symposium</u>

Finally, with reticence (because we've heard these individuals say enough true things to encourage us to think they might be able to inspire your imagination):

Marianne Williamson Cornel West RFK Jr. Vivek Ramaswamy Nina Turner Coleman Hughes Steve Turley

The author apologizes to those in all walks of public life whose names should have made this list – all those speaking publicly with as much courage, candor, and honesty as they can muster.

Grifters in online media the author suggests you avoid:

Cenk Uyghur and probably anyone else at The Young Turks

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> I have used the word we throughout 21<sup>st</sup> Century Common Sense because it sounds less ostentatious than "I" – because there's no way 21<sup>st</sup> Century Common Sense could have been written without those who it is dedicated to, and all those listed here on this Exhibit B.

Krystal Ball and Saagar Enjeti (Breaking Points) Ben Shapiro Mike Figueroa Destiny Vaush

(The author hopes he's wrong about those in this last category, but will not be swayed until these public people show that they elevate truth, honesty, and humility above partisanship and personal wealth)

# EXHIBIT C

Over the course of 2002, the Spotlight team published close to 600 stories about the scandal.

# 249 priests and brothers were publicly accused of sexual abuse within the Boston Archdiocese.

249 priests and brothers were publicly accused of sexual abuse within the Boston Archdiocese.

The number of survivors in Boston is estimated to be well over 1,000.

# In December 2002, Cardinal Law resigned from the Boston Archdiocese.

He was reassigned to the Basilica di Santa Maria Maggiore in Rome, one of the highest ranking Roman Catholic churches in the world.



## Major abuse scandals have been uncovered in the following places:

Albany, NY Altoona, PA Anchorage, AK Anchorage, KY Baker, OR Baltimore, MD Billings, MT Bridgeport, CT Briscoe Memorial, WA Brooklyn, NY Burlington, VT Camden, NJ Cape Girardeau, MO Charleston, SC Chicago, IL Cincinnati, OH Cleveland, OH

Collegeville, MN Conway Springs, KS Covington, KY Dallas, TX Davenport, IA Denver, CO Detroit, MI Dubuque, IA East Greenwich, RI El Paso, TX Fairbanks, AK Fall River, MA Fargo, ND Farmington, IA Fort Worth, TX Gallup, NM Goshen, NY

Grand Mound, IA Grand Rapids, MI Greenbush, MN Hannibal, MO Hartford, CT Helena, MT Honolulu, HI Indianapolis, IN Jackson, MS Joliet, IL Kansas City, KS Kansas City, MO Lincoln, NE Los Angeles, CA Los Gatos, CA Louisville, KY Manchester, NH

Marietta, GA Marty Indian School, SD Memphis, TN Mendham, NJ Miami, FL Milwaukee, WI Mobile, AL Monterey, CA Nashville, TN New Orleans, LA New York, NY Oakland, CA Omaha, NE Onamia, MN Orange, CA Palm Beach, FL Peoria, IL Philadelphia, PA

Phoenix, AZ Pittsburgh, PA Portland, ME Portland, OR Providence, RI Raleigh, NC Richmond, VA Rochester, NY Rockville Centre, NY Rosebud Reservation, SD Sacramento, CA San Antonio, TX San Bernardino, CA San Diego, CA Santa Barbara, CA Santa Fe, NM Santa Rosa, CA Savannah, GA

Scranton, PA Seattle, WA Spokane, WA Springfield, MA St. Francis, WI St. Ignatius, MT St. Louis, MO St. Michael, AK St.Paul/Minneapolis, MN Stebbins, AK Stockton, CA Toledo, OH Tucson, AZ Wellesley, MA Wilmington, DE Worcester, MA Yakima, WA Yuma, AZ

Buenos Aires, Argentina Auckland, New Zealand Berazategui, Argentina Antigonish, Canada Bass Hill, Australia Bontoc, Philippines Bathurst, Australia Adelaide, Australia Bindoon, Australia Brits, South Africa Ballarat, Australia Bruges , Belgium Arapiraca, Brazil Berlin, Germany Bo, Sierra Leone Ayacucho, Peru Akute, Nigeria

Christchurch, New Zealand Ciudad de México, México Cape Town, South Africa Feilding, New Zealand Cebu City, Philippines Dandenong, Australia Cuacnopalan, México Edinburgh, Scotland Canberra, Australia Flawinne, Belgium Chatham, Canada Curracloe, Ireland Cottolengo, Chile Chimbote, Peru Comillas, Spain Dublin, Ireland Caen, France

Kircubbin, Northern Ireland Hamilton, New Zealand Manchester, England Lancefield, Australia Hollabrunn, Austria Goulburn, Australia Letterfrack, Ireland Manila, Philippines Kilnacrott, Ireland Gortahork, Ireland Hobart, Australia London, England Igloolik, Canada Grenada, Spain Franca, Brazil Maipú, Chile Lota, Ireland

Mariana, Brazil Masterton, New Zealand Medellín, Colombia Melbourne, Australia Melipilla, Chile Mérida, Venezuela Middlesbrough, England Mildura, Australia Mittagong, Australia Monageer, Ireland Morisset, Australia Morón, Argentina Mount Isa, Australia Munich, Germany Nairobi, Kenya Naval, Philippines Neerkol, Australia

Newcastle, Australia Ngong, Kenya Ollur, India Ottré, Belgium Paraná, Argentina Perth, Australia Pilar, Argentina Poznań, Poland Preston, England Quilicura, Chile Quilmes, Argentina Rab, Croatia Reading, England Riekhofen, Germany Rio de Janeiro, Brazil Rufisque, Senegal Saint-Jean-de-Maurienne, France

Salta, Argentina San Luis Potosí, México Santiago, Chile Santo Domingo, Dominican Re Sherbrooke, Canada Silverstream, New Zealand Soni, Tanzania St. John's, Canada Sydney, Australia Toowoomba, Australia Trondheim, Norway Tubay, Philippines Wagga Wagga, Australia Wexford, Ireland Wilno, Canada Wollongong, Australia