

Table of Contents

Those Who Stand Looking	50
➤ The Power to Choose	50
➤ The Place of Government.....	51
Native Population Type	51
➤ Galactic Shelf.....	51
➤ Major Natives	51
➤ Minor Races	52
➤ Race and Ethnicity	52
Pan-Galactic Pornography	53
➤ Courtly Love	54
➤ Special People	56
Sentience vs. Sapience	56
Dating Man	57
➤ Omega Point.....	58
➤ Boorish Behavior.....	59
Endnotes.....	59

See Appendix FR – The Fundamental Realities
See Appendix GT – Emergent Government Titles

“Ah, arrogance and stupidity all in the same package. How efficient of you!”
– Londo Mollari, Babylon 5, “In the Beginning” (1998)

Luc: *Are you really Emperor?*

Londo: *I sometimes ask myself the same question. Yes, I’m the Emperor. Here, you see? This is the seal of the Centauri Republic. Only the Emperor can wear it. So either I am the Emperor, or I am in a great deal of trouble. Or both.*

– Babylon 5, “In the Beginning” (1998)

Those Who Stand Looking: All positions must begin with at least three Government Titles and cannot have more than five Government Titles.¹ Government Titles represent some combination of the central authorities of a civilization, the groups and interests who hold power over those central authorities, and the identities and visions of the people over whom those far reaching authorities govern. Positions must begin the game with a central government.

- **The Power to Choose:** Each position chooses starting Government Titles after the Public Space is set.
 - ✓ All positions must choose one (and only one) Structural Government Title and may choose, from a pool of ten randomly generated Estate and Social Titles called The Foresight, any combination of two or more additional Estate and Social Government Titles up to a maximum of five total Titles (incl. Structural Title).
 - ✓ The number of Government Titles also determines the number of Powers a position may activate each turn and how many Acts and Scenes are received each turn during the game. Government Titles are a complex subject that is described in greater detail later in these rules, but like Fundamental Realities, more Government Titles tend to restrict the options available to a position, even as the position receives the ability to do more from having more Titles (five Titles really is a practical game limit).
 - ✓ Unlike Fundamental Realities, Government Titles can be changed during the game, but it is a disruptive and sometimes difficult process that should be undertaken with care. Therefore, the initial choice of Government Titles is important. The Foresight will remain after setup as a pool of Titles from which a position may choose during the game when changing Titles. The Concierge will not alter Government Titles choices submitted by the positions.
 - ✓ See further discussion of The Foresight in Pool of the Abyss, 4 Government Titles, p. 630, *infra*.

Positions should choose Titles which they can probably maintain in the near-term and plan their early game based on what will keep the Titles from failing all Conflict Checks and becoming disrupted (see Foreclosure of a Dream, 3 Government Titles, p. 615, *infra*). Some are more difficult than others. As a concession to the early game situation, Conflict Checks will not be checked until the end of the third or fourth turn. Happy honeymoon.

- **The Place of Government:** All Government Titles consist of two parts, the large Government Title ‘piece’ which is placed on the Public Space and a corresponding Magna Carta describing the legitimacy requirements of the Government Title. Government Titles must be legally placed on the Public Space during the setup, as described in the Government Titles section. Once placed, the Government Titles cannot be moved, but can be removed during the course of the game if the Government Title is disrupted or changed.

“They didn’t listen of course. Arrogant men never do. Sadly, arrogance has never been exclusively a Human trait. It travels between the stars like solar winds.” – Londo Mollari, Babylon 5, “In The Beginning” (1998)

Native Population Type: A Native Population Type is a unique intelligent species that has its own subjective and objective physiological and psychological identity as a distinct sapient species. In short, a Native Population Type is your biologically and/or mechanically distinct species: Your starting population and all population factors descended from them during the game.

- **Galactic Shelf:** Native population types are all assumed to be sapient, possess existential free will, possess a Sentience Quotient (SQ) of approximately +13 (human = SQ+13) and are assumed to be at the top of the food chain on their homeworld. They are not assumed to be necessarily humanoid, human or possess any specific body size or shape. Dr. Who is perhaps the best example of an intelligence in excess of SQ+13 in video science-fiction; his main, consistently demonstrated, ability is to process and analyze vast amounts of information, subtle observations and clues (his awareness) in short amounts of time, on a higher order than the human form he takes.
 - ✓ Prof. Antonio Damasio (Dept. of Neuroscience, University of Southern California), “has suggested that consciousness, whether the primitive ‘core consciousness’ of animals or the ‘extended’ self-conception of humans, requiring autobiographical memory, emerges from emotions and feelings” (Jason Pontin, “The Importance of Feelings,” MIT Technology Review, June 17, 2014).² Thus, to the extent that sapience is congruent with humans, it must contain “extended self-conception” and “autobiographical memory.” See full feature quote in The Work of the Mind discussion, 3 The Big Bang, p. 9, *supra*.
- **Major Natives:** Each position represents a Major Native Population Type; two or more positions may represent different factions of the same Major Native Population Type, with related, but different sets of Fundamental Realities and Government Titles. Major Native Population Types are those that have achieved at least a significant in-system travel and colonization capability, and in most cases, have achieved interstellar flight capabilities or will soon, i.e. technologically-advanced races. The Native Population Type of each position begins with the initial populations and extends through all population factors grown from the original populations. All population factors of each position’s Native Population Type are affected, as appropriate, by the Fundamental Realities and the Primal State chosen before the game, the current Government Titles, all technologies completed, and share the Public Space belonging to their position while they are part of their Native Population Type’s position.
 - ✓ The concept of major races as presented here comes directly from my experience playing Traveller RPG in my youth; Major Race is a very specific and defined term in

Traveller's Third Imperium setting. However, Traveller's scheme of Major and Minor races simply codified a long-running thematic division in science-fiction literature: races, civilizations and/or populations that have achieved technology and interstellar travel capabilities, and those that did not. This in turn is assuredly an echo of the era of European global exploration, colonization and dominance, where the stark difference existed between those cultures that had oceangoing ships and accurate navigation and those that did not (e.g., see the *United States v The Amistad*, 1841). In this sense, GGDM is an echo of European colonialism, as is science-fiction trope.

- Minor Races: In addition to the Native Population Types of the positions (i.e. the Major Races), there may be a number of Minor Races located in the Galactic Space. Minor Races are discussed in 4 Diplomacy, p. 1140, *infra*. These Minor Races are civilizations distinguished from the Major Races in that they have not yet achieved either Stardrive or significant in-system colonization (and probably won't anytime soon). The Concierge controls all Minor Races and determines their placement. Players will generally not know the location of Minor Races until they discover them.
 - ✓ The core definition of the term "species" is the ability to reproduce offspring who can in turn reproduce. Two creatures belong to the same species – despite outward differences in size and appearance (e.g., sexual dimorphism, sexual dichromatism) – if they can produce offspring who can, if they survive, produce offspring of like kind. Species is continuity of life.
- Race and Ethnicity: Whether a Native Population Type has distinct races and ethnicities is up to the players and the Concierge. **Race** is more genetic (in the current use) while **ethnicity** is based more on common ancestry, culture, language, and dress. Both are a result more or less of random assortment of genes, genetic drift and genetic isolation – one of the primary drivers of mutation and evolution – in large populations spread over the surface of a sizable planet. It is more likely than not, then, that any species that comes into the game as a result of evolution (which implies an ability to change and a process of change, probably biological change), will have some sort of racial and/or ethnically distinct groupings. Diaspora to colonies would tend to continue the process and/or create new 'races' and 'ethnic' groups based on colonial ancestry and affiliation. This does not automatically equate to the presence of racism or ethnic hostility.
 - ✓ When I was young, I read S is for Space (1966), R is for Rocket (1960), Dandelion Wine (1957), The Martian Chronicles (1950) and maybe the Illustrated Man (1951) by Ray Bradbury. One story I remembered 35+ years later was "Way in the Middle of the Air" (1950) (I confess I had to go look up the title, but I remembered the gist of the story) about an Exodus of African Americans ("blacks") from the old Jim Crow South aboard rocket ships going to Mars colonies. It was in The Martian Chronicles, but I think it was excluded from the TV mini-series (1979) and was excluded from post-Cold War reprints. The base question of the story was what would Southern white men do without a daily target for their racism? It was published before the Civil Rights Movement. The Exodus is never mentioned elsewhere, and therefore is a discontinuity to the stitched-together story of The Martian Chronicles. It was one of Bradbury's few timely and overtly political stories, and critics (e.g., Sparknotes) believe it is one of his weakest.

“...absurdities like aliens who lusted after Earthwomen (about as logical as a man lusting after female though not male lobsters) and human/alien cross-breeding (genetically impossible) were once a firm part of the science fiction tradition.” – [The Science in Science Fiction](#), Ed. by Peter Nicholls (1982)

Pan-Galactic Pornography: What is sexy to an alien? The game assumes generally, that cross-breeding between Native Population Types (whether Major or Minor) *will not* occur. Interstellar interspecies crossbreeding should be viewed with extreme skepticism across the board, even if the species involved are both humanoid.³ With the necessary caveat – and this is where science-fiction writers find a loophole for interspecies crossbreeding – that modern humans have Neanderthal and Denisovan DNA indicating crossbreeding of premodern (or archaic) and *now extinct* hominid subspecies (e.g., a first-generation Neanderthal-Denisovian offspring was found⁴). This also indicates that premodern human ancestors had spread to Asia and had the ability to traverse short distances over water *before* the famous “out of Africa” migration of early modern humans.

- ✓ “The prehistoric world of multiple human species co-existing has often been compared to Middle Earth or other fantasy worlds, where dwarfs, elves and others all share the lands ... however ... the world of multiple human species was more like Star Trek with introgression between species being pretty common...” – Ben G. Thomas, “Who Were The Denisovan Humans?” YouTube, April 12, 2020.

Science-fiction literature rarely invokes or discusses the subject as it leads to uncomfortable discussions – whereas apparently faster-than-light travel is sexier and not considered as problematic technologically or philosophically for science-fiction writers and fandom. Fantasy, freed from inconvenient science, takes a more permissive, romantic and liberal “love conquers all” view (e.g., Arwen in Lord of the Rings). On Earth, we have had limited success in crossbreeding animal species, and the parents must share the same genus, for example, the mule (a male mule is called a horse mule, a rare female mule is called a Molly, but Mollys very rarely have offspring).

- ✓ In the Babylon 5 Crusade episode “The Needs of Earth” (1999) a stolen data crystal had a pornographic scene involving humans and aliens. There was no implication of reproduction, however. Surgical alteration was implied so that aliens could interact with humans in that way.
- ✓ In “Love Doesn’t Last Forever,” by Alan Moore (writer) and Rich Vietch (illustrator) in Epic Illustrated #34 (February 1986), pp. 16-23, a man has an affair with an alien and catches a horrific disease. He then killed his wife, her loverboy, and himself to make sure the disease didn’t spread, but the loverboy’s widow boarded a transport with the infection.
- ✓ In another old science-fiction short story (and I apologize that I do not have the title), an interstellar explorer discovers a lush green planet where a certain species of plant produces elaborate flowers that look like a seductive young human female lounging on a couch, along with hallucinogenic scents that cause male sexual desire. The females of the planet’s indigenous humanoid population destroy the plants whenever they find them, but the humans turn the planet into a sex tourist attraction.

- ✓ BSG featured crossbreeding between human model Cylons and humans and Hera became the mitochondrial Eve of modern humanity... that was mostly the point of the whole story about epochal cycles.

Note however, that the Lost Colonist Position (see 6 Beginnings, p. 63, *infra*) shares a *biological* Native Population Type with another position in the game – and thus are of the same species or close anyway – and mixing and crossbreeding (but not in the truest sense) *might* be possible between those two positions.

- ✓ Technically, Delenn in Babylon 5 was a Minbari that became a Human to close the circle of the prophecy (Captain Sinclair became a male Minbari). As a member of the Grey Council (until she broke it) and a leader of the religious caste, Delenn was still considered a Minbari ... but it is clearly indicated that she had a post-marital sexual relationship with Capt. Sheridan, that she had normal human ‘female problems’ (she consulted with Susan Ivonova who became her human female mentor), and they had a son, David. Whether Humans and Minbari constitute a Lost Colonist Primal State (see 6 Beginnings, p. 63, *infra*) relationship in Babylon 5 depends on whether you share the Minbari beliefs about the cycling and migration of souls. They certainly evolved independently on two planets, unless you believe outside agencies, e.g., the First Ones or the Great Machine, intervened, and thus are very different humanoid biologies. There is no indication that other Human and Minbari pairings could reproduce or even that they were sexually compatible, only that Delenn changed species.
 - See also Prophecy discussion, 2 Wheels in the Sky generally, *infra*.

But the situation might also be like that of Chimps and Bonobos or Old World and New World Monkeys, cases where populations separated by geography drifted apart into separate species.

- Courtly Love: Whether ‘courtly love’ or ‘platonic love’ could exist between alien species is a much more interesting question.

- ✓ “According to the autobiographic *La Vita Nuova*, Beatrice and Dante met only twice during their lives. ... It is more likely that the encounters with Beatrice that Dante writes of are the two that fulfill his poetic vision, and Beatrice, like Petrarch’s Laura, seem to blur the line between an actual love interest and a means employed by the poet in his creations.

Following their first meeting, Dante was so enthralled by Beatrice that he later wrote in *La Vita Nuova: Ecce Deus fortior me, qui veniens dominabitur michi* (‘Behold, a deity stronger than I; who coming, shall rule over me’). Indeed, Dante frequented parts of Florence, his home city, where he thought he might catch even a glimpse of her. As he did so, he made great efforts to ensure his thoughts of Beatrice remained private, even writing poetry for another lady, so as to use her as a ‘screen for the truth.’

Dante’s courtly love for Beatrice continued for nine years, before the pair finally met again. This meeting occurred in a street of Florence, which she walked along dressed in white and accompanied by two older women. She turned and greeted him, her salutation filling him with such joy that he retreated to his room to think about her. In doing so, he fell asleep, and had a dream which would become the subject of the first sonnet in *La Vita Nuova*.” – from Wikipedia article, “Beatrice Portinari.”

- ✓ “Upon her death in 1348, the poet found that his grief was as difficult to live with as was his former despair. ... While it is possible she was an idealized or pseudonymous character – particularly since the name ‘Laura’ has a linguistic connection to the poetic ‘laurels’ Petrarch coveted – Petrarch himself always denied it. His frequent use of *l’aura* is also remarkable....

There is psychological realism in the description of Laura, although Petrarch draws heavily on conventionalised descriptions of love and lovers from troubadour songs and other literature of courtly love. Her presence causes him unspeakable joy, but his unrequited love creates unendurable desires, inner conflicts between the ardent lover and the mystic Christian, making it impossible to reconcile the two. Petrarch’s quest for love leads to hopelessness and irreconcilable anguish, as he expresses in the series of paradoxes in Rima 134 ‘Pace non trovo, et non ò da far guerra;/e temo, et spero; et ardo, et son un ghiaccio’: ‘I find no peace, and yet I make no war:/and fear, and hope: and burn, and I am ice.’ Laura is unreachable – the few physical descriptions of her are vague, almost impalpable as the love he pines for...” – from Wikipedia article, “Petrarch,” captured October 31, 2019.

Nowadays, Dante and Petrarch would be called pervs and stalkers, and someone would call the police. They would be fired from their jobs or sued for harassment. Or their female love interest would say something rude like “Take a picture, it will last longer,” and some frat boy would want to start a fistfight. Our thoughts now always go instantly to the carnal; a complete historical turn from the poetic and literary ideals of five centuries ago, by the standards of centuries past, modernity has devolved us to the base and vulgar version of humanity.

Courtly or platonic love is beyond the reach of the current milieu where sexual gratification is idealized, and because of this, science-fiction literature has rarely attempted it (it requires considerable buildup to get to the concept currently). In Star Wars, the love between Luke Skywalker and Princess Leia must remain platonic because they are siblings, while the baser Han Solo character is free to indulge in his carnal desires. But they are all humans.

Perhaps the best screen version of science-fiction courtly or platonic love is in Babylon 5:

- ✓ “As part of the rebirth ceremony, I am required to tell someone that which I have never told anyone before. I love her [Deleenn]. ... My love for Deleenn is not quite what you might think. It is not romantic love as you consider it, it’s something higher, and nobler. A pure, perfect love if you will. I know that Deleenn is fated for another and I’ve accepted that in my heart. But I have vowed to stay at her side through all things for as long as I live. ... Since I can never tell her, I tell you as part of the ritual.” – Lennier, Babylon 5, “Ceremonies of Light and Dark” (1996).

Later, Lennier says to Deleenn in “Rising Star” (1997), “All love is unrequited.” He was repeating what Ivonova allegedly said, but he was really saying what he meant. Later in “Objects at Rest” (1998), Lennier finally gives into his jealousy and abandons Capt. Sheridan (now Deleenn’s husband) instead of rescuing him from an accident. Lennier fled into the unknown and broke his vow to stay by her side for as long as he lived.

- ✓ See also discussion of Shared Meanings in *The Commonality*, 3 Diplomacy, p. 1131, *infra*.

- Special People: There may also be other Major Races or ‘special races’ that are not Minor Races, which are introduced, defined and controlled by the Concierge for game purposes (e.g., the ‘Sea Peoples’ who plagued the late Bronze Age Mediterranean).

“Long before you were born a man decided that there could be a very simple test to determine if a machine was intelligent. Not only intelligent, but aware, possessed of a psychology. The test had only one question. Can a machine converse with a human with enough facility that the human could not tell that she was talking to a machine? I always thought this was cruel – the test depends entirely upon a human judge and human feelings, whether the machine feels intelligent to the observer. It privileges the observer, the human, to a crippling degree. It seeks only believably human responses. It wants perfect mimicry, not a new thing. It’s a mirror in which men wish only to see themselves.” – Catherynne M. Valente, Silently and Very Fast (2011)

Sentience vs. Sapience: Science-fiction writers have regularly misused the word “sentient” for decades when they mean “sapient” and “sapience” and it has spread to other writers and media. It always starts with definitions (tendentious pedant time!⁵):

- ✓ Merriam-Webster online dictionary at **sentient**: **1**: responsive to or conscious of sense impressions; **2**: AWARE; **3**: finely sensitive in perception or feeling.
- ✓ Merriam-Webster online dictionary at **sentience**: **1**: a sentient quality or state; **2** : feeling or sensation *as distinguished from perception and thought* (emphasis added).
- ✓ Merriam-Webster online dictionary at **sapient**: possessing or expressing great sagacity.
- ✓ Merriam-Webster online dictionary at **sagacity**: the quality of being sagacious.
- ✓ Merriam-Webster online dictionary at **sagacious**: **1 obsolete: keen in sense perception**; **2 a: of keen and farsighted penetration and judgment** : DISCERNING, **b**: caused by or indicating acute discernment (emphasis added).
- ✓ Merriam-Webster online dictionary at **sapience**: wisdom, sagacity.

So sentient/sentience cannot be the same as sapient/sapience, *ut infra*. The terms will be used correctly here as the distinction is vitally important, that is, in GGDM text, “sapient/sapience” will often be used where others would use “sentient/sentience.” Sentience Quotient and sapience are entirely different measures of *looking* (discussed later), and should not be confused – for example, it is probably possible to have a SQ +20 computer that is not sapient – though it is likely there is some as yet unarticulated relationship between SQ and sapience. Sentience was congruent with life until the information age, sapience was congruent with biological personhood until the possibility of artificial intelligence was first recognized (have you hugged a T-800 today?).

- ✓ “The Turing Test was invented in 1950 by British mathematician Alan Turing, one of the fathers of the computer age. Turing was also a gay man in a period when homosexuality was illegal in Britain. In 1952 he was convicted of committing homosexual acts and forced to undergo chemical castration. Two years later he committed suicide. *The Turing Test is simply a replication of a mundane test every gay man had to undergo in the 1950s Britain: can you pass for a straight man?* Turing knew from personal experience

that it didn't matter who you really were – it mattered only what others thought of you. According to Turing, in the future computers would be just like gay men in the 1950s. It won't matter whether computers will actually be conscious or not. It will matter only what people think about it.” – Yuval Noah Harari, Homo Deus: A History of Tomorrow (2016) (emphasis added).

- ✓ “I’ll tell you what, for every cyborg that isn’t human, I’ll show you a person that’s less than human.” – Cpt. Walker, Nydenion (2010).⁶
- ✓ See discussion of sophonts in *Alien Persons and Sophantistry*, 2 *Diplomacy*, pp. 1110, 1113, *infra*.

“We’ve never observed the Neanderthal Y chromosome DNA in any human sample ever tested,’ Carlos Bustamante, professor of biomedical data science and of genetics at Stanford’s School of Medicine said in a news release. ‘That doesn’t prove it’s totally extinct, but it likely is.’ Researchers aren’t sure if the absence happened by chance or can be explained by evolutionary circumstances. It may be, Bustamante said, that genes in the Neanderthal’s Y chromosome were incompatible with human genes. ‘The functional nature of the mutations we found, suggests to us that Neanderthal Y chromosome sequences may have played a role in barriers to gene flow, but we need to do experiments to demonstrate this and are working to plan these now,’ Bustamante said.”

– Brooks Hayes, “Modern male DNA without Y chromosome genes from Neanderthals,” *United Press International (UPI.com)*, April 7, 2016

Dating Man: Despite what females think, there is no Neanderthal Y Chromosomes in modern males (*ut supra*).

- ✓ See also Assortative Mating discussion, 5 *Taxation & Census*, p. 344, *infra*.

There have been many people who have claimed to ‘disprove’ the ‘theory of evolution.’⁷ None have been convincing and the idea of evolution of life on Earth, if not elsewhere, remains a bedrock of science, and a crumbling bedrock of opposition by religious conservatives.⁸ In the 1980s, however, evolution was not taught in high schools, no school board politicians would touch it, unless they could appease the religious conservatives by also teaching ‘creation science,’ a farce that was shot down by the courts (e.g., *McLean v. Arkansas* (1982), *Edwards v. Aguillard* (1987), and *Kitzmiller v. Dover Area School District* (2005) re: neo-creationist “intelligent design,” opinions are available in free PDF online), and mocked by the media.

- ✓ “Evolution pervades all biological phenomena. To ignore that it occurred or to classify it as a form of dogma is to deprive the student of the most fundamental organizational concept in the biological sciences. No other biological concept has been more extensively tested and more thoroughly corroborated than the evolutionary history of organisms.” – National Academy of Sciences (1984) as cited in Eugenie C. Scott, “Antievolution and Creationism in the United States,” *Annual Review of Anthropology* (1997), PDF is available for free at http://bio.classes.ucsc.edu/bio175/Other/Scott_1997.pdf.

Evolution is not properly a ‘theory’ but more or less accepted empirical fact; any confusion of this point is a willful lack of understanding of the scientific process: There is no shortage of scientific media on this subject refuting religious fundamentalists. Any success in ‘disproving’ evolution would essentially *destroy modern science as it is currently* as every branch of science – physics, chemistry, biology, psychology, zoology, geology, every one – has contributed something to the study of evolution of life on Earth. This is, of course, exactly what some people want, they want to somehow shove the genie back into the bottle, claw the world back to some religiously idealized time and condition in the past, to recede technology, undo history since 1780 A.D.

- ✓ This should not be confused, however, with the anarcho- or green-primitivism movements, who want a similar result but for different reasons and don’t seem to care much about evolution or science, but oppose the current technological civilization.
- **Omega Point:** Alternatively, ‘theistic evolution’ does not present itself as a theory and thus is not ‘creation science,’ but rather an attempt to harmonize creation mythology, supreme being (or God if you like), mysticism, with biological evolution and abiogenesis. To the extent that theistic evolution is so presented, most people listen politely, then shrug their shoulders and keep their own opinions. The problem with ‘theistic evolution’ is that it is primarily Christian (or by a stretch Abrahamic) and to be fully colorable as an argument, it should treat all creation myths as equally valid (a problem in itself) and seek to harmonize all of them consistently with each other and with biological evolution, cosmology’s age of the universe, geology’s age of the Earth – and you can be sure that other religions are not going to agree to this at all, and I do not think such efforts have been made in any case. Further, it suffers from the same “*a priori* metaphysical assumptions” as creation science, “that there exists a creator of the life whose origin is being examined” (from Wikipedia article, “Creation Science,” February 2, 2019), that is, that ‘theistic evolution’ – though not presenting itself as a theory (and avoiding testability) – begins with the assumptions both that creation stories are valid (in some non-literal sense) and a stated acceptance of biological evolution as valid, and then tries to harmonize them. That’s the problem in a nutshell.

Theistic evolution probably traces in part back to Pierre Teilhard de Chardin’s (1881–1955) Omega Point:

- ✓ “Teilhard’s theory was a personal attempt in creating a new Christianity in which science and theology coexist. The outcome was that his theory of the Omega Point was not perfectly scientific as examined by physicists, and not perfectly Christian either” – from Wikipedia article, “Omega Point,” February 6, 2019.

Omega Point, like the Rapture, or the once posited Big Crunch or opposite, Heat Death of the Universe, is so far removed into the uncertain future from the lives of humanity that it’s really meaningless, and so most people politely listen, shrug their shoulders and keep their own opinions. See discussion of Empirical Mythology, 1 Technology, p. 691, *infra*.

- ✓ “Young Earth creationists ... criticise theistic evolution on theological grounds, finding it hard to reconcile the nature of a loving God with the process of evolution, in particular, the existence of death and suffering before the Fall of Man. They consider that it undermines central biblical teachings by regarding the creation account as a myth, a parable, or an allegory, instead of treating it as historical. They also fear that a capitulation to what they call ‘atheistic’ naturalism will confine God to the gaps in

scientific explanations, undermining biblical doctrines, such as God’s incarnation through Christ.” – from Wikipedia article, “Theistic Evolution,” February 3, 2019.

- **Boorish Behavior:** Notably, the time that ‘creation science’ was being challenged in the courts coincides generally with the time that Christian Fundamentalist were also fiercely (and futilely) attacking Dungeons & Dragons (and Ozzy Osbourne, AC/DC, comic books, movies, and anything else they didn’t like) as ‘satanic’ or a cult that leads to suicide.

- ✓ See Excerpt – Dangerous Games, Prime Mover, *supra*.

Fundamental Christianity lost both battles and looked very foolish, boorish in the process, then the world moved on, the Berlin Wall came down in 1989. Clearly this outlines as a fight for *worldview* by – when the population could not be convinced otherwise – attempting to suppress disagreeable or distasteful ideas from general publication and from teaching in public schools. It failed on all counts.

- ✓ See Tyranny in the Nursery discussion, 3 Colleges, p. 491, *infra*.

- ✓ “The Bible as we have it contains elements that are scientifically incorrect or even morally repugnant. No amount of ‘explaining away’ can convince us that such passages are the product of Divine Wisdom.” – Rabbi Bernard J. Bamberger.

It is not the religion that is objectionable. And that is a distinction to be made; someone like reformist Rabbi Bamberger who recognizes that there are problems with the biblical record, both morally and scientifically, but still keeps the faith and spirit of the ancient religion, is the complete opposite of Biblical literalist and fundamentalist who insist that their book is right, divine, and the only truth and arrive at preordained conclusions, regardless of the mounting evidence, analysis, commentary and belief of the population to the contrary.⁹

The screaming and fanatical ranting of the religious fundamentalist and literalist is an alternate reality and a *prolonged shout into the void*, barrowing phrases from Sam Brodey, “The Chronicles of Nunes: How His Impeachment Speeches Created an Alternate Reality for GOP,” The Daily Beast, November 26, 2019 (emphasis added) (see full quote, 2 Constructural Elements, EN 5, p. 201, *infra*).

“The ideology of the old Commonwealth seems to grow more aristocratic the more we learn about it, so I’m a bit ambivalent about the return of the great and mighty Vedrans. It’s nice to see a fictional universe where a human being is not the greatest thing anyone can be, but the reverential tone Dylan gets when he talks about Vedrans makes me uncomfortable. And I really dislike the concept of alien Warders for a noble species – hopefully that’s the exception rather than the rule. Right now the old Commonwealth seems almost as hierarchical as Nietzschean society. When sentient ships are programmed to think as servants that dote and depend on captain-masters, one suspects an ideology of patronage and privilege exists elsewhere in the social order.”

– Michelle Erica Green, review of Andromeda episode, “The Fair Unknown,” littlereview.com, April 14, 2002

Endnotes.

¹ Commentary & Citation: Having only three Government Titles might be interpreted as an ideology of small government:

- ✓ “In any case it may be too little too late. The lack of police staff is a major issue, but not at the root of the problem, a lack of government commitment is. There are just too few civil servants securing the checks and balances of the state. If, for instance, there are no border police checking the cargo and no civil servants doing background checks on entrepreneurs, criminal elements can work with ease. It’s a tragic by-product of the years long political call for small government. Where small government rules, it turns out, criminal networks can flourish.” – Nadette De Visser, “The Dutch are Waking Up to Discover They Live in a ‘Narco State’” The Daily Beast, November 26, 2019.

² Citation: “Oh, the arrogance. I was recently talking to one of my friends, a former Bill Clinton operative, about the unique properties a special category of people have in common. The category is Humans Who Run for President of the United States. The unique properties are, in a word, an outsized sense of self. A level of arrogance is, by definition, required. Imagine believing you can solve unwieldy, complex, centuries-old, systemic problems that others heretofore have not, that your singular genetic and experiential alchemy makes you the best person to lead a nation, that you can in fact defeat dozens of other capable and qualified candidates to be the last man or woman standing.” – S.E. Cupp, “Hillary Clinton, get real,” CNN, November 14, 2019.

³ Citation: “Dogs and foxes cannot interbreed, because they have vastly differing chromosome counts. The red fox (*Vulpes vulpes*) has 34; the dog (*Canis lupus familiaris*) has 70. Gametes from each animal (sex cells) would have 17 chromosomes for the fox, and 35 for the dog. Assuming they could even figure out what each other wanted enough to mate, you’d have gametes with 17 and 35 chromosomes meeting, and a zygote of 34 complete chromosome pairs with 18 unpaired chromosomes hanging out in each cell. This is not compatible with life.” – Lorri Robinson in response to “Can a dog and fox breed? What would the mix be called?” Quora Forums, August 20, 2015.

⁴ Citation: Matthew Warren, “Mum’s a Neanderthal, Dad’s a Denisovan: First discovery of an ancient-human hybrid,” Nature, August 22, 2018.

⁵ Commentary: Throughout GGDM, definitions are important due to the nature of the game and the nature of the conversation. GGDM uses abundant dictionary definitions and definitions from other sources, and also provides definitions of terms as used within the game.

- ✓ GGDM is in some ways like Dune (1965). I read a review of the 2000 SyFy Channel remake of the Dune movie that commented that the mini-series explained and over-explained throughout so that ‘no one would be left behind.’ The strange terminology was one of the complaints of viewers of the 1984 David Lynch Dune movie. For GGDM to have any value, no one who makes the effort should be left behind.

⁶ Commentary: This is from the English subtitles, it made more sense than what the actor actually said at that moment, which is why I turned on the subtitles. ☺ I have encountered two movies recently where the English close captioned subtitles didn’t fully match the audio dialogue.

⁷ Commentary: *Blitzkrieg* was once a theory too, a military theory to overcome the limitations and problems of WWI industrial warfare (what Napoleon might have called ‘Grand Tactics’). The campaigns of 1939-1940 made it no longer a theory. The results of WWII did not disprove blitzkrieg as a theory, in fact, had no impact at all on the argument; the Germans lost WWII for other reasons, reasons other than the execution of Blitzkrieg. Technology changed the environment and Germany’s enemies learned their system; the principles of blitzkrieg are still at the heart of armored tactics even today.

- ✓ Thus, it is unlikely that the ‘Theory of Evolution’ can be disproven, rather, it may likely be superseded later as technology advances provide new tools for understanding, or our view of the universe changes. But it will still be true within the scope in which it was first conceived.

⁸ Commentary: Calling the ‘evolutionary biology’ a theory is the same as calling climate change a hoax or theory while the polar ice caps are melting and collapsing. Or like calling global civilization a dream ideology cooked up by Hollywood liberals.

⁹ Citation: “[Alexander] Cain wants to know why America isn’t mentioned [in the Bible], and then he centers in on Babylon. Because, you know, that’s never before been done in the history of [Biblical] interpretation....

[quoting from Cain’s book] “Babylon will reach space as it ‘mounts up to heaven’ (Jeremiah 51:53) and ‘raises its throne above the stars of God’ (Isaiah 14:14).”

Cain like many futurists is indeed a literalist, but this seems quite bizarre. This is really supposed to be about the space program? It’s hard to believe that anyone will take this seriously. Still, many will. This language is used to refer to pride and not to a literal action that is taking place.” – Nick Peters, “A Brief Look At Alexander Cain,” May 6, 2015 (forum post, TheologyWeb).