Table of Contents

"It does not matter whether the right to govern is hereditary or obtained with the consent of the governed. A State is absolute in the sense which I have in mind when it claims the right to a monopoly of all the force within the community, to make war, to make peace, to conscript life, to tax, to establish and disestablish property, to define crime, to punish disobedience, to control education, to supervise the family, to regulate personal habits, and to censor opinions. The modern State claims all of these powers, and, in the matter of theory, there is no real difference in the size of the claim between communists, fascists, and democrats." – Walter Lippmann, A Preface to Morals (1929)

Republics or Principalities: Walter Lippmann's idea of the state echoes both Max Weber's classic definition of sovereignty and also Machiavelli's famous introductory distinction of two types of sovereign states:

- ✓ "All states, all powers, that have held and hold rule over men have been and are either republics or principalities." – opening lines to The Prince by Machiavelli (1513), translated by W.K. Marriott.

- ✓ Mr. Weber died in 1920, nine years before the Lippmann book, Mr. Bernays published Propaganda the year before.[1]

Note how Lippmann's description parallels in many respects the Vital Powers described in GGDM – one of dozens of instances where the game design concepts (mainly from 2000-2002) preceded my discovery of intellectuals who already had pioneered the same concepts. This is not to say that I am any sort of intellectual prodigy – I am assuredly not – but that those concepts have become part of our milieu and in my youth, I picked up on the threads of the concepts without knowing or even asking, their origins. This process has been an intellectual version of Zeno's Paradox, where I play Achilles, forever chasing the tortoise.

- ✓ I did read The Prince when I was about 20 years old. When I later read Albert Camus' The Fall (1956) in World Literature in my senior year of college – I was 29 years old then – I felt it resembled somehow The Prince, though I still cannot say exactly why. It was just a connection I couldn't shake. Just something about it...

"Norway is a sovereign nation. Were we to accede to Germany's demands, we would not be. The answer must therefore be no."

– Foreign Minister Koht, The King's Choice (2016), from English subtitles

The Earthly Entanglement: Sovereignty is the necessary, exclusive property of an independent state or entity.[2] Max Weber famously defined a State as, any "...community that successfully claims the *monopoly of the legitimate use of physical force* within a given territory."[3]

- ✓ Within the view of the Marxist-socialist, Max Weber's formulation is but an expression of the capitalist-bourgeois ideology, to wit:

  - ▪ "In the works of the founders of the liberal tradition – that is, the founders of bourgeois ideology – liberty is security and security is liberty. For the

> ruling class, security always has and always will triumph over liberty because 'liberty' has never been intended as a counter-weight to security. Liberty has always been security's lawyer." – George S. Rigakos and Mark Neocleous, "Anti-Security: A Declaration," 2011, https://www.academia.edu/2292255/Anti-security_A_Declaration.

✓ See also, The Bargain discussion at the end of 5 Culture, p. 426, *supra*. 'Supra-Legitimacy' was also discussed in relation to Type 3 Fundamental Realities in 3 Beginnings, p. 42, *supra*, and in relation to the 'Happiness Meta-Aspect' in 4 Culture, pp. 409, 411, 414, *supra*.

✓ In this Marxist view then, security is not a 'supra-legitimacy' requirement of all governments, just those of the bourgeois ideology, and there only to the elite rulers, which view I believe would be rejected by the vast majority of humanity.

Sovereignty and legitimacy are the oldest known parts of the 'structure' of human civilizations and thus are properly included in any structural discussion.[4] However, sovereignty is not the application of force alone, it also requires a set of social, cultural, and economic forces that establish that force should not be needed but that if it is needed, it is legitimized.

✓ The *Ewiger Landfriede* passed in 1495 universally outlawed the medieval practices of feud and vendetta in the Holy Roman Empire. This created the state monopoly on the use of force in the modern sense, and required the creation of a judiciary to settle disputes, which removed dispute mediation from the direct power of the Emperor. It was the culmination of a medieval peace movement, and its eventual triumph over the next century shows that civilization found it preferable and internalized the idea.

▪ A parody of this process must occur in any space-opera setting.

✓ The Peace of Westphalia in 1648, made religion a sovereign choice and established inviolate borders, ending the religious wars and establishing international relations.

The structure of a government or political union is determined by who holds sovereignty. Sovereignty in a unitary government system is held by a single person or very small group of elites who can impose their supreme authority on the rest of the population and delegate authority.[5]

Smaller political units hold sovereignty in a confederation and form an intergovernmental umbrella organization for mutual benefit without giving up their sovereignty. A federation is a compromise contractual or quasi-contractual/customary distribution of sovereignty. Civil wars, revolts, succession disputes and insurrections almost always involve a declaration of sovereignty by a group that is not considered to hold sovereignty. Conquest, Conversion and Naturalization of populations (and even reversion) all relate to progressive acceptance of alien or foreign sovereignty.

There is a judicial view that the American Colonies, individually, never at any point had sovereignty, and thus could not have given, granted, conferred sovereignty to or upon anyone, but that sovereignty was conferred upon the colonies collectively by the King of England at the Treaty of Paris (certainly, the Founding Fathers agreed with Judge Bradshaw, see Luther & Charles excerpt *supra*). This view runs counter to the commonly held notion that states gave sovereignty to the federal government in forming the Articles of Confederation, and to the authority under which the state and local police forces have jurisdiction – how can state and local police have jurisdiction if they are not somehow sovereign?

2 Government Titles – Earthly Entanglement

Changes in sovereignty are momentous and, usually not peaceful, events within a society or civilization. There is always some group who has a vested interest in the *status quo* and/or who will perceive a threat arising from any change in sovereignty. Sovereignty is not an abstract concept; it is very real and enforceable by the necessary monopoly on the legitimate use of violence. It is also zero-sum.

- ✓ It is an interesting question for debate, whether each person is sovereign – that is, born sovereign or sovereign at adulthood – and gives up sovereignty by being part of society/civilization, or whether individuals are not sovereign, but that sovereignty is created when a government is formed that claims a geographical territory and certain powers.[6] Is each animal sovereign? Do our criminal laws treat individual's bodies as sovereign and inviolate? Which side you choose to argue speaks volumes about your philosophical leanings, are you a naturalist, transcendentalist, formalist or legalist?[7]

➢ <u>Dirty Hands</u>: Monopoly on the legitimate use of physical violence implies death or injury, it implies the willingness to inflict death or injury to keep 'order' and enforce laws. We all like to think we agreed to this by supporting law and order, but really, on a daily basis, our support is irrelevant in that respect; the monopoly was inherited by the current government.

- ✓ "Civilian authorities left all prerogatives to General Jacques Massu who, operating outside legal frameworks between January and September 1957, successfully eliminated the FLN from Algiers. The use of torture, forced disappearances and illegal executions by the French later caused controversy in France.... On 23 March following a meeting between Massu, Trinquier, Fossy-Francois and Aussaresses to discuss what was to be done with Ali Boumendjel, Aussaresses went to the prison where Boumendjel was being held and ordered that he be transferred to another building, in the process he was thrown from a 6th floor skybridge to his death.

  Major Aussaresses was unapologetic regarding the actions he had undertaken during the battle, he said that 'The justice system would have been paralyzed had it not been for our initiative. Many terrorists would have been freed and given the opportunity of launching other attacks .. The judicial system was not suited for such drastic conditions... Summary executions were therefore an inseparable part of the tasks associated with keeping law and order.'... The battle was the first clearly definable French victory of the war. The Paras and their commanders enjoyed immense popularity with the Pied-noirs and this sense of exuberance and strength would reach its zenith during the May 1958 crisis. ... As details of the use of torture and summary executions became public in the years following the battle and the end of the Algerian War, the French victory and the reputations of many of the commanders became tainted by the methods used in the battle." – from Wikipedia article, "Battle of Algiers."[8]

When the revolutionary characters in the movie Snowpiercer (2016) discovered that the guards had no bullets, the ultimate Why Not – the threat of instant death or punishment – vaporized in a second. The revolution was on!

- ✓ Irrelevance of consent to monopoly on the legitimate use of force on a daily basis is not the same as arguments about *police effectiveness* on a daily basis. Consent or cooperation of the population has a major impact on policing effectiveness daily (some neighborhoods are known to be or deemed hostile to the police); that is an argument related more to GGDM Enlightenment and Constructural Elements concepts.

✓ The core concept of non-violent resistance, non-violent protests is to deprive the authorities of any reason, any opportunity, to legitimize the use of force or violence against the dissidents to disperse the opposition. The second is to be willing to take the risk that they will anyway, the willingness to be victims of the government. Like the Soviets during the Berlin Airlift, if done correctly, with discipline, force of will, and intellect, the government is put into a difficult situation, and the bigger the protest, the better.

The development of the concept of sovereignty is inseparable from and intricately entangled with tribal warriors and heroic stories – the latter morphing into religion and tradition among warriors.[9] Who else was available to apply physical violence? And to rule and protect, they needed a monopoly on it and a leader to direct them. If for some reason you think this is not conceptually accurate, then we need a new definition of sovereignty. How would the concept of sovereignty develop among other races, for example, sheep or frogs or Emperor penguins? Thus global pacifist movements envision a world without borders – i.e. without sovereignty, and the more anarchist sorts also believe in limited or no government and/or police.

✓ "The script, titled Dead Right, by the husband-and-wife team of Harry Julian Fink and Rita M. Fink, was originally about a hard-edged New York City police inspector, Harry Callahan, who is determined to stop Travis, a serial killer, even if he has to skirt the law and accepted standards of policing, blurring the distinction between criminal and cop, to address the question as to how far a free, democratic society can go to protect itself." – from Wikipedia article, "Dirty Harry," September 29, 2019.

✓ "Nothing wrong with shooting as long as the right people get shot." – Dirty Harry, Magnum Force (1973).

✓ "Gary Crowdus wrote in Cinéaste, 'We are left with the comforting assurance that when we need him, Harry (and all the cops like him who do the 'dirty' jobs no one else wants) will be there protecting us from the lunatic fringes of both Left and Right. Sure, Harry may be a little trigger-happy but at least he shoots the right people. The problem, however – one which the film raises but never resolves – is who determines the definition of 'right' people?'" – from Wikipedia article, "Magnum Force," September 29, 2019.

▪ One critic noted that it would require an hour to explain, for each movie, why Dirty Harry is not in prison.

➢ <u>Glove Cleaner</u>: Power and responsibility go hand in hand, when one exists without the other, chaos or tyranny ensues. In each of us, our megalomaniac and narcissistic inner-selves can imagine power without responsibility; many historical situations feature sovereign power over but without responsibility to select groups or input from those groups resulting in exploitation, discrimination, resistance, and revolts (e.g., the War of the Sicilian Vespers).[10]

✓ "Freedom, however, is not the last word. Freedom is only part of the story and half of the truth. Freedom is but the negative aspect of the whole phenomenon whose positive aspect is responsibleness. In fact, freedom is in danger of degenerating into mere arbitrariness unless it is lived in terms of responsibleness. That is why I recommend that the Statue of Liberty on the East Coast be supplemented by a Statue of Responsibility on the West Coast." – Viktor Frankl.

- There is, in fact, a Statue of Responsibility Foundation for that exact purpose, see https://www.statueofresponsibility.com/. It's been around awhile, it doesn't seem to be very close to reality.

Power without responsibility is one of the great injustices that our political and judicial systems have sought to address, in a sense, for example, it might be a cause of the American and French Revolutions, Great Depression or the World Wars, and certainly of the dynastic wars that preceded them. And in our jobs and our lives, we have all experienced being held responsible for events and people we have no power over.

- ✓ Even Yahweh (aka Jehovah) in Robert Heinlein's <u>Job: The Comedy of Justice</u> (1984) was held to responsibilities by a higher power: The Branch Office. And Mr. Koshchei (probably related to Ambassador Kosh in Babylon 5, both from the Russian fables) had responsibilities to higher-ups, going back in infinite regression. Mr. Koshchei fined Yahweh for abuse of volitionals by forcing him to regenerate the Earth before the Rapture at his own expense from backup files.

➢ <u>Might Makes Right</u>: Implicit in the concept of sovereignty is the idea that might makes right. There is no avoiding it when resistance is removed and disputes are settled by legitimized physical force or resolved by the threat of it. In pre-Socratic societies, the concept had already become entangled with divine sanction, destiny, and heroic tales.

- ✓ "Rather than upholding a *status quo* and accepting the development of what he perceived as immorality within his region, Socrates questioned the collective notion of 'might makes right' that he felt was common in Greece during this period." – from Wikipedia article, "Socrates."

Thus Socrates was challenging both the concept of dynastic and aristocratic sovereignty preeminent in his day, but also the mythic religion that supported it. Thus, he was charged with religious impiety and corrupting the youth (see Hand Me the Hemlock, 1 Disruption, p. 256, *supra*).

And when hegemony is established by physical force or the threat of it, as is usually the case in history – there are millions of examples – the same problem occurs: Implicitly 'might makes right.' This then dovetails into the Hegemony discussion in 4 Order, p. 570, *supra*.

"'There's a reason you separate military and the police. One fights the enemies of the state. The other serves and protects the people. When the military becomes both, then the enemies of the state tend to become the people.' That quote comes from Battlestar Galactica's Commander Adama. He says it in the second episode of the first season of the series, 'Water,' written by Ron Moore. That episode is 10 years old. It's kinda crazy that a science-fiction story about interstellar warfare can so eloquently describe the horrifying situation in St. Louis County, Missouri. But it does. And so say we all..."

– Alex Abad-Santos, "Battlestar Galactica's timely warning about the militarization of policing," Vox (vox.com), August 14, 2014

The Roslin Maneuver: The issue of the 'militarization of the police' came to a boil in the summer heat of August 2014 in Ferguson, Missouri. Generally the discussion involved three points: a siege mentality among the police (aggravated by racism), the heavy-handed militant response by the police to protests and rioting, and the questionable decision of the U.S. Government to provide police with discarded military equipment to enhance their ability to fight foreign terrorism and drug gangs (related to the problem created by the Prohibition, see Flying the Banner, 4 Government Titles, p. 632, *infra*; see also the Opium Wars, 3 Commerce, p. 1216, *infra*).

- ✓ "On August 14, United States Senator Claire McCaskill (D-MO) stated that 'militarization of the police escalated the protesters' response.' St. Louis Chief of Police Sam Dotson stated he would not have employed military-style policing such as that which transpired. According to Chief Dotson, 'My gut told me what I was seeing were not tactics that I would use in the city and I would never put officers in situations that I would not do myself.' Another reason Dotson did not want the city and county police to collaborate was because of the history of racial profiling by police in that county." – from Wikipedia article, "Ferguson unrest," captured August 9, 2019 (five years later).

The civil state of any modern country can be judged by the relationship between the military, the police and the population; 2014 provided an unwholesome image of U.S. police departments as a hostile occupation force.[11]

Sometimes the media can be the police; All the President's Men (1976) was a 'procedural police crime drama' with newspaper reporters instead of police because law enforcement authorities were politically conflicted, inept, and untrustworthy in a situation involving the President of the United States.

- ✓ See previous parallel discussion regarding separation of political and military leadership, sociopolitical boundaries, The Fog of Lützen, 4 Colleges, p. 510, *supra*.

One of the most effective comments I saw was a post by an Iraqi War (and occupation) veteran which included a picture of him on patrol in Baghdad, with just a rifle and a combat vest and helmet. He commented that he 'patrolled one of the most dangerous cities in the world with less equipment and heavy-handed force' than the Ferguson, Missouri police used in responding to an initially peaceful protest.

"There is a contract and a bargain made between the King and his people, and your oath is taken: and certainly, Sir, the bond is reciprocal; for as you are the liege lord, so they liege subjects ... This we know, the one tie, the one bond, is the bond of protection that is due from the sovereign; the other is the bond of subjection that is due from the subject. Sir, if this bond be once broken, farewell sovereignty! ... These things may not be denied, Sir ... Whether you have been, as by your office you ought to be, a protector of England, or the destroyer of England, let all England judge, or all the world, that hath look'd upon it" – Judge Bradshaw's response to Charles I at Trial in January 1649

Regals and Revolutionaries: In the end, King Charles I lost his stutter and seemed to have understood very clearly the issues. The question he asked was fatal to the future of European monarchies (and of clerical-based legitimacy) and Louis XVI in 1793. Unfortunately, he was so convinced of his hereditary divine right to rule that he could envision no other basis for legitimacy. Judge Bradshaw knew already what position Charles I would take before the High Court convened by the Rump Parliament, and was waiting for the opportunity to *assert supra-legitimacy* as a principle over the King's claim of personal and exclusive sovereignty.

   ✓ See Luther & Charles excerpt, this section.

Giuseppe Garibaldi, the globe-trotting Freemason revolutionary hero of the Italian Unification (and also in South America) was in his youth a revolutionary seeking liberation and unification of Italy, as well as republicanism, social reform, and abolition of the Papacy and all clerical temporal power in Italy. After conquering Sicily and marching to capture Naples in 1860 (at age 53), he seems to have abandoned his campaign for social reform and republicanism – he sided against a peasant revolt in Sicily – instead fighting mainly for the unification of Italy, expulsion of foreign powers, and the recapture of Rome from the French (and abolition of the Papacy). This was a recognition that the forces in play (e.g., Emmanuel II), and his best possible chances for unification of Italy, were not either republican or interested in social reform. Thus, establishing sovereignty and restoring the ancient capital of Italy (and generating international sympathy) was the first priority (and this extended to the liberation of the Balkans, Greece, and Hungary) and the key to long-term self-determination of peoples. Garibaldi likely thought that social reform and republicanism would develop later if the people wanted it.

Subsequent history seems to confirm the validity of this idea; it took nearly a century and a national catastrophe for democratic forces to assert themselves in modern Italy. On July 25, 1943, King Victor Emmanuel III of Italy was able to finally reassert royal constitutional authority, dismiss Benito Mussolini from the government and have him arrested a few days after Rome was bombed by the Allies for the first time. The subsequent Armistice by Italy with the Allies and dissolution of the Fascist Party triggered the German occupation of Italy on September 8, 1943. Italy became a republic by referendum on June 2, 1946, and the King, Umberto II, was forced to abdicate and go into exile. Italy had grown tired of being Europe's centuries-long dynastic game of kick the can, tag, and king of the hill for every would-be conqueror.

   ✓ "I have seen three emperors in their nakedness, and the sight was not inspiring" – Otto von Bismarck (unsourced).

➢ Wake, Waking: Although the terms "imperial" and "empire" may be distasteful to modern Western citizens of democratic countries, empires are necessary for the development of the structures of human civilization by consolidating and centralizing economies, order, governance, political and military power and forcing the exchange of cultures – they were part of a historical process. In the chaos that follows the fall of the empire; the memory remains.

   ✓ "'Genesis, growth, time of troubles, universal state, and disintegration.' British historian Arnold J. Toynbee published a twelve volume work in 1961 called A Study of History. Those five words are what he deemed to be the stages that all civilizations go through before they ultimately break down. Toynbee argued that civilizations are not brought down by loss of control over the environment or loss of control over the human environment. He also added that attacks from the outside were not necessarily responsible for a society's collapse. But rather it was the societies themselves that

fail to solve new problems. Instead of creating new solutions to new problems, they overdevelop the structures for solving old ones.” – J.A. Willoughby, “The Promised Land,” This Side of Center (2014), p. 150 (Joseph Tainter seems to agree...).

✓ “The old civilisation, with all the brilliant qualities which make many moderns regret its destruction, rested on too narrow a base. The woman and the slave were left out, the woman especially by the Greeks, and the slave by the Romans.” – Dean William Ralph Inge, “St. Paul,” The Quarterly Review, Vol. 220, Nos. 438 & 439, January & April, 1914 (p. 61).[12]

✓ “Quite often the fall of such early empires acquires for later peoples the status of a paradise lost, a golden age of good government, wise rule, harmony, and peace, when all was right with the world. This is clearly evident in the writings of, for example, Gibbon (1776-88) on the Antonine period of the Roman Empire, of the ‘Hundred Schools’ on Chou China (Creel 1970; Needham 1965; Fairbank et al. 1973), or of Nehru on Mauryan India (1959). The attempt to understand the loss of paradise is at the same time a grasping to comprehend current conditions and a philosophy of how a political society should be. Here then is another dimension to the study of collapse: it is not only a scholarly attempt to understand the past and a practical attempt to ascertain the future, but also, in many minds, a statement of current political philosophy (see, for example, Isaac [1971]). This last aspect will not figure highly in the present work, but does account for much of the perennial concern with collapse.” – Joseph Tainter, The Collapse of Complex Societies (1988), p. 39.

St. Augustine of Hippo in On Christian Doctrine (426 A.D.) argued against the complete rejection and abandonment of the cultural achievements of classic antiquity during the terminal decline of the Western Roman Empire (arguing against, for example, his contemporary, St. Cyril of Alexandria whose monks murdered and dismembered Hypatia), but rather that ‘pagan’ skills and knowledge, be incorporated into the new age and repurposed for a Christian world. In his youth, St. Augustine was a teacher of rhetoric in Carthage and was appointed Rhetorical Professor in Milan where he became friends with Ambrose of Milan, also a great orator and rhetorician, thus, St. Augustine saw value for Christianity in pagan arts and knowledge, of which rhetoric was key to spreading the new gospel.

“I can picture in my mind a world without war, a world without hate. And I can picture us attacking that world, because they’d never expect it.”

– Jack Handey, “Deep Thoughts” (Saturday Night Live)

Earth Landing: Most of the classic aliens-land-on-Earth stories involve a violation of some nation’s sovereignty, including – for those who believe – landings by UFOs that have been reported over the years, or even UFOs flying through our airspaces. If aliens, however, landed in the ocean (e.g., The Outer Limits, “Trial by Fire” (1996)), that would be a different issue as no nation can claim sovereignty over the oceans (per classic international law) – do the nations of the Earth as a group have sovereignty over the oceans and would an ocean landing be a violation of collective Earth sovereignty? That is problematical.

Of course, in the classic alien invasion movie, sovereignty is clearly violated, ignored, and is thus not addressed directly in the film. There are a couple of classic First Contact movies that

approach the sovereignty issue – either intentionally or unintentionally – in interesting ways. In Close Encounters, it is clear that the U.S. Government invited the alien mothership to land, so no violation of sovereignty occurred; whereas, in the 2016 movie Arrival, the heptapods clearly violated the sovereignty of many nations, and the Chinese – probably remembering two centuries of violation of their sovereignty and exploitation by Western powers – were about to initiate hostilities to destroy or eject the alien ship from their territory. Efforts to prevent this action provided the dramatic crucible of the film.

An alien invasion, in the mode of the classic Hollywood movies, would actually demonstrate that humanity is not so bad – because see, the rest of the universe is just like us! That would be the true danger. That is also probably the real reason why we like those kinds of movies. Note for example, that ancient gods of polytheistic religions were – just like us! They stole, they lied and deceived, they were vainglorious, they fought over territories, they were militaristic, jealous, they had craft and technology, they were masters of their realms, they even had children and died. In this sense, alien Earth invasion movies have simply replaced ancient gods.

> *"The anti-slavery party contends that slavery is wrong in itself, and the Government is a consolidated national democracy. We of the South contend that slavery is right, and that this is a confederate Republic of sovereign States."*
>
> – Laurence Keitt, from Wikipedia article, citing to "Keitt, Lawrence [sic] M. (January 25, 1860). Congressman from South Carolina, in a speech to the House" [13]

Crazy Men with Guns: Though Mr. Laurence Keitt is certainly one of the more ... um ... colorful Congressional characters from that period (see 2 Order, EN 2, p. 544, *supra*), he did summarize the pre-Civil War *structural government dispute* perfectly. The Civil War Amendments (1865-1870, the 13th, 14th, and 15th Amendments to the Constitution of the United States) imposed the anti-slavery party's vision of the structural relationship of the Federal Government and the States.

An argument has been made by historians that the raid on Harper's Ferry in October 1859 was an important psychological turning point for the South leading to succession and the American Civil War. Prior to Harper's Ferry, the South believed and assumed that no white man would ever risk his life or be willing to die for abolition of slavery; ironically, the first person killed by John Brown's party was a free black man, Heyward Shepard, a baggage handler at Harper station who was shot in the back (looping back to the states had sovereignty argument, *ut supra*, p. 587).

Even though John Brown, who had military experience and a reputation from the 1856 Bleeding Kansas fights against the pro-slavery Missouri Border Ruffians, *was certifiably delusional* – he thought that seizing the armory would create a spontaneous slave revolt and he would gather an army at the arsenal and sweep through Tennessee to Mississippi freeing slaves[14] – *his fanaticism shocked the South* into realizing that militant abolitionist agitators in the North might eventually carry the general population to armed conflict.

The Estate of Southern Slavery was very alarmed by the size and organization of the Harper Ferry raiders, the number of people who knew beforehand (including two U.S. Senators), and by John Brown's martyrdom in the Northern press. Every school child learns (and forgets as soon as the test is done) the historical coincidence: That future Confederate Army of Virginia commander Col. Robert E. Lee was in charge of retaking the arsenal from Brown's hooligans, and

that his father was Col. "Light Horse" Harry Lee, who was relieved of command by General George Washington. The history of Arlington National Cemetery is bound up between the descendants of Martha Washington, Robert E. Lee, the American Civil War, and an 1883 Supreme Court decision.

✓ Delusional agitators are good excuses for Concierge Interventions in GGDM, *Interventions do not need to make strictly logical sense*. With technology, it takes only one crazy with a gun; imagine the effect of exponential technology and agitators?

Structural Government Titles: There are three types of Government Titles in GGDM. Structural Government Titles (hereafter, "Structural Titles") reflect *the direction in which the power flows* in a governing system.

Among social creatures, there appear to be only three possible types of structures: Unitary, Confederation, and Dualistic. All positions must have at all times one Structural Title; no position may have at any time more than one *undisrupted* Structural Title.

✓ The distinctions really come down to a concept of sovereignty. Sovereignty in turn is a concept of kings. At some point in our early history, a chieftain said, this is my place, these are my people, I rule here, and thus was born the concept of sovereignty. That is, the sovereignty of the people was either vested in, or flowed from (can both be true?) their chiefs whose authority soon became hereditary property, flowing from generation to generation.

➢ <u>All Roads Lead To...</u>: Unlike Estate and Social Titles, Structural Titles do not occupy a separate, 'exclusive' area of the Public Space, but rather, dictate the arrangement of other Titles, Pathways connecting the Government to the Colonies, and the placement of the Capital Colony within the Public Space. Whenever the conditions required for the Structural Government Title cannot be met, it is *automatically disrupted* (a very rare occurrence):

✓ A <u>Unitary Structural Title</u> requires that all undisrupted Social and Estate Titles be placed together in a bloc, all adjacent to each other, in the approximate center of the Public Space. Each Friendly, Naturalized, or Converted Colony owned by the position must be connected to at least one Social or Estate Title in the bloc by a Pathway of Monads *equal to or less than the total number* of Social & Estate Titles **plus one** at the time the Pathway is formed. One additional Monad may be added to the length of the Pathway if the Pathway joins another Pathway going to the bloc, but the total length of each Colony's Pathway must individually comply. The Capital Colony must be connected by Pathways to three Social and/or Estate Titles, using the same rules as other colonies. If a new Capital Colony is declared, new Pathways must be created. The Public Space occupied by the Unitary Structural Title is congruent with the space required by the Estate and Social Titles and Pathways.

▪ The Unitary Structural Title generally represents the classic 'top down' form of legitimacy (*dominus, basileus, homo summae potestatis*), what Justice Jackson called 'negative legitimacy' (e.g., monarchy, dynastic hegemony, divine right).[15] See Romantic Nationalism discussion, 3 Government Titles, p. 618, *infra*. The other Structural Titles are, in varying degrees, rejections of this ideology of force, recognizing *princeps* only

where necessary for military command, preservation of order, and law enforcement. *Führerprinzip* is synonymous with Nazi fascist dictatorship.

✓ A <u>Confederation Structural Title</u> requires that no two undisrupted Social and/or Estate Titles can be placed adjacent to each other in the Public Space. Each Friendly, Naturalized, or Converted Colony owned by the position must be connected by Pathway to both: 1) one of the Social or Estate Titles and 2) one other Friendly, Converted or Naturalized Colony controlled by the position. The combined length of the Pathways connecting any colony to both a Social or Estate Title and one other colony *must be equal to or less than* (in Monads) the number of undisrupted Social and Estate Titles plus the number of colonies at the moment the Pathway is formed. The Capital Colony must be connected by Pathways to all of the Social and Estate Titles using the same rules as regular Colonies, plus it must be connected to one other Friendly, Converted or Naturalized Colony controlled by the position. As such, the Confederation Structure may feature long and tenuous pathways that resemble a crazy 🕷🕸 or perhaps the runaround of our daily travels and relationships.

Confederations in GGDM's interstellar setting represent a sort of bottom-up form of legitimacy (perhaps what Justice Jackson called positive legitimacy, though this is not certain) in terms of planetary governments and a central interstellar authority (without comment on the local planetary power arrangements or government structures).

▪ "In addition of being a military alliance, the Lombard League was one of the first examples of confederal system in the world of communes. Indeed, the League had a distinct council of its members, called *Universitas*, consisting of representatives appointed by individual municipalities, and which voted by majority in various fields (such as the admission of new members, war and peace with the Emperor), powers that grew more and more with the years, so that the *university* obtained regulatory, tax and judicial power, a system comparable to that of a present-day republic. In the first period of the League the communes had little to do with confederal affairs, and the members of the *Universitas* were independent; in the second period the municipalities gained some influence but, as a counterweight, members were more involved in the municipal council policy. In addition, the League abolished the duties, with the creation of a customs union." – from Wikipedia article, "Lombard League," December 11, 2018.[16]

Confederations may not be favored by modern people playing this game, but the Confederation is the most probable *voluntary* collective arrangement in an interstellar civilization and if treated in slightly non-standard ways, presents some of the most interesting science-fiction possibilities, for example, Cordwainer Smith's Instrumentality of Mankind setting (1979).[17]

✓ A <u>Dualistic Structural Title</u> requires the position's Titles to be arranged in two approximately equal blocs (in the manner of the Unitary Structural Title) that are not adjacent. Each Friendly, Naturalized, or Converted Colony owned by the position must be connected to both blocs, each by a Pathway *equal to or less than* the number of

Social and Estate Titles *plus two*, at the time the Pathways are formed. Thus the Dualistic Structural Title position will resemble the hemispheres and corpus callosum of the human brain. The Capital Colony must be nearer to one bloc than the other, but connected to both blocs following the same rules as other colonies. If the Capital Colony is relocated for any reason, the relocation must represent, in the Public Space, a power shift from one bloc to another. Thus, if the Capital Colony was previously nearer to one bloc of Titles, it must then be placed nearer to the other when moved. The space taken up by the Dualistic Structural Title is congruent with the space taken by the blocs and all of the Pathways.

The Dualistic Structural Title in GGDM represents more or less the modern Western notion of the nation-state and probably aligns most with Romantic Nationalism discussed in 3 Government Titles, p. 618, *infra*.

The worldwide trend over the last several centuries has been that the 'cure' for most security, social and economic ills has been increased power to national governments. In the United States, the very move from Confederation to Federalism was prompted, in part, by Shay's rebellion and the external threat of foreign invasion. This trend, in combination with the advent of technology has seen more and more power going to the central constitutional government, making many citizens nervous. The problem is that all of the alternative cures suggested have not worked well. Thus, we are currently in the 'down' side of a historical cycle.

"When in the Course of human events, it becomes necessary for one people to dissolve the political bands which have connected them with another, and to assume among the powers of the earth, the separate and equal station to which the Laws of Nature and of Nature's God entitle them, a decent respect to the opinions of mankind requires that they should declare the causes which impel them to the separation." – U.S. Declaration of Independence (1776)

The Claaaw is Our Master: The Pathways connecting colonies to Government Titles are inviolate, unmovable, and unavoidable; each colony (other than Conquered Colonies) on the Public Space *must be* connected to Government Titles pursuant to the type of Structural Title the position has chosen. Monads occupied by non-Structural Government Titles (*ut infra*) are inviolate, that is, they cannot be occupied by anything else or used for any other purpose, including connection of Research Groups or Fuzzy Groups. Inviolate means that Monads occupied by the Pathways cannot be used for anything else while the Pathway exists; however, other Pathways can cross a Pathway and Fuzzy Groups can be formed over and are unaffected by Pathways.

The Pathway should be as short and direct as possible and cannot be altered once established, notwithstanding any other items on the Public Space that may be in the Pathway when first laid – they must either be moved or removed at the discretion of the Concierge so that the Pathway can be created.

- ✓ The Pathway from each colony to a Government Title will use at least one of the adjacent Monads, leaving less adjacent spaces for Aspects and Research Pieces and anything else that must be placed adjacent to the colony on the Public Space. A combined Pathway running through a colony will use two adjacent spaces to enter and exit the Monad where the colony is placed, and thus might be disadvantageous.

➢ <u>Broken Escalator</u>: Pathways run between colonies and Government Titles generally, Pathways cannot and should not be connected to stars on the Public Space, connecting a Pathway to a star on the Public Space does not automatically connect all colonies located at that starsystem. For the purpose of Pathways, stars just occupy a Monad on the Public Space and can be moved as long as there is another legal place adjacent to the starsystem's planets on the Public Space.

➢ <u>Commons Footbridge</u>: Two or more colonies can join in a common Pathway as long as the Pathway does not run through a Monad occupied by a Colony. Careful placement of Fuzzy Groups, Government Titles and Pathways on the Public Space is an important aspect of play. Typically, colonies will group around the Government Titles, and the larger a position grows (in number of colonies) the more space will be taken by the Pathways. The economy of Pathways also favors larger colonies, because the same Pathway is required regardless of the size of the colony.

➢ <u>Roads Must Roll</u>: Positions may always choose to connect colonies to Government Titles by more Pathways than are required. This may be insurance against removal or abandonment of the Government Title, but it also consumes more Monads on the Public Space. Extra connectivity *could be interpreted* as extreme loyalty of the colony population.

➢ <u>Capitol Chaos</u>: At any time that the Capital Colony is moved and/or a new Capital Colony is declared, the target colony may need to be moved on the Public Space to a suitable, legal location and/or new Pathways be created to satisfy the requirements of the Structural Title. The Pathways take precedence; some things may be lost. Foresight and planning are key.

*"The term 'citizen' supplanted 'subject' in this country and others, although not in Great Britain, by a process of lexicographic delineation. Even in the period immediately before the American Revolution, there was no such difference in connotation between 'subject' and 'citizen' as would predicate reserving the status of 'citizen' to the people of a republic and 'subject' to those under the sovereignty of a monarch. Distinguished French lawyers, writing during the **ancien regime**, seem to have found nothing preposterous in their occasional use of the term 'citizen' with regard to the most absolutistically ruled subjects of the King of France. During the middle ages, 'citizens' lived in towns, and so were members of communities exempted from the then almost ubiquitous feudal system. But, when the medieval system of government was replaced by the principles of territorial state sovereignty, 'subject' and 'citizen' came to be used as synonyms, at least by such eminent writers as Bodin and Grotius, although others, including Pufendorf and Spinoza, obviously inspired by a passage in Aristotle's **Politics**, attempted to re-establish a distinction between those two terms.*

*Spinoza's abstractions remained without direct practical effect, until a passage in Rousseau's **Social Contract**, adapting and somewhat coloring, but not quoting, Spinoza's proposition, provided the stimulus which made 'citizens' the terminology for a self-governing people. An English version of the passage reads, 'With regard to the associates, they take collectively the name of **People**, and are individually called Citizens, as participating in the sovereign power, and **Subjects**, as subjected to the laws of the state.'"*

– Maximilian Koessler, "'Subject,' 'Citizen,' 'National,' and 'Permanent Allegiance,'" Yale Law Review, Vol. 56, Iss. 1, Art. 12, 1946 (emphasis in original)

Subjects and Citizens: A BBC article put forth the British view that the President of the United States is effectively an elected monarch; that the Founding Fathers had only monarchy to use as example and the presidency was created in that image.

The presidency of the United States combines what is often the president and prime minister in other countries, more or less. At the same time, U.S. Presidential elections, especially in recent years, have exposed the two greatest weaknesses of our democracy: That the process of candidate selection does not reliably produce the best quality candidates for President, and that our system of taxpayer-funded public education does not produce the best electorate either.

The true freedom of the United States was the singular opportunity to cast off the creaking order of the old world (British officers referred to English colonist as 'Gillies' – a Scottish term for a servant) to experiment with ideas that others had only dreamt of, such as Judge Montesquieu's separation of powers and the ideas of Rousseau, Locke, and Hobbes regarding natural and inalienable rights and the duty of government; to rewrite the book. Few people who understand the concept of sovereignty would say that the sovereignty of the United States is in the person of the President (unlike a monarch who has *subjects*). As history has unfolded, the American break from the old order preceded the collapse of the European monarchies (and personal sovereignty of the head of state) and colonial systems into the 20th Century: Subjects became citizens.

✓ For example, look at the citizenship listings for Albert Einstein in the Wikipedia biographical article: He was a 'subject' of Kingdom of Württemberg (1879-1896), Austro-Hungarian Empire (1911-1912), Kingdom of Prussia (1914-1918) and a 'citizen' of Switzerland (1901-1955), Free State of Prussia (1918-1933) and of the United States (1940-1955).

✓ See also, Civis Sum discussion, 3 Order, p. 559, *supra*.

"The political organization of space is a particularly powerful source of spatial injustice, with examples ranging from the gerrymandering of electoral districts, the redlining of urban investments, and the effects of exclusionary zoning to territorial apartheid, institutionalized residential segregation, the imprint of colonial and/or military geographies of social control, and the creation of other core-periphery spatial structures of privilege from the local to the global scales."

– Edward Soja, "The City and Spatial Justice," JSSJ, January 2009

Social and Estate Government Titles: After the Structural Title requirement is met, each position may have as many Social and/or Estate Government Titles (chosen from the Foresight, see The Power to Choose, 5 Beginnings, p. 50, *supra*) in any combination, as desired up to the limit of five Government Titles, *including* the Structural Title.

The primary purpose of Structural Government Titles ... is to provide the 'structure' for a position and are also the most difficult to change or disrupt, they are the bastion of government. The Government Titles which have the most regular and direct effect on the position are the Social and Estate Government Titles.

✓ "Activists say these partisan maneuvers undermine democracy and ***that politicians shouldn't be choosing their voters***; politicians who gerrymander like to say that by

winning elections, they've earned the right to draw the districts as they see fit." – Jane C. Timm, "Gerrymandering is alive and well. The coming battle will be bigger than ever." NBC News, December 28, 2019 (emphasis added).

➢ Social Government Titles: The Social Titles represent the ideals held by the majority of the population (the 'ideal culture' in sociological terms), the way they regard themselves historically and philosophically, their identity. Social Titles answer the questions "Who are we?" and "What do we want?" The Conflict Check for each Social Title is based on the dual questions of how well the Title is fulfilling its own ideals and goals, and later, on how practically attainable those goals are in the current circumstances. Social Titles will tend to occupy larger, irregular shaped areas in the Public Space.

➢ Estate Government Titles: An Estate is a *cohesive and identifiable group* of people, organizations, or professions in a society that control a vital part of the functioning of the society, who are organized and recognize their potential power, have some leadership, and who actively apply or campaign to exercise or increase that power. Thus, an Estate Title represents a group that claims a share of the power due to their position in society. In any society there may be numerous, overlapping, and shifting Estates of different sizes, all claiming or vying for their share of the authority, trying to make their voices count; the Estate Title represents only the 'major Estates' who at the time the Estate Title is legitimate, control the authority in their society. Thus, the Conflict Check for each Estate Title is based on the goal of the Estate *remaining in power*, and whether or not the rest of society benefits from the Estate's continued power. Estate Titles tend to occupy smaller, regular shaped areas of the Public Space.

    ✓ The historical inspiration for the Estates Government Title was the late French Estates General system and other similar late Medieval institutions that led eventually to established legislative bodies.

➢ Resources & Ideologies: A simplified version if you like, Estate Titles represent those who command the resources, while Social Titles represent those who command the ideologies and worldview. Those who have power, and those who have ideas. This does not imply that Estate Titles do not also foster, possess, or require a certain ideology or worldview, which is how Social and Estate Titles naturally overlap. They compete for and combine to form those who command legitimate authority in the civilization. They are not always mutually exclusive or at odds, but they are distinctly different functions, and thus must be regarded separately. In the classic European arrangement, the Church was the Social Title that provided legitimacy to the hereditary nobility and royalty who held Estate.

    ✓ See discussion of sociopolitical origin of atheism in Europe in Legitimacy, 3 Government Titles, pp. 607-608, *infra*.

➢ New Kid in Town: The possibilities of Social and Estate Titles in the game are limited by:

    1) The words and concepts available to and understood by the designer and participants,

    2) What could conceivably work or be applicable to an interstellar civilization (as opposed to a planetary civilization), and,

    3) What can be expressed or translated into game terms, in the format in which this game is designed to operate, without granting any 'special powers' or creating new rules.

The game design obviously does not, and cannot, include every possible concept or idea, or every work ever written. Although some science-fiction literature has explored what sorts of governments might exist in the future, most of science-fiction continues with current governments or harkens back to older forms (e.g., Galactic Empires, monarchy, dictatorships, Republics); everything is the same in heaven as on Earth, rarely is anything better.

Page | 601

"The tide turned and the war began to go against the English. This was due in great part to the influence of a young French peasant girl, Joan of Arc. Inspired by the belief that she had been given a mission by God to deliver France from its invaders and to place the Dauphin on the throne of his fathers, she appeared before him, secured his reluctant consent to allow her to lead some troops, inspired them with her own enthusiasm and confidence, and won a great success by driving away the English who were besieging Orleans. The Dauphin himself was then stirred to greater activity and under the persuasion of the Maid of Orleans, as she came to be called, made his way to Rheims, the ancient coronation city of the French kings, and was there crowned king of France. Joan now felt that she had fulfilled her mission and asked to be allowed to return to her home, but the Dauphin insisted that she should remain with the army.

*Sometime after this she was captured by the English. **After a trial which was planned to end in but one way she was burned as a witch in the marketplace of Rouen.** Even one of the persecutors of the innocent French patriot girl wavered and turned away, crying, 'God have mercy upon us, we have burned a saint.' The movement of success which Joan had begun continued, and although the French frequently wasted their opportunities, yet on the whole the reconquest of their native land went steadily on. The English were driven out of one province after another; their expeditions from England were more poorly equipped and more unsuccessful. Finally the long war came to a close in 1453 by the defeat of an English army near Bordeaux, and the loss of all their territory in France except Calais."*

– Edward Potts Cheyney, <u>A Short History of England</u> (1904), p. 269 (emphasis added)

<u>The Trial of Joan of Arc</u>: Medieval society, due to the late Roman and post-Roman Christianization, seems to have had the most direct and literal reliance on symbols: artifacts, places, and persons. This is the distinguishing feature of the European medieval period; there really were no competing ideologies or any such ideologies were subsumed under dynastic claims (the Renaissance and Reformation then stands as the emergence of competing ideologies in Europe).

A striking example is the affair between Henry VI and Charles VII. Henry VI, the 10-year old son of Henry V of England, was crowned as King of France at Notre Dame in English occupied Paris in 1431 (he had been King of England since 1422). Seven-year old Charles VII, who had been disinherited by his father, was escorted by 17-year old Joan of Arc to Rheims cathedral in 1429 to be crowned as King of France. Rheims cathedral was the usual place of coronation of French kings and thus, in addition to being the surviving son of Charles VI, Charles VII had the stronger claim to legitimacy and the 'blessing' of Joan of Arc. Meanwhile, the English Court of Henry VI was consumed with corruption, intrigue and Henry's bouts of insanity leading to the War of the Roses and death of Henry VI while imprisoned in the Tower of London in 1471.

✓ "Of the love or hatred God has for the English, I know nothing, but I do know that they will all be thrown out of France, except those who die there." – Joan of Arc, Trial records, March 15, 1431.

Joan of Arc was captured by the Burgundy faction, sold to the English and executed as a witch or heretic about a year and a half later in early 1431. Joan of Arc's trial helped destroy any English

legitimacy in France. It was a political stage act, it broke every rule of ecclesiastical court proce-dure in that day, the court altered the transcripts of her testimony against her favor, fabricated evidence, and invented crimes on the fly, and it was considered a hideous affair even by the English (similar to Roland Freisler's People's Court in Berlin). All involved must have seen Biblical parallels which placed them on the wrong side of history and the English seemed to have taken extra precautions to insure she was really dead and had her body destroyed.

Further, by keeping her in a secular prison instead of confining her with nuns, the English left themselves open to charges of rape, and in fact, she did allege during her trial an attempted rape by an English Lord who entered her cell as well as groping, torment, and attempted rape by commoner English guards.

<div style="text-align:center">

"A movement is pioneered by men of words, materialized by fanatics and consolidated by men of actions."

– Eric Hoffer, <u>The True Believer: Thoughts on the Nature of Mass Movements</u> (1951)

</div>

Endnotes.

---

[1] <u>Commentary & Citation</u>: Consider the following: "After nearly fifty years of practicing law it was really a relief to give so much of myself for a time to the questions that interested me most. I never missed a chance to speak or write against prohibition. It was a matter of fighting for the liberty of the individual. I had no delusions about mankind in general. I knew his origin and the method by which he received his ideas and opinions. I knew the weakness of his intelligence, his narrow experiences, his misinformation on all questions pertaining to life, the depth of his prejudice, and his inordinate conceit; and yet I liked him. Never did I blame him, but I always feared him. In the hands of the powerful and crafty he is like clay in the grasp of the potter. Under the leadership of the tyrant he is dangerous to the peace of the world. I enjoyed talking on social, political, and religious problems particularly. I wanted to make converts. I wished to make every one reasonable and tolerant. To be sure I realized that what really drew me to these endeavors was the self-satisfaction that I got out of it all, and so I am aware that it has not been a desire to help my fellows nearly so much as to gratify certain feelings of my own." – Clarence Darrow's memoirs on the Sweet Trials, from his book, <u>The Story of My Life</u> (1932), Ch. 34.

✓ See Edward Bernays quote, 1 Culture, EN 1, p. 359, *supra*.

✓ Mr. Darrow most certainly was aware of and probably had read both Bernays and Lippman, his contemporaries, whom he seems to echo here. The writings of these three together might be taken as representing an intellectual pessimistic realism in post-WWI America.

✓ The other attraction of this quote that perhaps led to its inclusion (other than as stated above) here is that I concur in the opinion expressed by Mr. Darrow and likewise confess, with far less eloquence, the complicity of designing GGDM with my own satisfaction and gratification. See also 4 Culture, EN 2, p. 418, *supra*; Mr. Darrow and I are both talking about a sort of self-actualization.

[2] <u>Commentary</u>: To the extent that anyone else can tell you what to do or not do, you are less sovereign. Sovereignty is generally treated as zero sum by those holding it, and the extent to which you accept sovereignty as a zero-sum quality defines your theory of sociopolitical relationships.

[3] <u>Commentary</u>: The presence of two police officers – agents of the state who have legitimate authority to use physical violence – was key during the hostile rescue of Raja the Elephant in 2014. The owner and his friends were intent on intimidating the approximately 30 forestry officers, veterinarians and animal handlers involved, and on physically blocking the animal from being taken. But they were not willing to risk death, injury, or criminal punishment to block the enforcement of a court order for seizure of the animal. The police presence created room for rescue.

[4] <u>Citation</u>: "The two legal entities ... *Senātus* and the *Populus Rōmānus*, are sovereign when combined. However, where *populus* is sovereign alone, *Senātus* is not. Under the Roman Kingdom, neither entity was sovereign. The phrase, therefore, can be dated to no earlier than the foundation of the Republic. This signature continued in use

under the Roman Empire. The emperors were considered the *de jure* representatives of the people even though the *senātūs consulta*, or decrees of the Senate, were made at the *de facto* pleasure of the emperor. *Populus Rōmānus* in Roman literature is a phrase meaning the government of the People. When the Romans named governments of other countries, they used *populus* in the singular or plural, such as *populī Prīscōrum Latīnōrum*, 'the governments of the Old Latins.' *Rōmānus* is the established adjective used to distinguish the Romans, as in *cīvis Rōmānus*, 'Roman citizen.'

The Roman people appear very often in law and history in such phrases as *dignitās, maiestās, auctoritās, lībertās populī Rōmānī*, the 'dignity, majesty, authority, freedom of the Roman people.' They were a *populus līber*, 'a free people.' There was an *exercitus, imperium, iudicia, honorēs, consulēs, voluntās* of this same *populus*: 'the army, rule, judgments, offices, consuls and will of the Roman people.' They appear in early Latin as *Popolus* and *Poplus*, so the habit of thinking of themselves as free and sovereign was quite ingrained. The Romans believed that all authority came from the people. It could be said that similar language seen in more modern political and social revolutions directly comes from this usage. People in this sense meant the whole government. The latter, however, was essentially divided into the aristocratic Senate, whose will was executed by the consuls and praetors, and the *comitia centuriāta*, 'committee of the centuries,' whose will came to be safeguarded by the Tribunes. One of the ways the emperor Commodus (180–192) paid for his donatives and mass entertainments was to tax the senatorial order, and on many inscriptions, the traditional order is provocatively reversed (*Populus Senatusque...*)." – from Wikipedia article, "SPQR," captured September 27, 2018.

[5] Commentary & Citation: The concept of sovereignty is perhaps demonstrated by the appointment of military commanders by essentially subletting or conferring a degree of sovereignty upon the person of the commander, e.g.:

- ✓ "In April, the diploma by which Suleiman confirmed Ibrahim Pasha's appointment as *serasker* included the following: 'Whatever he says and in whatever manner he decides to regard things, you are to accept them as if they were the propitious words and respect-commanding decrees issuing from my own pearl-dispensing tongue.' Quoted by Rhoads Murphey in Ottoman Warfare 1500–1700, p 136." – from Wikipedia article, "Siege of Vienna" (1529), n. 10, captured December 22, 2018.

The President of the United States is not a sovereign person, but is appointed by the Constitution as the Chief Executive and the Commander-in-Chief of the Armed Forces of the United States. The essential element, sans sovereignty, of transfer of authority remains; the President is responsible for the commissioning of officers and appointment of commanders under his command, though this process now has little actually to do with the President. But the concept is still a part of the oath of enlistment (which I have taken a few times) of the United States armed forces (excepting the National Guard oath which is slightly different):

- ✓ "I, _____, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; and that I will obey the orders of the President of the United States and the orders of the officers appointed over me, according to regulations and the Uniform Code of Military Justice. So help me God." (Title 10, US Code; Act of 5 May 1960 replacing the wording first adopted in 1789, with amendment effective 5 October 1962). From army.mil, the website of the U.S. Army, December 22, 2018.

It is notable that the oath first demands loyalty to the Constitution of the United States, the document of the sovereign nation, followed in due order, by an oath to obey the orders of officers appointed by the President. The President of the United States does not exist without the Constitution and has no authority without the Constitution, and thus is not a sovereign person.

[6] Commentary: See King Arthur's encounter with the Annoying Peasant in Monty Python and the Holy Grail!

[7] Commentary: Philosophical ruminations about the ultimate source and nature of sovereignty should not be construed in any way as supporting the so called "sovereign citizens movement," which I regard as utter nonsense in all its forms. 'Sovereign citizens' are people who want to manufacture an excuse to do whatever they want, weasel-worded anarchist wannabes, without consequence or responsibility – usually after they are caught by law enforcement. They are people who want to enjoy the benefits of civilization – roads, technology, goods and services, commerce, culture, emergency medical assistance, peace and good order – without doing their part, paying their fair share, and being responsible. They are the warped adult version of the juvenile who whines, why do I have to go to school (this is slavery!), why do I have to mow the grass if it's all going to die in the fall, why do I have to shovel the snow 'cause it's all going to melt in two months anyway?

[8] Commentary: Considering the hatred of the French occupiers by the native population, why did the FLN lose? Of course, there were great material and manpower differences between the opposing forces, but the FLN was waging an offset campaign and should have at least survived. However, it is the classic conundrum of 'terrorist' resistance:

How can you convince the population that you are fighting for them when civilians are being killed by your planted bombs? When it is the civilian population who are being terrorized, essentially caught between sides and just wants it to end? This is the danger of radicalization of resistance, the more radical they are, the less likely they are to inspire support or even a general uprising. Radicalization leaves them isolated, with no exit, except death.

- ✓ In May 1958, General Jacques Massu, who had come to resent what the French had done in Algiers, was the leader of a military coup d'état that seized control of Algiers, then Corsica, and caused the collapse of the Fourth Republic in France, eight months after they had destroyed the FLN and 'won' the Battle of Algiers. So the victorious military leaders of one day became the rebels of the next day ... not uncommon in history.

- ✓ Three years later, in 1961, a group of four retired generals with some other officers (supporters of de Gaulle in 1958), organized another coup d'état to try to force the French de Gaulle government to stop negotiations for the independence of Algiers. The widespread use of transistor radios allowed the soldiers in Algeria to hear news from France that was not controlled or screened by their officers, which may have caused them to refuse to join the insurgent coup. This is a case where technology affected the outcome of a dicey affair.

[9] Citation: "When population in the Preclassic became sufficiently dense that productivity fluctuations were a matter of serious concern, the solution to each local group so affected must have been obvious: raid neighboring groups to make up a deficit. Since the only alternative over the short-term was famine, the development of warfare ... was entirely expectable. Long-term solutions included agricultural intensification and the establishment of a hierarchically managed economy. These were not permanent solutions, however, for the archaeologically-evident pattern of population growth indicates that, with each establishment of a higher-capacity production system, population simply rose further. The military option must have been perpetually tempting.

The establishment of competitive relations among local Mayan groups had important implications for the further evolution of ... society. It is no accident that population pressure, warfare, and sociopolitical complexity emerged together in the Middle and Late Preclassic and the Protoclassic, for as Webster has argued, they were systemically related (1976a, 1977). Organization for the initiation, conduct, and resolution of war provided a significant managerial/leadership role that contributed to the emergence of a social hierarchy. Economic stratification resulted from success at war, as the bounty of a successful campaign was subject to expropriation and distribution by the leadership (Webster 1976a, 1977: 349-51).

Although major fortifications did exist, the majority of conflicts (if they were indeed related to subsistence stress) would have involved raids on fields, as crops neared maturity, and on peasant villages and storage complexes, after the harvest. The insecurity that this created among the rural population selected for nucleation around secure, regional centers (Sanders 1981a: 361; Webster 1977: 348). This in turn further intensified subsistence stress, as populations aggregated into smaller areas, leaving large hinterlands with comparatively fewer people and less agricultural production (Webster 1977: 348)...

Complex feedback relations emerged among agricultural production, conflict, and complexity. Productivity fluctuations made military adventures tempting, even essential, while in turn military strategy came to influence agriculture. Dispersed, shifting swidden plots were essentially indefensible (at least at any reasonable cost), and yet were highly vulnerable and essential to subsistence. Concentrated, intensive systems, such as raised fields and terraces, were at the same time more easily defended (being compact, concentrated, and stationary) and productive enough to be worthwhile defending. The same consideration applies to centralized storage facilities. While it would be simplistic to suggest that warfare was the sole reason for agricultural intensification, it certainly made intensification that much more attractive. (And of course once present, such capital assets make tempting targets [Webster 1976a: 1 1 1, 1977: 367-8].) Similarly, management of conflict was probably not the only reason for the emergence of sociopolitical hierarchies, but both directly (through the need for military leadership) and indirectly (through the need for labor mobilization and agricultural management), it certainly influenced their development." – Joseph Tainter, The Collapse of Complex Societies (1988), pp. 171-172.

- ✓ "The first set consists of continental differences in the wild plant and animal species available as starting material for domestication. That's because food production was critical for generating large surpluses that could support non-farming specialists, and the buildup of large populations enjoying a military advantage over others. All developments of economically complex, socially stratified, politically centralized societies beyond the level of small nascent chiefdoms were based on food production. Pleistocene extinctions played a large part in the availability of domesticable animals, limiting options greatest in Australia and the Americas. In terms of technology, most societies acquired much more from other societies than they in-

vented themselves. Thus, diffusion and migration within a continent contributed importantly to the development of certain civilizations." – Jared Diamond, <u>Summary of Guns, Germs, and Steel</u> (2017), p. 45, Kindle Edition.

✓ This is key to understanding also the plight of the Plains Indians as the white hunters wastefully decimated the bison population in 1872-1873 with long range rifles and intensive organized hunting to satisfy the demands of the east. They did not kill the bison for food – the whites had plenty of food – but to harvest certain parts that had high value in the markets. The Indians, birds, and wild dogs were left the carcasses to scavenge. In this light, it is understandable why leaders such as Comanche Chief Quanah Parker and Medicine Man Kwihnai Tosabitʉ (aka Isatai'i) were alarmed by the threat to their people's existence, the threat of starvation due to the decimation of the bison, and the invasion of white settlers. This led to the Second Battle of Adobe Walls in June 1874, where hundreds of Comanche, Cheyenne and Kiowa warriors were defeated by a small group of white hunters with modern weapons and long-range rifles. A similar result occurred in September 1874 at the Buffalo Wallow Fight where two civilian scouts and four troopers held off over 100 Comanche and Kiowa warriors with accurate rifle fire, though five were wounded and one killed. Native American losses are disputed in both engagements but they were spiritually defeated.

[10] Commentary: Rotten eggs, have you ever smelled them? "Dirty Hands" and "Glove Cleaner" refer to an original Twilight Zone episode, but could just as well refer to Dirty Harry movies.

[11] Citation: "The Army is a broadsword, not a scalpel. Trust me, senator, you do not want the Army in an American city... Twelve hours after the President gives the order we can be on the ground. One light infantry division of 10,700 men, elements of the Rapid Deployment Force, Special Forces, Delta, APCs, helicopters, tanks, and of course the ubiquitous M16A1 assault rifle. A humble enough weapon until you see it in the hands of a man outside your local bowling alley or 7-11. It will be noisy. It will be scary, and it will not be mistaken for a VFW parade... I urge you – I implore you – do not consider this as an option." – General William Devereaux "The Siege."

[12] Citation: This entire volume of the Quarterly Review is in the public domain and has been digitized on Google Books, free to the internet public.

[13] Citation: From the *Congressional Globe,* 19th Century predecessor to the *Congressional Record.* Unfortunately the hundreds of pages of images from the record at https://memory.loc.gov/ammem/amlaw/lwcglink.html#anchor36 are apparently not text searchable and display one page at a time for reading.

[14] Citation: However, see previous feature quotes by Frederick Douglass and Harriett Tubman that slaves didn't know they were slaves, 3 Order, p. 546, *supra*.

[15] Commentary: As in the Concierge is always divine and always right!☺

[16] Citation: Note that the Wikipedia article contains links to both the current and the 1911 Encyclopedia Britannica articles on the Lombard League. A comparison of those articles demonstrated that the Wikipedia article is more detailed than the 1911 Encyclopedia Britannica online article on the same subject. Yet, as mentioned previously, the former would not be accepted in many places whereas the latter would be authority without question in any school writing and research assignment paper.

[17] Commentary & Citation: Walter Jon Williams suggests that Dr. Paul Linebarger, one of the odder intellects of the science-fiction college, who taught at Duke University and John's Hopkins Institute for Advanced International Studies in Washington, while he worked for the U.S. Government and wrote the manual on Psychological Warfare (Infantry Journal Press, 1948), wrote science-fiction stories under the famous pseudonym Cordwainer Smith to avoid government scrutiny of his fiction and that his fiction was not scrutinized because authorities at the time regarded the science-fiction genre as trivial, ridiculous and not worth scrutiny (consistent with the assertion of my white haired 12th Grade English teacher, in 1984 that science-fiction is not literature). See, Walter Jon Williams, "The What-He-Did: The Poetic Science Fiction of Cordwainer Smith," October 7, 2016, Tor.com.

✓ The 1956 movie, Forbidden Planet, is considered a watershed moment in popular acceptance of science-fiction as literature. MGM, who had never made a sci-fi movie, jumped into the market. Two points distinguished Forbidden Planet: 1) the actors, directors and producers determined that they had to take the story *seriously* and 2) Forbidden Planet had a *serious budget* (along with astounding development of new techniques, sets, and post production) much larger than any of the previous (budget-starved) science-fiction movies. From "Everything you need to know about Forbidden Planet," JonnyBaak YouTube Channel, August 1, 2019.