Table of Contents

See Appendix EGTEX – Emergent Government Titles Example
See Appendix GT – Emergent Government Titles

"THE real trouble with this world of ours is not that it is an unreasonable world, nor even that it is a reasonable one. The commonest kind of trouble is that it is nearly reasonable, but not quite. Life is not an illogicality; yet it is a trap for logicians. It looks just a little more mathematical and regular than it is; its exactitude is obvious, but its inexactitude is hidden; its wildness lies in wait.

I give one coarse instance of what I mean. Suppose some mathematical creature from the moon were to reckon up the human body; he would at once see that the essential thing about it was that it was duplicate. A man is two men, he on the right exactly resembling him on the left. Having noted that there was an arm on the right and one on the left, a leg on the right and one on the left, he might go further and still find on each side the same number of fingers, the same number of toes, twin eyes, twin ears, twin nostrils, and even twin lobes of the brain. At last he would take it as a law; and then, where he found a heart on one side, would deduce that there was another heart on the other. And just then, where he most felt he was right, he would be wrong."

– G.K. Chesterton, <u>Orthodoxy</u>, Ch. 6 (1908) (emphasis in original) [1]

Two Hearts: Perhaps G.K. Chesterton is the origin of Dr. Who's two hearts – he is distinguishable from humans in that he has two hearts, both physically and metaphorically. Sometimes the viewers forget that he is actually an alien in human form, he is not one of us, it is both human and an alien time lord.

> ✓ Mr. Chesterton also, probably not coincidentally, describes exactly why the ancient Greeks and Medieval scholars were wrong about Terra Australis Incognita.

Cockeyed Universe: Sometimes you wonder if the universe is 'programmed' in some cockeyed way and we occasionally get a glimpse of it. On Wednesday, November 28, 2019 the Pittsburgh Penguins were down 3-0 to the Avalanche in Colorado. Penguins captain Sidney Crosby then scored three consecutive goals – a natural hat trick in 5:35 of game time – to tie the game, but the Penguins lost the game 6-3. On Tuesday, December 4, the Colorado Avalanche were down 3-0 to the Penguins in Pittsburgh. The Avalanche scored three quick goals in the 2nd Period to tie the game 3-3. But in the 3rd Period (after an Avalanche goal was disallowed for goaltender interference), Penguins winger Patrick Hornqvist scored three consecutive goals – a natural hat trick in 2:47 of game time and a new Penguins record on hat giveaway night – to put the Penguins up 6-3 over the Avalanche, which was the final score. Many of the free hats ended up on the ice.

> ✓ Sometimes I think my life was programmed, every human has thought this at least once. Is it that we look back on our lives in see the inevitability of our current situation in the events of the past, or is it just the human need to try to assemble meaning out of random events? It is the source of the ideas of destiny and pre-destiny, ideas which any reasonable person rejects quickly, which is supported only by the barest stretched circumstantial evidence, but to which humanity holds onto intuitively.

Emergent Titles: About 15 years ago, I designed a set of 100 Government Titles by the process of first thinking of a name or concept (e.g., oligarchy, matriarchy) and then matching to it up to four Conflict Checks that seemed to reflect the requirements of the concept or ideology.

This was a decently useful process in forming the idea of Government Titles; however, game designers, especially those of tabletop games, long ago discovered that combinations of randomly generated attributes are superior for encouraging emergent game narrative (not to mention the

exponential number of possible combinations from just a few attributes) because sapients will naturally try to make sense out of apparent randomness. While such a system may not be suitable for fuzzy concepts such as Fundamental Realities, it is eminently suitable for concrete, objective at-the-moment game situations such as are Conflict Checks in Government Titles.

✓ The later switch to emergent Government Titles provided a structure supporting a much more diverse, thought-provoking range of Conflict Checks, a better distinction of Social and Estate Titles, and a more realistic depiction of existential realities of governments.[2] Much of the commentary and various discussion points in the GGDM text are reflected in the Themes.

✓ There are 600 Conflict Checks in 60 Title Themes. Each Government Title will use at most 4 Conflict Checks and each position will have a maximum of 16 Conflict Checks to satisfy. The Themes and Conflict Checks cover all subjects important to the game that can be expressed in objective game data.

➢ Shaking the Bingo Balls: Construction of an emergent Government Title is accomplished in the following steps (a decision tree which easily can be automated):

1. It must first be decided whether the proposed title is a Social Title or Estate Title. This can be done by a 50-50 die roll, or it can be a conscious decision.

2. Next must be determined the 'scope of the concept' in GGDM terms, a die is rolled to determine if the Government Title has 1, 2, 3, or 4 Conflict Checks.

   ▪ During the 2016 Presidential Election, there was more than the usual talk about the rise of a third major party to break the monopoly and declining effectiveness of the two-party system instituted in 1858. I read an article (which I cannot find now, so I will paraphrase) written by a journalist who attended a fringe political party national convention where they nominated their 2016 Presidential candidate. The journalist noted that the convention was held in a hotel at the same time as a large comic book convention, and people from the latter wandered in and out of the political convention. He also vaguely mocked the list of fringe speakers at the convention and lamented the range of small, one-issue, limited appeal political parties. His suggestion in the end was that if one of these parties could get serious (and serious donors) and 'get rid of their tin-foil hat,' they might attract enough support to become a major party in the current climate. The two major parties, of course, have broad appeal and platforms covering all major issues. Thus, the number of Conflict Checks can vaguely equate to the major issues represented by the Government Title.

3. The third step is to determine whether one of the Conflict Checks will come from the Interstellar Civilization Themes instead of either the Social or Estate Title Themes. This can be done on a 50-50 die roll as well. If the result is positive, one of the Social or Estate Title Theme Conflict Checks is replaced by using a randomly-determined Theme from the Interstellar Civilization Group to generate that Conflict Check. This is done even if the proposed Title has only one Conflict Check; that is, a single Conflict Check Social or Estate Title can arise from Interstellar Civilization Themes, and still act as either a Social or Estate Title in the game.

4. The forth step then is to make two rolls for each Conflict Check, one to determine which Emergent Government Titles Theme is to be used (#1-20), and the second roll is to determine which Conflict Check is selected from the Theme (#1-10). Do not re-roll duplicates of the first die roll (i.e. two Conflict Checks can come from the same Theme), but do reroll duplicates on the second roll (i.e. a Government Title should not have exact duplicate Conflict Checks). Conflict Checks can be contradictory.

5. After determining the Conflict Checks, the final step to creating an Emergent Government Title is to first roll a die to determine how many Vital Powers are associated with the Government Title and then to roll to determine which Vital Powers are associated with the Title, rerolling all duplicates.

For example, a new **Estate Title** is being generated, the die roll result indicates that it will have four Conflict Checks (Steps 1 and 2).

- A die is rolled and on an even result it is determined that one of the four Conflict Checks will be rolled from the Interstellar Civilization Themes (Step 3). So let's get to it! One d20 is rolled and the result is a 15 which is the Security and Survival Theme (i.e. ICT15). A d10 is rolled in that theme group and the result is a 1: "(T) No other **alien colonies** exist in systems where a Friendly Colony is located *or* all **alien colonies** in a starsystem with a Friendly Colony are owned by the position." This is the first Conflict Check for the new Estate Title. Hmmm...

- A d20 is then rolled three times for the Conflict Checks from the Estate Themes (Step 4), with results of 1, 1, and 9, meaning that two Conflict Checks will come from EGT1 – First Estate – Legitimizers and one from EGT9 - Military-Industrial Complex of the Estate Title Themes.

- On EGT1, two d10 are rolled resulting in Conflict Checks: #5 "(F) Friendly population factors (including related Lost Colonist population) are under the control of alien sovereigns (i.e. other Major Positions)." and #9 "(F) The position has lost a colony to alien conquest within the last three turns."

- On EGT9, one d10 is rolled, resulting in Conflict Check: #4 "(F) Position has not lost any Warships, Logistical Ships, Bases, or Fighters or fired any Ship Missiles in Combat in the last two turns (in order to lose something in combat, you have to be involved in a combat...)."

- Note that Conflict Checks which begin with (T) pass if they are objectively true, and Conflict Checks which begin with (F) pass if they are objectively false.

- Taken together, the final Estate Title looks like this:

  1. (T) No other **alien colonies** exist in systems where a Friendly Colony is located or all **alien colonies** in a starsystem with a Friendly Colony are owned by the position. [Must be TRUE to pass]

2. (F) Friendly population factors (including related Lost Colonist population) are under the control of alien sovereigns (i.e. other Major Positions). [Must be FALSE to pass]

3. (F) The position has lost a colony to alien conquest within the last three turns. [Must be FALSE to pass]

4. (F) Position has not lost any Warships, Logistical Ships, Bases, or Fighters or fired any Ship Missiles in Combat in the last two turns (in order to lose something in combat, you have to be involved in a combat...). [Must be FALSE to pass]

Players are free to name Social and Estate Titles whatever they wish, I might call this one an ugly bit of xenophobia. To satisfy all of the Conflict Checks the position would 1) need to have exclusive control of all stars where they have Friendly Colonies, 2) control all population factors of their Native Population Type in the game, 3) not lose any colonies to alien attackers and 4) lose ships, bases, fighters or fire Ship Missiles in combat every two turns. This Title may be one of up to ten choices available to the position and the position may choose to install it when conditions warrant.

Finally, the last step, a die roll indicates that two Vital Powers are associated with this Estate Title, and two more rolls result in the Taxation Power and Combat Power being associated. I smell 'evil' empire! And it's not a new type of cologne.☺

"Here, again in short, Christianity got over the difficulty of combining furious opposites, by keeping them both, and keeping them both furious. The Church was positive on both points. One can hardly think too little of one's self. One can hardly think too much of one's soul."

– G.K. Chesterton, Orthodoxy, Ch. 6 (1908)

Furious Opposites: The two-party system of the United States is often one of furious opposites, more so lately. Contradictory or seemingly irreconcilable Conflict Checks are possible and allowed (the example above is rather straightforward); they should not be rerolled. Contradictions require creative and emergent explanations and are not unknown to history:

✓ For example, as a youth in Italy, Louis-Napoleon Bonaparte was involved with the Italian resistance to the Austrian occupation of Northern Italy. He and a friend eventually fled across the French border to avoid arrest.

▪ Decades later, when he overthrew the French Second Republic and became Emperor Napoleon III (1852-1870), he personally led French troops to join those of Piedmont-Sardinia in a war to oust the Austrians from Italy in 1859 and was present at two battles (following his Principle of Nationalities). Like his famous namesake, he could claim to fight the Austrians in Italy, nominally for the liberation of Italy from the Habsburgs.

▪ However, the French Catholics were a strong force in French popular politics such that, as Prince-President of the Second Republic, Louis-Napoleon Bonaparte was pushed into supporting French troops sent previously

to protect Rome (and to restore the clerical power in the Papal States), which was then temporally ruled by the Pope, and those French troops fired upon *Republican* Italian troops led by Garibaldi in 1851 who sought to liberate Rome for the new Italian Republic. The French troops in Italy were resented as occupiers propping up a corrupt regime by both the population of the Papal States whose clerical rulers were reactionary, inept and corrupt, and by the Republican elements in French society (similar to the U.S. experience in South Vietnam[3]). Thus the Prince-President (and future Emperor) was forced to attempt to broker compromises between the Pope, papal supporters (e.g., Ultramontane party) and radical republicans.

- Later, after the war with Austria, Emperor Napoleon III was forced to continue defending Rome (despite his own nationalist beliefs) against liberation attempts by Garibaldi in 1862 (Garibaldi was arrested by the Italian government) and 1867 (Garibaldi was defeated in battle with French and Papal troops); Garibaldi finally captured Rome in 1870 after the final evacuation of French troops following Sedan. Rome then became the capital of modern Italy and the Pope retained the sovereign Vatican.

➤ Pool of the Abyss: The pool of emergent Government Titles (the Foresight, see The Power to Choose, 5 Beginnings, p. 50, *supra*) generated at the beginning of the game will remain available to the position during the game for use whenever a change of Social or Estate Titles occurs. At the discretion of the Concierge, new emergent Government Titles may be generated from time to time during the game whenever necessary – for example, if all Social or Estate Titles have been used, or possibly some titles may 'age-out' of the pool every ten turns to be replaced by new potential Government Titles.

However, caution should be exercised in replenishing the pool before it is fully drained – as Government Title changes are made during the game, the players will first take those they like the most, are most comfortable with, leaving less immediately desirable titles in the pool. Later in the game, this may cause positions to 'evolve' in another direction, for example, from peace to xenophobia and war, or vice-versa, as their civilization changes with a succession of Titles. Replenishing Titles in the pool prematurely may alter the course of the game.

➤ Sides of the Coin: Conflict Checks that require a Power activation or event to have occurred within X turns, or that a certain condition currently exist, guide the position's conduct by requiring the position to do or not do certain things in the game *as long as the position is interested in not failing that Conflict Check*, that is, the position players must be diligent and cognizant. A position may, at its own risk, allow or cause a particular Conflict Check to fail by action or inaction.

- ✓ Most Conflict Checks are capable of multiple interpretations, for example, does "(T) Position has Naturalized a Converted Colony within the last five turns" imply an empire building or imperialist drive, or does it suggest a developing pan-galactic civilization? It depends which side of the argument you embrace, but within GGDM's standard rules, only Converted Colonies can be Naturalized. And only Conquered Colonies can be Converted. And colonies don't get conquered on their own will.

✓ Participants should be cognizant that some actions which seem positive can cause a Conflict Check to fail. For example, a Conflict Check that reads, "(T) No Naturalized, Converted or Conquered Colonies owned by the position are within Short Movement of the Capital Colony at the current best ship movement speed" can be caused to fail by increases in Ship Speed, by moving the Capital Colony, etc. It can also cause the position to destroy **alien colonies** by Orbital Bombardment if they are too close, rather than Conquering them, or it might cause the position not to attack and conquer those colonies, providing an umbrella of sorts. Or maybe the position simply doesn't increase Ship Speed.

✓ While some Conflict Check fails are permanent and some Conflict Checks may fail as soon as the Government Title is active (as long as the Title isn't instantly disrupted, see A House Divided, 5 Government Titles, p. 637, *infra*), in most cases, there is some grace period to restore the conditions necessary before all other Conflict Checks fail and the Government Title is disrupted. For example, "(T) The position had either a successful Research Attempt or Development Attempt last turn" can fail one turn and then 'un-fail' or pass the next turn, depending on many factors, including luck, in research and development. *Past failure has no effect on Conflict Checks*. As long as it was not the last Conflict Check to fail, the Government Title will not be disrupted.

"My attitude toward progress has passed from antagonism to boredom. I have long ceased to argue with people who prefer Thursday to Wednesday because it is Thursday."

– G.K. Chesterton, New York Times Magazine, February 11, 1923 (from the website of The American Chesterton Society)

"There are two kinds of fools: one says, 'This is old, therefore it is good'; the other says, 'This is new, therefore it is better.'"

– Dean William Ralph Inge, <u>More Lay Thoughts of a Dean</u> (1931) [4]

Second Sight: The first group of Themes created were the Interstellar Civilization Themes which simply followed through the sections of GGDM rules in order, so the ICT (i.e. Interstellar Civilization Themes) are really 'GGDM game themes' and can be followed in that manner if participants wish to create or add their own.

✓ Second sight is another term for intuition, see discussion in Foresight, 2 Colleges, p. 472, *supra*. Sometimes I have felt second sight in the design of GGDM when decisions I make lead to unintended, unanticipated, but pleasing developments or incidentally solves design problems in other parts later. Here I use the term more literally and humorously in reference to 'doing over' the Government Titles design in 2018.

➢ <u>Lowering the Drawbridge</u>: In working through the Themes for emergent Estate Titles, I have found that it comes down to a couple of basic questions of understanding (for those who may wish to create or add their own Conflict Checks and Estate Title Themes):

---

4 Government Titles – Emergent Titles

✓ **What does X occupy?** It is said, not without reason, that possession is nine-tenths of the law. This is the question of what X group owns in society, more specifically, what critical real estate (the Castle, both literally and figuratively) is owned by X group. This is not a question of whether what they are doing with it is beneficial to society (that is more in the territory of Social Titles), only that it is critical enough to society to create power, control, wealth, etc. In this way, the medical profession is in the same place as a drug kingpin, excepting that one is legitimate and regulated and the other is illegal and prosecuted.

✓ **What is characteristic of X group?** This question I have found covers more diverse situations, such as the Youth Bulge, by allowing a historical approach. For example, what was characteristic of the post-Roman Scandinavian Youth Bulge? Viking raids, invasion of England and France, migration into the Ukraine (e.g., the *Rūsiyyah,* the Kievian Rus' polity). So this youth pressure can be translated then into objective game terms of what it would take to maintain an Estate Government Title based on the youth bulge (e.g., baby boomers, youth *as an Estate*). Occupy Wall Street?

➤ Flying the Banner: Social Titles can likewise be framed in a couple of questions similar to Estate Titles:

✓ **What is their ideal result?** This is similar to what does the group want, however, distinguishable in that the social movement has the most power before the ideal result is achieved and significantly less power afterward or the closer they get.[5] Thus, social movements are often self-defeating. An egregious example is the early 20th Century Temperance Movement which reached the height of its power with the ratification of the 18th Amendment to the U.S. Constitution (i.e. the Prohibition). The unanticipated effects of the Prohibition were a massive jump in the power, wealth, and organization of criminal syndicates, an increase in their armaments and chaos, resulting in a substantial increase in Federal police power and further erosion of the power of the states to the central government to combat social ills that transcended state borders. The Prohibition was ended by the 20th Amendment fourteen years later, but the temperance idea collapsed, substance abuse was 'accepted' as a fact of civilization and it has been very hard for subsequent efforts to curb its growth or stop the sophisticated illicit power of violent criminal cartels.

Although the preceding is framed in terms equating a Social Title to a historical social movement, it is not helpful beyond basic understanding to equate all Social Titles with the type of social movements that are historically famous (e.g., the Civil Rights Movement or Gandhi). Social movements represent the ideals and desires of society (whether good or ill in the long run, e.g., the March on Rome 1922) and only those who meet the greatest resistance and have the greatest support on the other side become the conflicts we know in history. Many and rather tamer social movements are going on at any given moment in a civilization, e.g., current civilizations desire prosperity, some kind of conformity, obedience to authority, and continuation of whatever makes civilization work and continue into the foreseeable future.

✓ **What is the practicality of the ideal?** Seemingly, the greater the ideal, the less attainable it is in any practical sense. This works as a dynamic; the ideal survives because it is great and distant (*ut supra*), but at the same time, attracts little serious support because it is great and distant, seemingly unattainable and impractical. Social

movements that take hold are those that seem to offer some immediately attainable ideal or goal, but those movements are also the ones most likely to lose momentum after initial political success.[6] An example of this might be the triumph of labor in the U.S. in 1935 and 1938 with the Wagner Act, the FLSA, and the height of union power in the early 1960s, the Equal Pay Act of 1963 and Age Discrimination Act of 1968. Although additional rights have been created for labor, union membership and effectiveness has declined since the mid-1970s (I remember the 'wildcat strikes' in the 1970s) as organized labor has achieved all of its goals generally, corruption and organized crime had infiltrated the unions (e.g., Jimmy Hoffa), and parental government and successful litigation secured the results of the crusade. Much the same can be said of the Civil Rights Movement: Ultimate legal and legislative success has sapped momentum, leaving only a residue of political correctness and media reporting of continued systemic discrimination (e.g., disproportionate criminal sentencing).

This is useful in explaining much of the sociopolitical history of the 20th Century, to greater or lesser degree depending on circumstances, peculiarities and details of each situation. The initial goals of the Russian Communist revolution: Overthrow of the tottering *ancien regime* and establishment of a worker's state, were immediately attainable in the shadow of WWI, even if at great cost. The practical realization of the rest of the ideology, the promises ... well, the history speaks to that. Within ten years (and after the defeat of the Soviet invasion of Poland in 1920), the same old power and corruption crept into the new institutions ("Meet the new boss, same as the old boss." – The Who), and the German invasion of Russia in 1942 probably extended the existence of the Soviet Union by 30 to 50 years because they won the war (like a successful cancer treatment can extend the life of a terminal patient).

➢ Into the Breach: Estate vs. Social Titles might then be characterized as a contrast of control of civilization's needs vs. wants (or possibly in philosophical terms, *is vs. ought*, see 2 Culture, p. 374, *supra*). At the bottom of all of these questions is the last question of how to form a true or false query from game data which will represent some aspect of the questions being asked for that Government Title Theme. In a larger sense, this is the entire process of GGDM design in a nutshell.

The actual process is one of picking your spots, especially when creating the Social Titles, I have found that there are thousands of words that express concepts about our civilization, history, what sort of society we are descriptively, but not all, in fact, a surprising few are actually expressible as Government Title Themes. Many words, such as you might describe our civilization as empirical or materialistic or oligarchic, are included within the range of other terms in GGDM, such as Constructural Elements, Colleges, or Technology. Many concepts do not have any expression in game terms, for example, the discussion of mythopoeic thinking and parallelism in More Than a Feeling, p. 808, and The Fine Print-isms, p. 811, 1 Temporal Technology, *infra*. What usually happens is that I am working, watching television, sleeping or walking to work, and my mind is deep processing; suddenly it will all come together, a theme and several possible Conflict Checks will emerge into my consciousness.

✓ "The architecture supporting our conceptual knowledge of abstract words has remained almost entirely unexplored. By contrast, a vast neuropsychological, neurolinguistic and neuroimaging literature has addressed questions relating to the structure of the semantic system underpinning our knowledge of concrete items (e.g. artefacts and animals)." – Sebastian J. Crutch, Elizabeth K. Warrington, from abstract of "Abstract

and concrete concepts have structurally different representational frameworks," Brain, Vol. 128, Is. 3, March 2005, pp. 615–627 (free article on Oxford Academic).

"And the world looks just the same;
And history ain't changed;
'Cause the banners,
They are flown in the next war."

– The Who, "Won't Get Fooled Again" (1971)

Won't Get Fooled Again: For participants who wish to design their own new Social or Estate Title Themes, there are 'cardinal sins' to avoid when writing new Conflict Checks:

- ✓ Avoid Conflict Checks which can never fail, e.g., "(T) Position has stardrive technology" passes 99.99% of the time and cannot fail once it passes. Conversely, there are Conflict Checks that can fail permanently – perhaps a cosmic negativity bias.[7]
- ✓ Avoid self-fulfilling Conflict Checks, e.g., "(T) This title has never been disrupted" is bad because the Conflict Check can never fail, and so the Title can never become disrupted.
- ✓ Avoid Conflict Checks that do not require regular affirmative action (e.g., Power Activations, RPs spent) or that do not curtail the position from doing something the members may want to do (checks and balances, decisions are made) to pass each turn.
- ✓ Avoid turn requirements that are too long (e.g., "(T) Expansion Power has been activated at least once in the last 20 turns," – one activation would allow the position to pass the Conflict Check for 20 straight turns, making the Title undisruptable).
- ✓ And avoid Conflict Checks that are impossible or convoluted (I certainly pushed the envelope a few times on this one).

"But this involved accuracy of the thing makes it very difficult to do what I now have to do, to describe this accumulation of truth. It is very hard for a man to defend anything of which he is entirely convinced. It is comparatively easy when he is only partially convinced. He is partially convinced because he has found this or that proof of the thing, and he can expound it. But a man is not really convinced of a philosophic theory when he finds that something proves it. He is only really convinced when he finds that everything proves it. And the more converging reasons he finds pointing to this conviction, the more bewildered he is if asked suddenly to sum them up.

Thus, if one asked an ordinary intelligent man, on the spur of the moment, 'Why do you prefer civilization to savagery?' he would look wildly round at object after object, and would only be able to answer vaguely, 'Why, there is that bookcase . . . and the coals in the coal-scuttle . . . and pianos . . . and policemen.' The whole case for civilization is that the case for it is complex. It has done so many things. But that very multiplicity of proof which ought to make reply overwhelming makes reply impossible."

– G.K. Chesterton, Orthodoxy, Ch. 6 (1908) [8]

Endnotes.

[1] Citation: The entire book is available for free online at LeadershipU (leaderu.com), a Christian apologetics website. The copyright would long ago have expired.

[2] Commentary: Admittedly, the Conflict Checks being written in 2018 are, unlike the previous Government Titles, being written on the assumption that the Conflict Checks will be assisted by automation and not involve the Concierge poking around the data. If the game data is properly tagged, and the checks are objective, I am certain that a query can be written for each of the 600 Conflict Checks.

[3] Commentary: The French occupation of the Papal States was similar to the U.S. experience propping up the corrupt, inept government of South Vietnam, except in one very important respect – the cultural, historical and linguistic differences, and climate and geography, between Western troops and Indochina was much greater and the environment much more alien and hostile. This is *the more likely condition* in GGDM situations.

[4] Commentary: One can imagine from this statement that Dean Inge had little patience with 'old tyme religion' tent revivalists who were popular across the United States in that time (e.g., the subject of Neil Diamond's song, "Brother Love's Traveling Salvation Show" (1969)).

[5] Commentary: Though it might not be considered a 'social movement,' the First Crusade is a perfect example of the phenomena. Though the leaders feuded, lingered and delayed after securing Antioch in June 1098 (this is the strange incident of the Holy Lance of Antioch described in White Rose, 1 Constructural Elements, p. 178, *supra*), eventually the rank and file forced them (on threat of mutiny and disorder) to continue to Jerusalem, the ultimate goal of the Crusade. *Jerusalem was the only objective that kept them together.* After five months of marching, the Crusaders finally reached Jerusalem in July 1099 and in a week, captured the city by a bloody assault that turned into a massacre of the population. After the capture of the final objective, the leaders continued feuding over rule of Jerusalem, and two factions left with their men for Jericho. The only event that brought them back together was the approach of the Fatimid army threatening to recapture Jerusalem. In August 1099, the reunited Crusader army, in an audacious surprise dawn attack routed the Fatimid army of twice their size at the Battle of Ascalon, looted their camp, and returned to Jerusalem. Satisfied that they had met their oblications, shortly afterward most of the First Crusade army returned to Europe, leaving a token force behind.

[6] Commentary: Placed in this context, it is not surprising at all that the sociopolitical ideals represented by the Articles of Confederation, ratified in March 1781, just over seven months before the British surrender at the Siege of Yorktown (thus, ratified in the height of the Revolution), quickly faded and were replaced by the dualistic U.S. Constitution in June 1788. In a certain pro-states or libertarian view of history, this was the innocuous beginning of the leeching of power from the states to the central government which has been continuous and accelerated significantly after the American Civil War and after the Great Depression-WWII era.

[7] Commentary: That is, every living thing is mortal, we have not yet discovered any life that is immortal. *See?*

[8] Commentary: I read from or about writers such as G.K. Chesterton, Alexandria Petri, Eric Hoffer, Nadja Kornith, Bertrand Russel, Kate Becker, J.B. Bury, Amanda Hess, or Joseph Tainter, and I think, wow, I'd like to sit and talk with these people. But the desire for conversation would be purely one sided, within a minute or less any one of them would figure out that I am a lightweight (a term I saw applied in an article to Sebastian Gorka) non-conversational schmuck. I would end up just mumbling my admiration for their work.

- ✓ I have thought from time to time since my youth of what I call the fantasy dinner; a gathering of intellects in a particular field around a dinner table for eight. I might imagine, for example, a dinner with Tom Clancy, Sir John Hackett, Frank Chadwick, Col. Harry Summers, Lynn Montross, Prof. Tom Nichols, and Col. Trevor N. Dupuy (yes, I know that most of them are deceased as of 2020 ... this is a fantasy dinner, that is the way those things usually work). And there I sit or stand in the eighth seat, which might appear empty since I am but a garden gnome peering from behind the edge of the table, over the table cloth, just quietly listening to these men talk shop, hoping not to be noticed because I have nothing useful to add. But for the fact that this is my fantasy dinner, the eighth seat could be better used, perhaps one of the West Point editors, or Rear Adm. Alfred Thayer Mahan, or Generals McMasters or Schwarzkopf would attend as guest speaker and I could just sit in the window behind the curtain. I am in any event expendable, and every military man knows what that means (life expectancy in combat, 3 minutes or less), mission first, don't screw it up. Thus GGDM may actually stand for *Garden Gnome, Discarnate Manifestations*.☺