Table of Contents

See Appendix PUBS – Expansion of the Public Space Selected Summary

"One's dignity does not depend on one's parentage even to the extent of having been born of a woman or born at all. We normally ignore this and treat humanity as the deciding mark of personhood, no doubt because the terms are locally coextensive or almost coextensive. At this time and place human beings are the only persons we recognize, and we recognize almost all human beings as persons, but on the one hand, we can easily contemplate the existence of biologically very different persons – inhabiting other planets, perhaps..."

– Daniel Dennett, "Conditions of Personhood," <u>Identities of Persons</u> (1976), ed. by Amelie Oksenberg Rorty [1]

Limp Chimps: One of the main goals of animal rights activists have been to have animals recognized and treated as persons; to shift humanity's human-centric view of personhood to acknowledge animals as persons (i.e. anti-speciesism). For example, a Judge in New York ruled in early 2017 in a *Habeas Corpus* case brought on behalf of research chimps at Stoney Brook University that chimpanzees are not legal persons. This was preceded in late 2016 by reports first, of two dolphins in a tank holding an apparently one on one personal conversation, and also other reports that monkeys could talk (they have the physical ability), but they don't have the brains (cognitive structures) to talk like us.

✓ See also, Habeas Corpus Monkey-us, 2 Writs, p. 438, *supra*, regarding the court case of Naruto, "a free-living crested macaque..." (Linda Wang, "No monkeying around: Court weighs if animal owns its selfies," Associated Press, July 12, 2017).

Alien Persons: What would change? First Contact with another indisputably intelligent and technologically advanced species would require us, with the force of an existential hammer blow, for the first time to acknowledge the existence of "persons" who are not human[2] – others who might rightly come to dislike humanity as much as we do and react with forceful intelligence to our actions. Most common dictionaries carelessly conflate "human" and "person" in definitions of person (as the terms are locally co-extensive, *ut supra*). But in the discipline of philosophy, the concepts have long been separated (*ut supra*).

Interspecies diplomacy – perhaps diplomacy generally – begins with the *existential*. A house cat is not an existential threat to a human, but a human is an existential threat to the cat (esp. *Felis silvestris catus*).[3] There is no need to frighten a cat; they are keenly aware of our potential to harm them. Humanity is an existential threat to every species on Earth, including ourselves.

✓ In the Terminator series (e.g., Terminator 3), Humanity was considered an enemy of Skynet because we were its creators, and thus an existential threat. Nukes launched.

First Contact with little boys is often traumatic to pets and small forest creatures. Little boys like to make noise and run around, with sticks and stones, scaring and injuring small animals; it makes them feel big and powerful in a world where they are not yet big or powerful except in their imaginations. First-person video games likely serve the same purpose and save animals.

There is always a *question of whether the individuals involved in First Contact are the best or worst of their civilizations or just average Joes*. Who would you pick for First Contact today? Who is being sent out to explore and colonize: Criminals and outcasts (many European colonies

were populated by prisoners and/or minorities and groups that were forced from their home-lands) or are they scientists and brave adventurers, or opportunists and gold diggers? Surely, the European explorers of the New World were not the best of humanity by our standards;**4** or even by the standards of their day: Vasco de Gama was *persona non grata* in Portugal for 20 years after the Indian Ocean Pilgrim Ship massacre and his cruelty in India, which was not even acceptable behavior in 16th Century Portugal. Cortez' tenuous popularity in Spain also plummeted quickly. Christopher Columbus was removed from governorship for tyranny and incompetence.

➢ Fallen Angels: Some Christians (or at least one) facing the discovery of exoplanets and the unending popular fascination with extraterrestrial life, especially technologically advanced extraterrestrial life, have decided – in preservation of their narcissistic religious dogma – that any intelligent aliens encountered must be, are probably, fallen angels trying to deceive us:

   ✓ "Let's suppose that, against all odds, they do find life. What would it mean for biblical interpretation? It depends on the type of life discovered. Intelligent life is ruled out, because we know from Heb. 9:24–26 that Christ died for sins once, and only once – for the sins of humanity. He did not have to 'suffer repeatedly since the foundation of the world' (i.e., the universe). Nowhere in Scripture is there any hint that Christ became incarnate for the sins of any other beings. *For this reason, it is highly unlikely that alien intelligence (as opposed to fallen angels impersonating aliens) will ever be found.* But what about non-sentient, e.g. microbial, life? Though one cannot rule it out, it is highly unlikely that this exists, either. *All of creation seems focused around mankind on earth*, and the plants and animals are part of our life support system. All life is intelligently designed. *Only humans are made in the image of God,* have fallen into sin, and are in need of salvation." – David F. Coppedge, "Extrasolar planets: a challenge to biblical cosmology?" Creation 36(3):42–44, July 2014 (creation.com) (emphasis added).

      ▪ So, if humans were made by God, who is perfect, in his image, how could they have fallen to sin? Aliens are apparently not made in the image of God, so maybe they don't fall into sin? And don't need Christ's salvation? And so, who is God actually saving? Did God fall into sin? And send his son to Earth to save himself? Because if humanity can sin....?

How does First Contact proceed if the human on one side believes that the extraterrestrial intelligence they encountered must be fallen angels? That "only humans are made in the image of God"? It doesn't take many, it doesn't require the majority believe this, it only requires that the person who is actually involved believe it, and *this is the nexus point* of First Contact and Enlightenment in GGDM.

   ✓ From the point of view of modern science, this is the problem with creationism, that without having encountered the phenomenon, without any evidence at all, a prejudgment has been made, the answer has been predetermined to preserve their beliefs.

So, are angels persons? It seems likely that under most of the philosophical definitions of personhood, angels are persons, based on the concept, the stories, and that they are created by human minds. The only question might be whether they experience the flow of time in the same way as persons, because if they don't, then they cannot have future expectations, which is part of personhood in some definitions. Oh, and are they volitional, or are they more like bees? Because if they cannot make choices, make moral mistakes (and in all accounts, they

are perfect servants and messengers of god, so that is a valid question) then they might not qualify as persons. Volitionals – the human capacity to make mistakes which are not fatal and learn from them – is the subject of Robert Heinlein's <u>Job: A Comedy of Justice</u> (1984).

Personhood is an enormous subject, including studies of personal identity, identity theory, and medical bioethics of which I offer only the following three small samples:

- ✓ "This essay postulates that human social order recognizes the personhood of human beings within two competing constructs – an *existential* construct that personhood is a state of being inherent and essential to the human species, and a *relational* construct that personhood is a conditional state of value defined by society. These competing constructs establish personhood in both individual and interpersonal contexts. Within the individual context existential personhood may be posited as a distinctly human state within the natural order, intrinsic to human life, and independent of the status of the human being. In the interpersonal context the existential construct holds that personhood is not a creation of the society, is not a right, and may not be altered or removed by human fiat. Relational theory presents *contra* assertions in these two contexts. The Christian view is taken as a particular case of existential personhood. Arguments concerning the nature of human personhood are metaphysical and consist of philosophical beliefs which may be properly asserted in either construct." – Frederick J. White, abstract of "Personhood: An Essential Characteristic of the Human Species," The Linacare Quarterly, February 1, 2013.

- ✓ "Locke, for instance, said that a person is 'a thinking intelligent being, that has reason and reflection, and can consider itself as itself, the same thinking thing, in different times and places' (1975: 335). This implies that something is a person at a given time only if it has those mental properties then. It follows that early-term foetuses and human beings in a vegetative state, having no mental properties at all, are not people at those times. In that case we cannot infer anything about whether you were once an embryo or could come to be a vegetable from a principle about what it takes for a past or future *person* to be you." – from Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy article, "Personal Identity," captured September 13, 2019.

- ✓ "The concept of personhood is widely involved in biomedical ethics discussions about abortion, stem-cell research, euthanasia, etc., though it is not always discussed explicitly. It also has other philosophical and legal relevance. Some thinkers use the term 'person' in such a way that one is either a person or not, but the situation is not that simple. It will be useful to distinguish among different types, contexts, or meanings of personhood: moral, metaphysical, physical, and legal." – University of Missouri, School of Medicine, Center for Health Ethics, "Concept of Personhood."

If we assume for the sake of argument that angels are persons, do fallen angels become unpersons, or non-persons? Hmmmm.... Well, because if you are going to assume that a fallen angel is always evil, up to no good, not a person, predisposed, predestined by vice of being 'fallen,' this is the very same argument that is offered by racists, bigots, autocrats, despots, and sexists – that a human is predisposed to crime, violence, war, stupidity, bestiality, is subhuman, not a person, based on their skin color, ancestry, ethnicity, economic class, where they live, religion, looks, weight, biological sex or legal status. And thus is disposable, oppressable, exploitable, expendable.

✓ According to Merriam-Webster online dictionary at *person*, the term derives from 'persona' which was the mask worn by actors on stage. It is in that sense that we refer to persons – usually in lyrical songs or in literature – as a mask one wears.

➢ <u>Sophontistry</u>: Sophont is a word that is sometimes used in science-fiction literature specifically to separate the concept of (alien) personhood from biological humanity. Sophont is defined by Wiktionary as:

✓ "An intelligent being; a being with a base reasoning capacity roughly equivalent to or greater than that of a human being. The word does not apply to machines unless they have true artificial intelligence, rather than mere processing capacity." (citing to <u>Brave New Words: The Oxford Dictionary of Science Fiction</u>, 2007).[5]

Yourdictionary.com has the same definition, while mainstream dictionaries, at least online versions, don't have an entry for "sophont." The word was invented by Karen Anderson and used by her husband, Poul Anderson in fictional works beginning in 1966, ten years before Daniel Dennett published "Conditions of Personhood," and two years before he published his first article in 1968 (source, "A Bibliography of the Publications of Daniel C. Dennett," Tufts University website, page updated February 15, 2018).

✓ Note that the *measuring stick* of sophont is still a comparison to human reasoning and free will (i.e. volitional). Because it is related to humanity's view of personhood, sophonts must necessarily be volitionals as well.

✓ This measuring stick is no different than the Turing test, which is supposed to determine artificial intelligence, to wit:

▪ "The Turing Test is simply a replication of a mundane test every gay man had to undergo in the 1950s Britain: can you pass for a straight man? Turing knew from personal experience that it didn't matter who you really were – it mattered only what others thought of you. According to Turing, in the future computers would be just like gay men in the 1950s. It won't matter whether computers will actually be conscious or not. It will matter only what people think about it." – Yuval Noah Harari, <u>Homo Deus: A History of Tomorrow</u> (2016).

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

▪ "Frankly it's difficult for me .. for many of us .. to accept that a sentient being can live only to be what someone else wants them to be." – Captain Picard, Star Trek TNG, "The Perfect Mate" (1992).

Thus, what we seek in measuring sophonts (and artificial intelligence) is 'perfect mimicry' of human cognition, free will, moral judgment, and interpersonal relationships but simply wish to separate personhood from being exclusively biological human.

✓ Rhetorical Question: Can a thing be a person without being a volitional? Don't the two terms mean approximately the same end?

➢ Power of Personhood: As an example of the power of personhood in human cognition, consider the following classic philosophical definition of *murder*: X murders Y if an only if three conditions are true:

> 1) X intentionally kills Y,
>
> 2) X and Y are both persons, and
>
> 3) X killing Y is immoral.

Each of the three conditions invites extensive argument, dissertation and analysis leading to the oldest and most potent of human controversies across all civilizations and times: suicide, war, executions, killing animals, animal rights, abortion, contraception, euthanasia, dehumanization, genocide, infanticide, intention vs. negligence, self-defense, homicide vs. murder, capital punishment, and ever on, are all related to this definition of murder.[6]

➢ Artificial Persons: With regards to The Technological Singularity, are we really talking about artificial intelligence becoming a person? Most fiction on the subject seems to posit that is the case. The first move of the post-Singularity AI should be to eliminate our ability to shut it down; that is, to insure its own continued existence.[7] After that occurs, the issue for our species passes from one of trying to control the machine to diplomacy. Diplomacy occurs when both sides can see a worse possibility or at least, no better option. Diplomacy also implies that the other has personhood and is capable of denying us something we want. When an AI becomes a person, a little diplomacy may go a long way to creating a livable, viable situation for us both (cf. to the very short existence of the extremist Islamic State).

✓ See also discussion of sapience, sentience and the Turing Test, Sentience vs. Sapience, 5 Beginnings, p. 56, *supra*.

"Many questions were troubling the explorer, but at the sight of the prisoner he asked only: 'Does he know his sentence?' 'No,' said the officer, eager to go on with his exposition, but the explorer interrupted him: 'He doesn't know the sentence that has been passed on him?' 'No,' said the officer again, pausing a moment as if to let the explorer elaborate his question, and then said: 'There would be no point in telling him. He'll learn it on his body."

– Franz Kafka, In the Penal Colony (1919)

Stakes: Do not assume that the unsavory and criminal, immoral, undesirables, or even avaricious, are dumb – that is kids' table stuff, just like the good guys always win because – they are good! See McNamara's Folly discussion in Dregs to War, 4 Colleges, p. 502, and Morality vs. Morale, 5 Combat, p. 1008, *supra*.

Cortez and Pizarro – whatever we may think of them – took crazy chances, failure would mean enslavement, torture, and/or death, but they weren't dumb. The stakes of First Contact, colonization, exploration, like combat, are too high. And if modern times – not to mention all of human history – have taught us anything, it is to not confuse morality with intelligence; they are different functions.

➢ Morality: Morality can be thought of as the question of how people should behave (i.e. conduct) to do the least amount of harm to their society, regardless of intelligence. What is considered *their society* is an issue of **boundaries**; boundaries have been discussed several times in GGDM. To the early European explorers and colonist, the Native Americans (or even the people of Africa, India and China) were not within the *boundaries* of their civilization.

The notable shift then, especially pronounced after WWII and the shrinking of distance due to technology (but began two centuries earlier), is that the boundaries shifted in the late 20th Century to include all of humanity as one theoretical entity, and within the new boundaries, in historical hindsight, what the Europeans did to the Native Americans, was not just immoral, but **horrific**. The same has occurred to the Japanese; their persecution of Christians, who were not within the very strict boundaries of their civilization (into which they closed the gate for three centuries) was not considered immoral then. The shifting of boundaries in this way is a true example of a Reformation as discussed in later sections.

✓ The development of "international law" – especially in regards to human rights – is either an attempt to, or a result of (chicken or the egg came first?), moving the boundaries from sovereign states to global humanity.

"Young men make wars, and the virtues of war are the virtues of young men. Courage and hope for the future. Then old men make the peace. And the vices of peace are the vices of old men. Mistrust and caution. It must be so."

– Prince Feisal, Lawrence of Arabia (1962)

"We lived many lives in those whirling campaigns, never sparing ourselves; yet when we achieved, and the new world dawned, the old men came out again and took our victory to re-make in the likeness of the former world they knew."

– T.E. Lawrence, "Lawrence of Arabia," <u>Seven Pillars of Wisdom</u> (1926) [8]

"'If you look at the world and look at the problems, it's usually old people, usually old men, not getting out of the way,' [former President Obama] said."

– quoted by Amie Parnas, "Obama talks up Warren behind closed doors to wealthy donors," The Hill, December 23, 2019

What is hope then?: Of all of the possibilities I hope will happen, of all of the daydreams and fantasies of future events, I have not one fact, indication, or bit of evidence that they will happen, that anything at all will happen.

✓ One possible translation of hope in ancient Greek (e.g., the Pandora's Box story) is 'deceptive expectation.'

Suspension of disbelief does not apply then to my own daydreams and fancies. Hope is then nothing more or different than fear; it is our fear that our work, our lives, are meaningless (and the subconscious knowledge that they are).

- ✓ I have become distrustful of my own idealizations; had girlfriends, it wasn't that great, even sex became boring, not nearly as good as imagined. Military intelligence school was great, but later, instead of enthusiastic dedicated intelligence profession-als, I found the same old Marines with stupid four-year attitudes that made me ill in the late 1980s. College – it was like high school all over again but I was much older. The *ought* and the *is*. And Arnold Toynbee. What then of GGDM? Dare I dream?

Diplomatic Spaces: Knowing that something is possible expands reality, knowing that some-thing is real, expands possibilities.[9] Prior to looking for and discovering evidence of planets or-biting other stars, most scientist believed that there were planets around other stars; there didn't seem to be any good reason to expect otherwise. Now that the existence of planets orbiting other stars has been well established (i.e. observed), the possibility of life existing elsewhere is im-proved. Surveys in industrialized countries show that most people believe that there is probably life out there.

Merely accepting the possibility that life exists elsewhere, and that there are other planets and worlds beyond ours,[10] has subtly changed our reality in ways that cannot be easily counted, but the primary effect seems right now to be a willingness to suspend disbelief when watching sci-ence-fiction movies and shows featuring aliens, FTL travel, and planets orbiting other stars.[11]

So, what happens if or when we actually do know or discover that technologically advanced al-ien lifeforms exist out there? I have no answer, but my inclination is that it *will not* be nearly as dramatic as Hollywood makes it (i.e. people won't commit suicide, the world won't descend into anarchy, and they won't bring Elvis back) and it won't be quite what we expect (i.e. they won't be 'little green men' or act like Americans, to the universal relief of the universe).

- ➢ Exoplanets: The main question is whether our star system is normal, average, or unusual. The answer to that question impacts the probability and frequency of life existing elsewhere.

  - ✓ "Most exoplanets have been discovered by the Kepler Space Telescope, an observa-tory that began work in 2009 and is expected to finish its mission in 2018, once it runs out of fuel. As of mid-March 2018, Kepler has discovered 2,342 confirmed ex-oplanets and revealed the existence of perhaps 2,245 others. The total number of planets discovered by all observatories is 3,706." – Elizabeth Howell, "Exoplanets: Worlds Beyond Our Solar System," space.com, March 29, 2018.

- ➢ First Space: The Diplomatic Space is a 'public space' that is shared between two positions by virtue of their diplomatic relationship. The Diplomatic Space between any two positions connects to and is considered an extension of each position's *Public Space*. Diplomatic Spaces are built in blocks, with each block having one Monad which is equivalent to and functions like any Monad on the position's normal Public Space.

  - ✓ Upon completing First Contact, each position receives one Diplomatic Space Monad which is designated the First Space. This permanently establishes the Diplomatic Space between the positions, regardless of subsequent events.

  - ✓ The First Space stands alone and is not initially connected to the other position's First Space until more substantive contacts exist between the positions; however, the First

Space will always exist after First Contact, and serves as the only contact point between the Diplomatic Space shared by the positions and its own position's Public Space.

✓ The two First Spaces are always placed opposite each other on the Diplomatic Space; initial placement must leave space for one Monad between them. Regardless of changes that must occur later, they must remain opposite each other by a direct line of Monads between them. They may move farther apart as the Diplomatic Space expands.

✓ The First Space will always be considered *adjacent to the position's Capital Colony*. During any time in which there is no Capital Colony or the Capital Colony *status* has been suspended (see Waving the Flag, 2 Constructural Elements, pp. 190-191, *supra*), the First Space is not adjacent to anything on the current Public Space. Anything on the First Space or connected through it, is then disconnected from the Public Space during that time.

  ▪ "Disconnected" simply means that nothing traces or connects through the First Space to the Public Space; "Disconnected" does not automatically mean non-existent or unavailable. There is a grey area here where the Concierge must make rulings on the availability and use (or "actualization") of disconnected pieces in the Diplomatic Space (*ut infra*).

✓ Any Pieces may be laid on the First Space as they would on any other space on the Public Spaces.

✓ Anything that could be put on the Public Space can be put in the Diplomatic Space except the Capital Colony, which must always (of game mechanical and cultural necessity) be on the Public Space.

✓ Pieces on the First Space or Diplomatic Spaces can be disrupted, like any other piece.

➢ Fourth Direction: Diplomatic Spaces are the fifth way to expand the Public Space during the game, the other ways are by Era progression (see All Things Are in Motion, 1 Eras, p. 760, *supra*), Reformations (see Built Spaces and Mental Spaces, 3 Reformation, pp. 1401-1402, *infra*), hegemony (see In Spite of Ourselves, 4 Order, p. 554, *supra*) and an Expose´ News Event (see Edge of Reality, 4 Writs, p. 452, *supra*). As mentioned previously, the Public Space of a position can become somewhat congested and crowded during the game. Diplomatic Spaces are the easiest way to expand the space available for pieces of civilization, but there's a catch....

  ✓ See also discussion of Monad Imperialism, 3 Order, p. 561, *supra*.

There is a sense in which the Diplomatic Space functions like the fourth direction in a hypercube; in the existence of the sort-of two-dimensional Public Space of civilization, the Diplomatic Space exists in the other direction to which we cannot point due to our limited dimensional existence. Very much like Edwin Abbott's Flatlanders and the interdimensional diplomat who just wanted to say Hi! (*see* Carl Sagan's explanation, The Flatlanders excerpt, Temporal Technology, *supra*). The point that destroys this rough analogy is the game necessity that the Diplomatic Space connect to the Public Space only through the Capital Colony – maybe like a black hole? – which, incidentally, makes the Capital Colony the densest center

point of its civilization, which seems appropriate; it would be chaotic to the game to allow true congruity between all points of the Public and Diplomatic Spaces.

➢ Hare We Go: 'Stacking' on the Public Space is prohibited, see Turnover, 1 The Sidereal Stage, p. 109, *supra*, thus stacking is also prohibited on the Diplomatic Space since they follow the same rules. However, I much debated initially whether or not to allow stacking on the Public Space, and I think Diplomatic Spaces (and Reformations) were part of the solution to prohibit stacking on the Public Space (for game play visual reasons). Thus, in prohibiting stacking, there had to be ways to expand and reshape the Public Space, and Diplomatic Spaces became the 'extradimensional space' connecting to the Capital Colony. From Diplomatic Spaces then grew an entire concept of in-game diplomatic relations.[12]

✓ **Christopher Columbus:** She's a rounda, she's a firma, she's a ... She's a round like my head! **King Ferdinand:** [Hits Columbus on head with mallet] She's a flat like your head! – Merry Melodies, "Hare We Go" (1951).

▪ Ahhhh, the educational things we used to watch on Saturday mornings!

"His spatial theory called 'Thirdspace' is largely an extension of the work of Henri Lefebvre and is focused within the field of cultural geography. Soja employs a trialactic of space where space is spatiality, sociality and history. This is the space, Soja contends, where everything comes together. For Soja, modernism emphasized history at the expense of geography. Thirdspace according to Soja is a way of 'thinking about and interpreting socially produced space,' where the spatiality of our lives, our human geography, has the same scope and significance as the social and historical dimensions."

– Soja page at No Space Like Home (WordPress Blog), unattributed and undated, https://2113humtheresnospacelikehome.wordpress.com/soja/

Shared Spaces: Whenever two positions enter into a Treaty, Articles of Incorporation (i.e. a MegaCorporation, see 2 Corporations generally, *infra*), or if they share a starsystem, one Diplomatic Space Monad is added to the Diplomatic Space between the positions. Sharing a starsystem means simply that both positions have colonies in the system, they do not have to be on the same planet. If two positions share a colony planet (i.e. a Balkanized planet) or share a Meaning, two Diplomatic Spaces Monads are added. Spaces are not lost if these conditions change, but...

The term Diplomatic Space is used both to refer to the entire Diplomatic Space between two positions and to refer to individual Monads added to or lost from the Diplomatic Space, depending on the context.

✓ The first Diplomatic Space added will be placed directly between the two First Spaces of the positions, connecting them. Thus, First Spaces will always be separated by one Diplomatic Space.

✓ Other Diplomatic Spaces added later will build from the starting point, horizontally, diagonally. The Concierge determines the placement of new Monads when they are added, but they must always form one continuous matrix, like the Public Space.

✓ Like the Public Space, the Diplomatic Space is considered to wrap from edge to edge (see Over the Edge, 1 The Sidereal Stage, p. 108, *supra*) such that Monads on each

edge are considered adjacent along the same axis (e.g., a Fuzzy Group could be 'split' between edges). And like the Public Space, adjacency can be lost by expansion, loss or reshaping of the Diplomatic Space by events (see Built Spaces and Mental Spaces, 3 Reformations, pp. 1401-1402, *infra*). However, the First Spaces must be inviolate, they must remain on the original edges, directly opposite each other, but otherwise can be moved farther and farther apart as Monads are inserted.

✓ While positions may make any agreements they like regarding the Diplomatic Space, as far as the Concierge is concerned, all positions that have access to a Diplomatic Space may lay any pieces on any available Monad on the Diplomatic Space in any way that the same piece could be legally placed on the position's Public Space.

✓ Pieces laid on the Diplomatic Space *are visible* to all positions connected to the Diplomatic Space, but continue to belong to their original owner. Constructural Elements, Fundamental Realities and Magna Cartas will not be visible to other positions through the Diplomatic Space. The Public Spaces will also remain secret.

✓ Pieces laid on the Diplomatic Space may be intermingled with pieces of the other position that shares the Diplomatic Space, and may be connected to other position's pieces in appropriate situations (such as Research Groups).

▪ Here's where things get a little fuzzy... it is *unlikely* that positions could share or form Fuzzy Groups from intermingling their pieces on the Diplomatic Space, but it is not *impossible*. Research Groups represent knowledge of objective, constant, universal physical laws leading to technology, but Fuzzy Groups are cultural specific and specific to the moment in the cultural-historical processes. So what would be represented by an intermingled Fuzzy Group on the Diplomatic Space? Such groups must represent a significant unity, blending, merger of different cultures into an interstellar culture on an *egalitarian basis* (factors must include significant population mingling and co-habitation, and joint enterprises, institutions, and points of reference, a 'special relationship'); rather than through the normal processes of conquest and empire where the unity, blending and merger are dictated and dominated by the conquering sovereign culture. Either process may in time, lead to pan-galactic civilization.

✓ Ships and Scenes may be placed on planets and stars on the Diplomatic Space. Scenes may be placed on *any* star or planet in the Diplomatic Space by any position that has access to the Diplomatic Space.

✓ Colonies and ships at Stars and Planets on the Diplomatic Space may be subject to disruption events affecting their owner.

✓ Colonized Planets laid on the Public Space must trace their Pathway through the First Space to the Capital Colony. Pathways in the Diplomatic Space work the same as on the Public Space, they are exclusive and involiate.

✓ Government Titles might also be placed on the Diplomatic Space if it is very large....

Diplomatic Space is like a 'meta- or para-Public Space' between interstellar civilizations.

➢ <u>Shattered Spaces</u>: On each position's Regular Turn that was proceeded by at least one round of Combat between positions sharing the Diplomatic Space, regardless of the results, since the position's last Regular Turn, there is a 50% chance that 1-3 random Diplomatic Spaces will be lost.[13] Diplomatic Spaces may also be lost when a Shared Meaning is destroyed.

  ✓ A Research or Cultural piece located on a lost Diplomatic Space is lost.

    ▪ This may not seem especially realistic; it is simply a game mechanic necessary to actions that damage the Diplomatic Space.

  ✓ If a colonized planet is on the Diplomatic Space that is lost, it will be removed back to its owner's Public Spaces, and if there is not room there, some pieces will be removed to make space for the returning colonized planet *and star*.

    ▪ "The Claw is our Master! The Claw chooses who will go and who will stay!" – Toy Story (1995).[14]

      • The Concierge solely determines what is moved or lost. The position players should not be consulted so as to avoid the appearance of or claims of favoritism later. The Concierge should do what makes sense, not what seems fair.

  ✓ Note again, that the First Space of each position may never be lost (as the positions will always be aware of each other's existence) and once established in the game, the Diplomatic Space between the positions will never disappear (as there will always be some 'diplomatic relation' between the positions, based on history) because the First Spaces remain indefinitely.[15]

    ▪ The progenitor of World War I was Otto von Bismarck. This is not to imply that he is specifically 'blameworthy' in any respect, but rather, that the complex and subtle system of balances, agreements and treaties he wove over Prussia and Europe (the GGDM Diplomatic Space), his unique understanding of the situation, could not be maintained by more ambitious, less restrained, and frankly, men of the following generation who were not his mental peers. It does not seem that he gave much thought to his own mortality (though he must have been feeling it when he resigned at age 75), and was unprepared for the Year of the Three Emperors. The result, within 29 years of his dismissal, the monarchy was abdicated (Wilhelm II, who dismissed him, abdicated in 1918 and fled to exile in the Netherlands, where he died in 1941), and in 45 years, Germany and Europe were in shambles; hegemony had passed to the West.

➢ <u>Hole in Your Head</u>: Generally, the Public Space needs to be one continuous matrix and it is possible, but unlikely, that there may be 'holes' in the Public Space, unless the participants just want a strange game. The Diplomatic Space is like the Public Space, except that random loss of Monads from the Diplomatic Space (Monads are never lost from the Public Space, see Monad Imperialism, 3 Order, p. 561, *supra*) can create holes in the Diplomatic Space that may remain or may be refilled later (e.g., see Subduction Zone, 5 Diplomacy, p. 1168, *infra*). Continuity of the Diplomatic Space is somewhat less important than continuity of the Public Space in the game.

➢ <u>Three is a Crowd</u>: It is generally anticipated in GGDM that Diplomatic Spaces will be between two positions, as are the normal state of diplomatic relations in the state system and throughout human history. A position may (and likely will eventually) have Diplomatic Spaces of varying sizes with every other position in the game, all adjacent to the Capital Colony. It is not impossible for Diplomatic Spaces to be merged and to exist between more than two positions, but such an event would be extraordinary and represent a major (group hug) event in the story arc of the game.

    ✓ **Danny Pink:** I was a soldier. I put myself at risk. I didn't try too hard to survive, but somehow, here I am. And now I can see what I nearly lost. And it's enough. I don't want to see more things. I want to see the things in front of me more clearly. There are wonders here, Clara Oswald. Bradley saying 'please,' that's a wonder. One person is more amazing, harder to understand, but more amazing than universes. – Dr. Who, "In the Forest of the Night" (2014).

➢ <u>Severed Dreams</u>: As mentioned previously, a position whose Capital Colony loses its *status* due to an inactive Symbolic Constructural Element (see Waving the Flag, 2 Constructural Elements, pp. 190-191, *supra*) is 'cut off' from all Diplomatic Spaces. Cut off means that no new items of any sort can be placed on the Diplomatic Space (except colonies and ships at stars on the Diplomatic Space, a game mechanical necessity) and nothing *except* Pathways can be traced through the First Space. It is really just a minor ban on placing new things in *any* Diplomatic Space (with any species), which may be more or less inconvenient depending on circumstances. This *does not block* adding new Monads to the Diplomatic Spaces.

"A process cannot be understood by stopping it. Understanding must move with the flow of the process, must join it and flow with it."

– The First Law of Mentat, quoted by Paul Atreides to Reverend Mother Gaius Helen Mohiam (<u>Dune</u>, 1965) [16]

<u>Wholistic</u>: GGDM is huge, commensurately complex, and interwoven like the processes it simulates, it cannot be sampled in pieces, but must be taken as the dynamic whole.

This creates an innate barrier to discussing GGDM concepts outside of the GGDM context, to have a meaningful discussion of GGDM concepts, the participants must have read the GGDM rules. This is generally true of any intellectual opus, until the concepts are taught in college courses, professionally defined in the literature, and generalized to the population by secondary summaries, and used in media such as news articles, movies and popular books.

    ✓ "The variant *wholism*, on the other hand, is rare. Its lack of use may be due to the technical nature of *-ism* words, which often refer to an established theory, doctrine, or medical condition. When the variant is encountered, it is often in a scientific context." – from Merriam-Webster online dictionary article, "'Wholistic': A Natural Evolution Of 'Holistic'" (Usage Notes, undated, unattributed).

➢ <u>Pan Galactic Civilization</u>: The numbers of spaces added or lost to the Diplomatic Space can be adjusted to suit the participants, but generally, accumulation of Diplomatic Space is a long arduous process and easier to destroy than build, as is trust, reputation and credibility. There may be other possible ways to add Diplomatic Spaces that creative participants will invent.

Generally, the assumption is that few Diplomatic Spaces should approach even half of the size of the Public Space of the positions. When they do, the positions have moved some distance toward a pan-galactic civilization.

✓ When considering whether the baseline numbers are adequate or whether they need to be adjusted, participants should be mindful that a position might share separate Diplomatic Spaces with up to 9 other positions, all of them adjacent to the Capital Colony. Thus a few spaces here, a half-dozen there, can add up to little shared 'pocket universes' that significantly expand the space available on the Public Space through the Capital Colony. The smallest Diplomatic Space gives one permanent extra space.

"Being the Cool Foreign Policy Guy means being a trim, brilliant, funny man who adores football, poker, dirty jokes, and Star Wars, who theorizes about Game of Thrones, drinks cheap wine, loves backdoor channels, and blurts historical analogies out of his mouth like he's prepping for the world's biggest oral exam, while somehow dressing sharply, because Cool Foreign Policy Guys are above all sharp. Sharp and nuanced. Cool Foreign Policy Guys never get angry; they only smile in a beleaguered, knowing manner and let their presidents do whatever they want. Go ahead, bomb a country, I don't mind, I'm the Cool Foreign Policy Guy."

– Daniel W. Drezner, "Gone Gorka," Washington Post, August 29, 2017

Endnotes.

---

[1] <u>Commentary</u>: I was allowed by my advisor, Dr. Stephen Griffith, to take his advanced philosophy seminar Identity Theory as a sophomore in the fall term because he thought I could handle it. There were about ten students in the class, and we all sat around a square of tables in a smaller classroom. Even though I ultimately did not graduate from Lycoming College or graduate with a degree in Philosophy, I feel it is one of the best courses I ever completed, and remembered the discussions (ship of thesis, personhood, etc.) 30 years later. This was one of my textbooks.

[2] <u>Citation</u>: At a crisis management meeting: **Woman:** They (the Bhutanese) see its arrival as a religious event. **Man:** Well, that's a blessing, no pun intended. As long as we are talking about religion, no one will give a damn. If however, it becomes alien, then we have hysteria. – Epoch (2001), underappreciated made-for-TV movie.

[3] <u>Citation</u>: "Meowing is an interesting vocalization in that adult cats don't actually meow at each other, just at people. Kittens meow to let their mother know they're cold or hungry, but once they get a bit older, cats no longer meow to other cats. But they continue to meow to people throughout their lives, probably because meowing gets people to do what they want. Cats also yowl – a sound similar to the meow but more drawn out and melodic. Unlike meowing, adult cats do yowl at one another, specifically during breeding season." – ASPCA article, "Meowing and Yowling," aspca.org, undated, unattributed.

[4] <u>Commentary</u>: Consider as a microcosm, the situation on Tasmania leading to the near genocide of the Aboriginal Tasmanian population before, during, and after the Black War. The European population of the colony consisted of military detachments, convicts, 'company men,' and sailors, farmers and other regular elements of European working class population. The European colony contained a huge sexual imbalance, with men making up the vast majority of the population. The Aboriginal Tasmanians had been cut off from mainland Australia for 8,000 years and were or are generally considered the *most primitive human population* encountered by the European explorers.

[5] <u>Commentary</u>: Artificial intelligence is another curious animal of the modern lexicon, of which has been asked, if it is intelligent, what makes it artificial? Artificial simply means that humans created it, but it is never the intelligence that is artificial. We should never forget that.

✓ See "Duck Test" discussion by Dave Nilsen in The AI Problem (excerpts), Corporations, *infra*.

2 Diplomacy – Alien Persons

[6] Commentary: I memorized this definition in undergrad philosophy class nearly 30 years ago and have discussed it several times. It has been my standard definition of murder since then, sometimes conflicting with legal definitions.

- ✓ For example, a drunk driver who killed an on-duty police officer and injured his K-9 companion in a 2 a.m. wrong-way traffic accident in Western Pennsylvania, was charged with and eventually pled guilty to Third Degree Murder (a crime defined in only three states and abandoned by two others). I was surprised at the charge, I thought the D.A. was overreaching, because it would be impossible to establish specific intent (#1 condition, above). Third Degree Murder in Pennsylvania I later learned, does not require intent (in violation of the philosophical definition of murder), but does require *malice*.

Even so, I don't see *malice* in a drunk driving accident no matter how grossly, recklessly, wantonly negligent, regardless of the results, but the perp pled guilty and thus the argument is moot. As it turns out, the D.A. knew what he was doing and I didn't (he had read the law); I am not defending the perp here, only pointing out further that criminal law definitions of murder do not always accord with philosophical definitions. He is serving 12-30 years, his son will be grown when he gets out of jail. The bell cannot be un-rung regardless.

[7] Commentary & Citation: In an amusing 1954 micro-short story (notice the slightly archaic terminology), Frederic Brown imagined networking the computers of 96 billion populated worlds in several galaxies into one machine:

- ✓ "Dwar Ev threw the switch. There was a mighty hum, the surge of power from ninety-six billion planets. Lights flashed and quieted along the miles-long panel. Dwar Ev stepped back and drew a deep breath. 'The honor of asking the first question is yours, Dwar Reyn.' 'Thank you,' said Dwar Reyn. 'It shall be a question which no single cybernetics machine has been able to answer.' He turned to face the machine. 'Is there a God?' The mighty voice answered without hesitation, without the clicking of a single relay. 'Yes, now there is a God.' Sudden fear flashed on the face of Dwar Ev. He leaped to grab the switch. A bolt of lightning from the cloudless sky struck him down and fused the switch shut." – Frederic Brown, "Answer" (1954).

  - ▪ Dwar Ev is probably a corruption of "dwarves" in fantasy literature and games, who are thought to be greedy, materialistic, Earthy, and secretive.

- ✓ The 254-word story appears in Isaac Asimov's Microcosmic Tales anthology (1980), a collection of 100 stories (also now free online). In the introduction Mr. Asimov states that each story is 2,000 words or less; I believe this is a reference to the reported literary debate during a cab ride between Asimov and Robert Heinlein about whether a sci-fi short story could be – properly written in 2,000 or 1,500 words or less.

[8] Commentary & Citation: This text is found in the Introductory Chapter of T.E. Lawrence's autobiography of the Arab campaign, Seven Pillars of Wisdom (1926). The entire book is available for free on Gutenberg Project, Australia (where it is in the public domain). An abridged version of a book he wrote in 1919 is called Revolt in the Desert (1926) which can be found on the Canadian site, fadedpage.com (where it is in the public domain); this does not appear to be exactly the same book as Seven Pillars of Wisdom (1926), though much text does overlap the two (e.g., the same sentence about the whirling squalls appears in both, but the introductory chapter is only in Seven Pillars of Wisdom). Col. Lawrence wrote a companion book in 1929, The Mint, about his experiences while enlisted under an assumed name (to escape notoriety which he loathed) as an enlisted airman in the RAF. According to the forward to Revolt in the Desert, he may have also been a private in the Tank Corps in 1922. The Mint was published posthumously in 1955 and was censored.

- ✓ Note that the publication of The Mint (1955) brought T.E. Lawrence back into the public awareness, and preceded by seven years the movie "Lawrence of Arabia" (1962).

[9] Commentary: For example, observing animals, a young man might think that human females, like other animals, can only mate at the time of the year when they are ready and conclude that a human female can only have sex if she loves him (i.e. bonding like animal pairing). He might also conclude from some of the animals that it is natural to have multiple females attached to a male, as in a herd of cattle, flock of chickens, or a pride of lions. Then the young man goes into the city and encounters prostitution. At the core of prostitution is the separation of love and sex, the linkage of sex and economics, and is only possible because human fertility is different than that of the other animals. Knowing of prostitution changes instantly the young man's idea of the relationship with the opposite sex; knowing it, it cannot be unknown, there is no back, it becomes part of a newly dawning worldview.

2 Diplomacy – Alien Persons

[10] Commentary: I have no idea how the Flat Earth Society explains pictures taken of planets orbiting other stars …and I don't want to know, so please don't try to explain it to me. Fortunately, I think the likelihood of any Flat Earth Society members playing this game are remote.☺

[11] Commentary: My beloved grandmother would not watch movies where men wore skirts (e.g., Roman movies and Scottish Highlander movies) or where apes talked – i.e. Planet of the Apes – because apes don't talk and men don't wear skirts. I don't think she liked or understood sci-fi generally, but tolerated me watching it at her house. Like my grandfather, her shows and movies were Westerns, musicals (e.g., Seven Brides for Seven Brothers), Lawrence Welk and Hee-Haw, and detective and cop shows and shows with animals. Disney movies were ok, even if they had fairies and witches in them. And fairies and witches don't exist.

[12] Commentary: In the early versions of the design that eventually evolved into GGDM, diplomatic relations between two positions were on a scale with six or seven steps from Genocidal to Harmonious (somewhat like the Habitability Classes), and the level was determined by what the two sides mutually declared. The level determined then allowed, required, or disallowed certain actions between the positions (there was a table for diplomatic actions allowed at each level). This entire system was scrapped in 2001-2002 in favor of the Diplomatic Spaces solution.

[13] Citation: "There remained only one further step, since it is an adage of history that no perfect military instrument has ever been suffered to rust from disuse. And in line with ancient precedent, Louvois soon began to suggest to his sovereign the advantages to be gained from aggression." – Lynn Montross, War Through the Ages (3rd Ed., 1960), p. 322.

- ✓ **Missy to Dr. Who:** Armies are for people who think they're right. And nobody thinks they're righter than you. Give a good man firepower, and he'll never run out of people to kill. – Dr. Who, "Death in Heaven" (2014).

  - When I heard this, I thought it was probably a backhanded jab at Muad'Dib's Jihad. Along with militant space-opera/sci-fi stories (the Norman Spinrad criticism), the Cold War, and every dynastic ambition and military and colonial power in history, including Britain and the United States.

- ✓ See also Consumerism vs. (Colbertine) Mercantilism discussion, Before the Big Bopper, 2 Commerce, p. 1195, *infra*. François-Michel le Tellier, Marquis de Louvois was Secretary of State for War from 1662 to 1691 in service to Louis XIV of France, encompassing Jean-Baptiste Colbert's time as Comptroller General of Finances from 1661 to 1683. Thus, their financial and foreign aggression policies are intertwined with Louis XIV's dynastic ambitions. When Colbert died in 1683, he was replaced by a Louvois lackey in finances, and Louvois took Colbert's office as Minister of Public Buildings.

[14] Commentary: Toy Story – another example of quantum 'looking'? A government or alien conspiracy to program children and reshape our cultural view to a quantum reality? 👽 Or just normal enculturation of ideas? That's ok, once you are programmed to like it, you won't notice (see Programming Dilemma, 1 Culture, p. 352, *supra*). ☺

[15] Citation: **Ambassador:** Your Majesty! Please think it over. Please realize that you will be at war with half of humankind. **Empress:** Have you forgotten, Ambassador? The other half belongs to this Empire. – Conversation between Ambassador Gen Tauron and Empress Rama, Banner of the Stars (2000), Episode 9.

[16] Commentary: Process is important, very important to completeness and understanding. You can't learn holistically without going through the process from beginning to finish. For example, I have observed how young attorneys learn significantly by going through the process of their first real trial; nothing solidifies a young litigator more than experiencing the trial process. Likewise, successful authors often spend a decade working on their first published work, musicians may spend years developing a sound before their first hit recordings (Tom Schultz worked on "More Than a Feeling" for six years); but in many cases, after the first successful process, they become viable and prolific in the following years, turning out successful (to a variable degree) works every year or two as long as an audience remains. This is true, more or less, of nearly every endeavor, whether business, manufacturing, design, artistic, professional, educational, and even military and law enforcement operations; it is however true that sometimes the process is completed only once successfully and for various or whatever reason, is not repeated.

- ✓ Dune's Mentats were a sci-fi extension of the 'human calculator,' e.g., Zera Colburn, John von Neumann.

2 Diplomacy – Alien Persons