

EXCERPT FROM APPENDIX A
STRATEGIC GUIDANCE TOWARDS IMPROVING OUTCOMES

PART III - MOVING INTO THE ADMINISTRATION'S SECOND YEAR¹
CHAPTER SIX - A BIT BEYOND THE FIRST YEAR

Clues from the Ukraine Crisis

The Foundation of Unity

Homeland Territory. The foundation of unity is in the protection of the sovereign territory in which the united people live. Ukrainians are united under the leadership of their president, [Volodymyr Zelenskyy](#), a person whose career has been blessed because of his sensitivity to people's feelings. The invaders are encountering substantial resistance from the elderly and the youth without regard to formal military status.

The people are defending their homeland with their lives. They have experienced liberty, and they will fight to the death to defend it. Their unity has inspired an astounding support from the next network level of sovereign states. That next level could be identified in many ways ranging from other democracies to all the sovereign states on the planet Earth. Within that range there are at least three networks that are candidates.

One such network is the *North Atlantic Treaty Organization*, NATO. It is prioritized in relevance because there were at least two

¹The strategic guidance treatise also serves as an [appendix](#) to the overview [booklet](#), *IT IS TIME TO DECIDE! DO YOU WANT TO LIVE IN A FREE SOCIETY?* All of this is authored by the personhood of the Declaration Era Educational Press ([DEEP](#)). The DEEP enterprise is designed to be a nonpartisan educational endeavor to be gifted to a nonprofit organization, as soon as it becomes self-supporting and appropriate Board of Directors is assembled.

The appendix is designed to provide periodic updates of unfolding events. The succeeding chapters this year will focus on the report of the Select Committee investigating the January 6 assault on the Capitol and the outcome of the midterm elections. The readership is invited to provide and share their comments.

critical political conditions called for by President Putin's negotiations with the United States leading up to his unprovoked start of the biggest European wartime action since World War II. One was a legally binding guarantee that the Ukraine would not be admitted to NATO. The other was the removal of elements of American military strength from Europe. Some of this is discussed in the prologue to the latest revision of the overview [booklet](#), *IT IS TIME TO DECIDE! DO YOU WANT TO LIVE IN A FREE SOCIETY?*

That discussion is incorporated by reference. It starts on page xxviii using the side heading of **The Newest Crisis** and runs until page xxxiv. The paragraph headings are as follows: **The Last Week in February; Our Domestic Significance;** and **President Putin's Behavior.**

The prepared text of President Biden's *State the Union* message on March 1 included the following excerpts provided in boxes, with our review comments after the box.

Six days ago, Russia's Vladimir Putin sought to shake the foundations of the free world thinking he could make it bend to his menacing ways. But he badly miscalculated. He thought he could roll into Ukraine and the world would roll over.

Instead he met a wall of strength he never imagined. He met the Ukrainian people. From President Zelenskyy to every Ukrainian, their fearlessness, their courage, their determination, inspires the world. Groups of citizens blocking tanks with their bodies. Everyone from students to retirees and teachers turned soldiers defending their homeland.

This is leading to our discussion of scale of unity rising to networks of sovereign states, and unity of a diversity of political interests with sovereign states that value democracy.

Let each of us here tonight in this Chamber send an unmistakable signal to Ukraine and to the world. Please rise

if you are able and show that, yes, we the United States of America stand with the Ukrainian people.

Elected representatives to the House of Representatives and the Senate, of both major parties, rose in support of the Ukrainian people. It shows some existence of unity in the foreign policy relevance that is in some measure already indicated by the electorate.

In some measure, the founding fathers expected a Senate leadership that would go beyond simply responding to the masses; and would delve deeper to understand the implications choices. The tribalism has eroded the reality of expecting senatorial behavior to better judge the common good. The process is contaminated with personal political interests overriding the common good, especially in placing political interests above the nation's interests. Observance of the oath of office to follow the Constitution has been eroded.

The electorate needs a better education. That includes an understanding of the relevance of global behavior and/or enough savvy to understand if their elected representatives are capable of doing the right thing, and motivated to do so by their commitment to the common good.

Putin's latest attack on Ukraine was premeditated and unprovoked. He rejected repeated efforts at diplomacy. He thought the West and NATO wouldn't respond. And he thought he could divide us at home. Putin was wrong. We were ready.

Bipartisan applause showed across the aisle unity on this matter.

Here is what we did. We prepared extensively and carefully. We spent months building a coalition of other freedom-loving nations from Europe and the Americas to Asia and Africa

to confront Putin. I spent countless hours unifying our European allies. We shared with the world in advance what we knew Putin was planning and precisely how he would try to falsely justify his aggression.

We countered Russia's lies with truth. And now that he has acted, the free world is holding him accountable. Along with twenty-seven members of the European Union including France, Germany, Italy, as well as countries like the United Kingdom, Canada, Japan, Korea, Australia, New Zealand, and many others, even Switzerland.

That statement is intended to include linking NATO as a critical next level of networks of global democracies. Some Republican leadership may reconsider their support of the previous administration's position regarding NATO. Former President Trump was right in asking them to increase their allocation to defense spending to come closer to a fair share. Now they plan to do so.

As a global leader we had a track record of allocating more than our proportionate share (on a variety of measures) for the common good of that democratic effort; but we enjoyed the role of leadership that went along with it. We were better able to afford contributions to our common interest, and were wise to do so. Time horizons are critical in understanding the development of social capital [at some point a link discussing social capital will be provided.] that contributes to the common good. That calls for taking a long view of the consequences of current conditions.

The model we have been using on the DEEP website is an organic analogy from the human body to the societal body. We have been enhancing that model by application of two critical concepts dealing with real estate and urban development, that is also amenable to the application of the organic model — the two critical concepts of fixity of location and long-term investment. Fixity of location is relevant because of the territorial nature for sovereign states. The long-term investment concept takes us beyond dealing what we know now to our understanding of reasonable expectations of long-term outcomes.

Since we have become accustomed to linear reasoning that deals with science relationships, we have difficulty in understanding changes in relationships as systems evolve. Although there are some powerful models, such as agent-based models, that explore outcomes with changing assumptions, the best that we can do most of the time is to consider patterns.

History does not repeat itself, but it does indicate that patterns of the past provide clues for outcomes of the future. Strategically, we do best with our choices if we use a variation of the minimax strategy that deals with the extent of the downside that we will find acceptable. The process then calls for maximization of benefits within that constraint.

Obviously, different people in different societal organizations, have different judgments as to what they will accept as the downside in pursuit of their goals. This is helpful for us in understanding the behavior of President Putin in his leadership of Russia and the behavior of President Zelensky. It is also helpful with understanding the behavior of the people in the country.

The people of Ukraine are united in their protection of their territory that has afforded them the benefits of democracy. They shifted from a previous administration with about a seventy percent vote for the new leadership. The people of Russia are divided on what their leader President Putin calls a *special military operation*. A great many believe his propaganda. However, a great many are protesting with the message of *no war*. Putin has undercut the freedom of the press that existed by massive arrests and the promise a fifteen-year sentence for those who contradict what he pretends to be the truth.

Our Common Purpose. We now have to deal with the more costly approach of curing the problem than preventing it. Former President Trump's accepting President Putin's lies over U.S. intelligence was a costly contributor to emboldening the Russian autocrat, President Putin.

The first impeachment of former President Trump dealt with a telephone conversation in which Trump was attempting to extort a favor from Ukraine president, Zelensky. In the Senate trial, the failure to even allow expert testimony from a witness of the alleged

quid pro quo request encouraged the then president to pursue his reelection, presumably at any cost.

The failure to convict him of the trial of the second impeachment removed the opportunity for a second senatorial action that would prohibit him from holding federal office in the future. The point here is that Trump, as an admirer of Putin, is still a significant threat to the survival of American Democracy.

A further point here is that, as previously noted, there was support for President Biden's remarks of support of the Ukraine with congressional representatives of both parties rising in applause to support America's position favoring another democracy under threat by an autocrat who has been undermining the West in the fear of democracy becoming favored by the Russian populace.

Later in the State of the Union message, President Biden was supporting some components as standalone items that Republican representatives supported, plus other policies that were more favored by Republicans than at least by some Democrats, yet there was an absence of Republican applause for the policies that their constituents favored. There will be more discussion of this in the context of the scale of unity.

Returning now to the discussion of our president's comments, he continued as indicated in the box that follows.

We are inflicting pain on Russia, and supporting the people of Ukraine. Putin is now isolated from the world more than ever. Together with our allies — we are right now enforcing powerful economic sanctions. We are cutting off Russia's largest banks from the international financial system. Preventing Russia's central bank from defending the Russian Ruble making Putin's \$630 Billion "war fund" worthless. We are choking off Russia's access to technology that will sap its economic strength and weaken its military for years to come.

Tonight I say to the Russian oligarchs and corrupt leaders who have bilked billions of dollars off this violent regime

no more. The U.S. Department of Justice is assembling a dedicated task force to go after the crimes of Russian oligarchs. We are joining with our European allies to find and seize your yachts, your luxury apartments, your private jets. We are coming for your ill-begotten gains.

And tonight I am announcing that we will join our allies in closing off American air space to all Russian flights — further isolating Russia — and adding an additional squeeze — on their economy. The Ruble has lost thirty percent of its value. The Russian stock market has lost forty percent of its value and trading remains suspended. Russia's economy is reeling and Putin alone is to blame.

President Biden was not prepared to provide a no-fly zone for the Ukraine. For a long time, American presidents have been picking up on responsibilities that Congress should have legislated. Perhaps, Congress should consider legislating the request for a no-fly zone called for by the Ukrainian president. We shall return to that shortly.

Our Global Leadership Role. Our global leadership role grew in the post-World War II era, but it was eroded starting at least a few decades ago. For the Democrats it was forsaking blue-collar workers beginning in the last quarter of the twentieth century, leading to what became known as the *Rust Belt*. That is discussed in a subsection of the third chapter (*A Historical Perspective*) of trilogy's first book (*Common Sense Revisited: America's Third Revolution*). The major section is *Economic Evolution in America's Political Structure*. The subsection is *Returning to Political Evolution*. The excerpt is in the box that follows.

Returning to Political Evolution. Returning to political evolution, but now in the 20th century's fourth-quarter, we have public policy undergoing a significant transition, especially with political parties. More of this will be discussed in the next chapter, but as a prelude to the next section which

is focused on the *Internet* and *Cultural Evolution*, consider a very brief discussion of transitions occurring in both major political parties.

As to the Democratic Party, by the early 1970s, there was great attention to workers gaining opportunity from the shift in the structure of production moving from consumer goods benefiting from further productivity increases enabled by the innovations contributing to the rise of American growth especially the preceding quarter of a century. That shift was to members of the workforce who through education and training in the previous quarter of a century were now working with white-collar skills in contrast to the dominant skills of blue-collar workers. These “knowledge workers” were “engineers, scientists, and analysts who wore white [65] collars and tapped away at desktop computers and technology firms, universities, consulting firms and banks [see page 693 of Jill Lepore’s *These Truths: A History of the United States*]. xv ...

... The commonality of interests that fostered an evolution in the role of government to recover from the Great Depression, to join with the Allies in winning World War II, and to design public policy for the Post-WWII era had worked well. What we shall see in this chapter, and beyond, is that the Democrats lost their dominance in the decades that followed, and enough of the Republican leadership, in and out of government, placed party above country using the lust for power to dominate the era that followed.

More of the Republican leadership is discussed in the next chapter; but, a comment on its courting blue-collar workers is about to be noted. Returning to the shift in strategy by the Democratic Party, as discussed by Lepore [page 693, *op. cit.*], she notes that the Democratic Party “...was willfully kicking its base out from under it. Since the rise of Williams Jennings Bryan 1896, the Democratic Party had been the party of labor. But early in the 1970s while Republican Party was courting blue-collar white men, especially men who had lost the manufacturing jobs, the Democratic Party...”

The paragraph continues and includes the previous quote referring to “knowledge workers.”

A discussion of the [internal revolutions of the Republican Party](#) is on the web. They relate to the quote from the box, “What we shall see in this chapter, and beyond, is that the Democrats lost their dominance in the decades that followed, and enough of the Republican leadership, in and out of government, placed party above country using the lust for power to dominate the era that followed.

The linked posting on the web is titled [The Fourth Republican Revolution](#) has some discussion of the leadership of former President Donald Trump as constituting the Fourth Republican Revolution. The box that follows contains a couple of paragraphs about what is discussed as the Fourth Republican Revolution.

The Trumpian Takeover of the Republican Party

The Trumpian takeover of the Republican Party may be viewed the Fourth Republican Revolution. We may not have needed another clue, but there was one on Friday, July 31, 2020, in the form of *The New York Times* op-ed item titled “We Created the G.O.P Demise.” It is authored by Stuart Stevens whose book, *It Was All A Lie: How the Republican Party Became Donald Trump*, is scheduled for publication this coming Wednesday, August 5, 2020. However, there are ample reviews already available; one of which is exceptionally lengthy. But we need not rely on the Stevens presentation. We have just discussed the power pursuit dimensions of the Gingrich led Republican Revolution (see pages 15 and 16). [20]

In some respects, the Trumpian takeover of the Republican Party through the nomination process in which Trump attacked his fellow Republicans, is simply an adoption of the playbook of Newt Gingrich as discussed in *The Gingrich Led Republican Revolution*. In other respects, in concept, it “is a continuation of winning at any cost.” In the latter case,

instead of it being the political party winning at any cost, it appears that in the case of the person of Donald Trump, as an individual, winning at any cost. That certainly appears to be the objective of his behavior as president of United States. And, as of the time that this is being drafted, one may make the case that his failure to properly pursue the interests of the nation in the case of the pandemic, because he prioritizes his reelection, is in some measure at the cost of the premature death of over 100,000 Americans.

One may argue that the voting public made an electoral decision in November 2020 that was the start of a shift back to global leadership. An indication of that as transition back to global leadership is indicated by the continuation of excerpts from President Biden's message on the state of the nation. It is related to what amounts to a further discussion of economic warfare.

Together with our allies we are providing support to the Ukrainians in their fight for freedom. Military assistance. Economic assistance. Humanitarian assistance. We are giving more than \$1 Billion in direct assistance to Ukraine. And we will continue to aid the Ukrainian people as they defend their country and to help ease their suffering.

Let me be clear, our forces are not engaged and will not engage in conflict with Russian forces in Ukraine. Our forces are not going to Europe to fight in Ukraine, but to defend our NATO Allies — in the event that Putin decides to keep moving west. For that purpose we've mobilized American ground forces, air squadrons, and ship deployments to protect NATO countries including Poland, Romania, Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia. As I have made crystal clear the United States and our Allies will defend every inch of territory of NATO countries with the full force of our collective power. And we remain clear-eyed.

Now, the readership may wish to consider that a Russian success in Ukraine would embolden them to proceed against some NATO members who in an earlier time were part of the Soviet Union. The disasters of our attempts in Afghanistan and Iraq of fostering democracy certainly act as a deterrent to us engaging in another venture in building democracy abroad. Ukraine already has the democracy, so we are being drawn into its defense as a global leader of democracy, assisting in the resilience of what may go down in history as one of the bravest democracies. We are discussing assistance to a democratic sovereign state, not the creation of a new democracy.

Our failures in the twentieth century foreign ventures in pursuit of democracy are not an encouragement to foreign involvement. Maybe we just don't understand the process by which democracies may be created so as to flourish. Add to that, maybe we need a better understanding of why and how empires fail and sovereign states regress.

Possibly, this may be a time to consider that the rise of the West in the last two and one-half centuries is in danger of decline. Certainly, totalitarian regimes have been attacking democracy, and they have a goal of undermining spread of democracy. If Russia is successful in controlling Ukraine, there is no reason to believe that Putin would not continue his rebuilding Russian leadership to some semblance of the former Soviet Union.

That would extend to doing battle with countries that were formerly part of the Soviet Union who are now part of NATO. Based upon NATO's position of not embracing the option of pursuing a no-fly zone, as well as our position, you can expect that once Russia recovers from its being crippled by the economic sanctions, if Putin is still in charge, he will resume his empire building.

Consider that the possibility that the West is being shortsighted by not instituting the no-fly zone requested by Ukraine President Zelensky; at least with a modified no-fly zone covering only geographic areas not occupied by Russian military. It will be discussed shortly in considering off ramps and adaptation via "*Russia Has Suffered a Crushing Moral Defeat*" and "*Ukraine War Brings Moral Clarity.*"

NATO is organized as a defense organization. The big question is what does it take for NATO to recognize the clear and present danger to their membership that a few decades ago was part of the Soviet Union; and there is an autocrat with aspirations unencumbered by morality. The pattern Putin is pursuing has a commonality similar to that of Adolf Hitler, almost a century ago.

There is a strong case that there is some form of warfare in the near future with the totalitarian leader of Russia in defending European democracies. Putin thinks that it is already underway. NATO keeps thinking it will go away.

Consider the possibility that NATO would make Ukraine an honorary member of the alliance in recognition of its commitment to defend its democracy, and a failure of Ukraine to survive as a sovereign state would be a clear and present danger, not only to some of its numbers but to the future of democracy.

Considering the pattern of events unfolding, especially if Putin obtains control of Ukraine, it would be no surprise that China would seek to reunify Taiwan with mainland China.

Offramps Evaporated

Early In Negotiations. Early in the American negotiations with the Russians regarding Ukraine, President Biden spoke of deterrence in the form of sanctions being proportionate to the extent of violation of the sovereignty of the Ukraine. Biden, in his senatorial days, exhibited expertise in understanding the opposition, especially from across the aisle. Compromise in democracy is an essential element because the foundation is pluralism. Dealing with autocrats is a different proposition.

When Joseph Biden, as vice president, had a meeting with Vladimir Putin, it was reported that Biden believed that Putin had no soul. Even so, it was not surprising then, that when negotiations were proceeding, Biden was talking about proportionate responses with sanctions for violations of the integrity of Ukraine sovereignty, possibly referring to the separatists and the potential for what was referring to as a couple of Peoples Republics. This was potentially implied in Biden's "original statement that related to an extent of action compromising the sovereignty of the Ukraine." The quotation

is from the overview booklet's prologue. The key paragraph is on page xxx. It is from the subsection titled *Our Domestic Significance*, and is as follows:

President Biden got some backlash after his original statement that related to an extent of action compromising the sovereignty of the Ukraine. Even after his [Biden's] clarification, President Putin was not deterred; and proceeded with a full-scale attack on a sovereign state. As this is being drafted on February 27, Putin has gotten some surprises.

Compromise with autocrats presents a problem of appeasement. In the same prologue, a couple of pages later (on page xxxii) we have a short paragraph as follows:

President Putin's Behavior. The pundits can have a field day in trying to understand Putin's thinking. Some have said that he's gone off the rails. Others just point to his miscalculations. The expectation was that Kyiv would fall in a matter of days.

Considering the patterns of behavior by totalitarian leaders, and particularly the Putin case of his pattern of doubling down when he encounters resistance, it becomes especially risky to have a trust in behavior, especially because the evolution of events in which his miscalculations have been present more problems that he was prepared to handle; even though he had thought that he had made adequate preparation.

Earlier in the appendix of which this is to become a part, there is a substantial discussion about *if we knew then that we know now*. As it happens, this is the *then* in which we should know that Putin will not give up his ambition to restore power to Russia and leave a legacy for himself as a hero.

He has taken the path of destroying a legacy that he could have achieved. That is likely to happen because the environment is changing, and his reasoning is outdated, because relationships

changed. They have changed because the West's unity on humanity may move at a rapid pace.

Unity on Humanity. The West's unity on humanity has altered the balance of power. The visual presentations seen on television have impacted the vast majority of Americans to the extent that they favor a policy of a no-fly zone as requested by Ukrainian president, Volodymyr Zelensky. They may not grasp the escalation risks and/or the potential long-term consequences of not defending their liberty being endangered.

Since the beginning of March, there have been a couple of op-ed pieces that might support the absence of an offramp in which Putin could declare a victory. It looks like Putin's recognition of two new People's Republics is off the table as a negotiated settlement. The memory of appeasement is still vivid.

The discussion of the two op-ed pieces previously identified (*Russia Has Suffered a Crushing Moral Defeat* and *Ukraine War Brings Moral Clarity*) was under consideration for drafting on Saturday, March 5. The first is from *The New York Times* on Wednesday, March 3. It is titled "*Russia Has Suffered a Crushing Moral Defeat.*" It is authored by Alexey Kovalev who is identified as "the investigations editor of Meduza, independent Russian news outlet." The city of origination is identified as Moscow.

The first cited op-ed piece (the one authored by Alexey Kovalev) opens as follows: "Shock and shame. That is the response of many Russians to the sight of rockets and artillery shells hitting Ukrainian tower blocks that in their concrete uniformity could easily be in Moscow."

The success of that humanity pursuit as a matter of global unity could well take a generation or two. The Ukrainian crisis may be accelerating the process as may be the doubling down of Putin.

The op-ed piece continues making a series of points. They include (1) "And it being done in our name." (2) "We may be far from a large-scale antiwar movement, but the seeds have been sown." (3) "They [the soldiers] were told by their commanders they were going to Ukrainian border to take part in logistical drill, only to find themselves at war."

It goes on to discuss dissent efforts to contain the inhumanity of an invasion that is “a visceral horror.” Additionally, the author notes the existence of a petition with over one million signatures condemning the war. The concluding paragraph starts with, “A mass Antiwar movement still a little off.” It concludes the paragraph with the following: “As the country continues to bomb and terrify Ukraine, more and more Russians may wake up to something only a few dare to say publicly: That Mr. Putin is an existential danger not only to themselves but also to the world. And he must be stopped.”

The second op-ed piece, the one authored by Aaron Rhodes, has as its opening the sentence as follows: “Russia’s war against Ukraine could restore Western societal appreciation for freedom and democracy.” The paragraph continues with a viewpoint of the right side of the aisle with the second and concluding sentence as follows: “these principles have been eroding for decades by leftist ideology in the war a lot for philosophical fads.”

The rest of the article not only deals with human rights, but introduces Putin’s relationship with the religious right. The fourth paragraph starts off as follows: “Western Christian conservative once looked to Mr. Putin as a savior of Christendom, but that romance has soured. The columnist goes on to quote a work by journalist Marcia Gessen in which she “revealed Mr. Putin as a merciless leader whose brutal policies in Chechnya and elsewhere are at odds with Christian faith.”

The article continues with a discussion of the Cold War indicated by the differences between liberal democracies and totalitarian regimes in the arena of individual freedom. Although the article develops the political position of the right in the context of religious faith, it provides another force leading to unity across the aisle. What is unfolding is a unity at the global level for versions of democracy that will fight back by undermining accounts of autocratic regimes.

Now, as this is being drafted in the wee small hours of March 8, yesterday’s op-ed piece by Thomas L. Friedman is up for discussion. It is titled *The Cancellation of Mother Russia Is Underway*. The key point is in its opening paragraph. The key sentence is as follows: “There is only one country [that] might have the power to stop it

now, and it's not the United States. It's China." The "it" refers to "... The future of Europe and the world at large.

The article focuses on weapons in a globalized world that has made China a key player. China depends upon the global economy, and Russia is being isolated. The op-ed piece discusses the globalization of moral outrage of employees and customers pressuring their companies to isolate Russia.

The key paragraph for this reviewer is as follows: "Putin was a total ignoramus about the world he was living in, and so he bet the farm in the twenty-first century casino of globalization, where in the end, the house always wins — or there is no house left.

American Unity at the Core

The Great Experiment

A Sign of Progress. On March 1, 2022 a sign of progress toward American unity was the across-the-aisle support for the president's approach to the Ukraine crisis. That way of looking at it is that the Republicans and Democrats united against a common enemy.

Another way of looking at it is that the issue was the global scale for protection of democracies that goes beyond our national security as a sovereign state. It goes to the scale of the unity among free societies in the face of aggression by totalitarian states.

The role of American unity is at the core of *The Great Experiment, American Democracy*, a democratic republic that started off as thirteen sovereign states united in a Confederation. It was a pluralistic experiment with a diversity that included Southern states with an economy built upon slavery.

It took a little over a decade to convert the Confederation to the United States of America to become reorganized with constitutional arrangements designed to protect the populace from a tyrannical leader. It provided for a pluralistic structure that outlawed the government having religious authority. It became known as *The Great Experiment* because it had the source of authority from a qualified electorate rather than from royalty, church, or sheer force, and it had a pluralistic society.

Its significance is summarized in a single sentence, "The cause of America is, in a great measure, the cause of all mankind." The box

that follows contains an excerpt from the [Prologue](#) for the trilogy's first book, *Common Sense Revisited: America's Third Revolution*. The reference is to Thomas Paine's pamphlet, *Common Sense*.

His first edition was published anonymously on January 10, 1776. The next edition, published February 14, 1776, contained an introduction signed "The Author." The opening sentence of the introduction's last paragraph is as follows: "The cause of America is, in a great measure, the cause of all mankind."

The link to the [Prologue](#) will take you to the front matter. The prologue starts on page xv. It's well worth reading the first few pages, but especially note the excerpt (starting on the bottom of page xviii) provided in the box that follows:

The Cause of All Mankind

"The cause of all mankind" may reasonably be interpreted to rest on the pursuit of the unalienable rights articulated in the Declaration of Independence: "We hold these Truths to be self-evident, that all Men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty, and the Pursuit of Happiness." The creation of American Democracy, as an institutional arrangement, has been called *The Great Experiment*.

That experiment arose out of the pursuit of justice. It was a response to the tyrannical reign of King George III that morphed from a rebellion into a revolution that united what became thirteen sovereign states. The transition from the Confederation to the Federation has been called America's Second Revolution. The hallmark of the Federation is the Constitution designed to avoid tyranny. It does so utilizing a separation of powers into three branches of government. It is

the legislative branch that has oversight function regulating the administrative branch. It includes the power to impeach....

...The global spread of democracy has picked up on *The Great Experiment*. It has done so with mixed responses. Part of the problem is in the electorate understanding and exercising its responsibilities and with the elected representatives fulfilling their fiduciary responsibilities in the interests of the electorate, but with the knowledge and ethics expected in a representative form of government.

The populist views may not reflect sufficient knowledge of potential outcomes of potential changes in regulations to make a multitude of favorable decisions on highly complex issues. There is a reliance on the representatives to use their expertise much in the same way as there is a reliance upon physicians, attorneys, engineers, and others whose specialized knowledge can serve better at making choices that will influence outcomes. The electorate is, however, responsible for the civic engagement essential to their expression of values and interests and their selections of representatives they trust to act in the best interest of those whom they represent, the electorate.

The sign of progress at the domestic scale was significantly different except for one bit of major legislation, the infrastructure bill developed under bipartisan leadership. The box that follows contains a series of excerpts from the speech.

America used to have the best roads, bridges, and airports on Earth. Now our infrastructure is ranked 13th in the world. We won't be able to compete for the jobs of the 21st Century if we don't fix that. That's why it was so important to pass the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law — the most sweeping investment to rebuild America in history. This was a bipartisan effort, and I want to thank the members of both parties who worked to make it happen....

... We'll create good jobs for millions of Americans, modernizing roads, airports, ports, and waterways all across America. And we'll do it all to withstand the devastating effects of the climate crisis and promote environmental justice. We'll build a national network of 500,000 electric vehicle charging stations, begin to replace poisonous lead pipes — so every child — and every American — has clean water to drink at home and at school, provide affordable high-speed internet for every American — urban, suburban, rural, and tribal communities.

4,000 projects have already been announced. And tonight, I'm announcing that this year we will start fixing over 65,000 miles of highway and 1,500 bridges in disrepair. When we use taxpayer dollars to rebuild America — we are going to Buy American: buy American products to support American jobs.

The topics that followed included a number of projects more closely identified as Republican rather than Democratic. That is when the reality resumed.

Reality Resumed. Reality resumed on March 1, 2022 when the sign of progress towards American unity shifted to the domestic scale. President Biden, having failed to get the comprehensive build back better agenda passed by the Congress, went on to segmentize the agenda and use the opportunity to include some items more heavily favored by the Republicans than the Democrats.

The box that follows includes a series of excerpts from the “Copy of prepared copy of the speech.” It's not a comprehensive view. It is just a sample for the flavor.

So — we have a choice. One way to fight inflation is to drive down wages and make Americans poorer. I have a better plan to fight inflation. Lower your costs, not your wages. Make more cars and semiconductors in America. More infrastructure and innovation in America. More goods moving faster and cheaper in America. More jobs where you

can earn a good living in America. And instead of relying on foreign supply chains, let's make it in America.

Economists call it "increasing the productive capacity of our economy." I call it building a better America. My plan to fight inflation will lower your costs and lower the deficit. 17 Nobel laureates in economics say my plan will ease long-term inflationary pressures. Top business leaders and most Americans support my plan.

And here's the plan: First — cut the cost of prescription drugs. Just look at insulin. ...

...Second: cut energy costs for families an average of \$500 a year by combatting climate change. Let's provide investments and tax credits to weatherize your homes and businesses to be energy efficient and you get a tax credit; double America's clean energy production in solar, wind, and so much more; lower the price of electric vehicles, saving you another \$80 a month because you'll never have to pay at the gas pump again.

Third: cut the cost of child care. Many families pay up to \$14,000 a year for child care per child. Middle-class and working families shouldn't have to pay more than 7% of their income for care of young children. My plan will cut the cost in half for most families and help parents, including millions of women, who left the workforce during the pandemic because they couldn't afford child care, to be able to get back to work.

My plan doesn't stop there. It also includes home and long-term care. More affordable housing. And Pre-K for every 3- and 4-year-old. All of these will lower costs.

And under my plan, nobody earning less than \$400,000 a year will pay an additional penny in new taxes. Nobody. The one thing all Americans agree on is that the tax system is not fair. We have to fix it..... let's make sure corporations and the wealthiest Americans start paying their fair share. Just last year, 55 Fortune 500 corporations earned \$40 billion in profits and paid zero dollars in federal income tax. That's simply not fair...

...So that's my plan. It will grow the economy and lower costs for families. So what are we waiting for? Let's get

this done. And while you're at it, confirm my nominees to the Federal Reserve, which plays a critical role in fighting inflation. My plan will not only lower costs to give families a fair shot, it will lower the deficit.

The common ground for domestic programs was notably lacking in applause from the right side of the aisle even when President Biden was specifically including domestic programs that the Republican Party favored.

We need to do a better job in across-the-aisle efforts to make substantial progress in demonstrating the success of pluralism as a key element in the success of *The Great American Experiment*.

The Deficit Issue. Recovery from the pandemic and saving democracy from Putin's unrealistic territorial expansion scheme is obviously contributing to the deficit. As a final item from the State of the Union message, consider the box that follows.

The previous Administration not only ballooned the deficit with tax cuts for the very wealthy and corporations, it undermined the watchdogs whose job was to keep pandemic relief funds from being wasted. But in my administration, the watchdogs have been welcomed back. We're going after the criminals who stole billions in relief money meant for small businesses and millions of Americans. And tonight, I'm announcing that the Justice Department will name a chief prosecutor for pandemic fraud.

By the end of this year, the deficit will be down to less than half what it was before I took office. The only president ever to cut the deficit by more than one trillion dollars in a single year. Lowering your costs also means demanding more competition. I'm a capitalist, but capitalism without competition isn't capitalism. It's exploitation — and it drives up prices. When corporations don't have to compete, their profits go up, your prices go up, and small businesses and family farmers and ranchers go under. We see it

happening with ocean carriers moving goods in and out of America. During the pandemic, these foreign-owned companies raised prices by as much as 1,000% and made record profits.

Tonight, I'm announcing a crackdown on these companies overcharging American businesses and consumers. And as Wall Street firms take over more nursing homes, quality in those homes has gone down and costs have gone up. That ends on my watch. Medicare is going to set higher standards for nursing homes and make sure your loved ones get the care they deserve and expect.

Further on the deficit, there is a substantial discussion of deficits under the Republican Revolutions. Here are some excerpts from what is posted as [The Fourth Republican Revolution](#).

Reagan's Republican Revolution in the Early 1980s

The Powershift Dimension. “The first Republican Revolution was the Reagan one, which promised to roll back Lyndon Johnson’s Great Society.” So wrote Fareded Zakaria in the *Time Magazine* November 4, 2010 article, “The Republican Revolution: Real This Time?”

The Fiscal Dimension. The fiscal dimension is discussed in the rest of paragraph and the ensuing paragraph. The opening paragraph continues as follows: “In its place, Reagan proposed a low tax, small-government America. The first part happened, with a historic reform of the tax codes, bringing marginal rate tax rates way down and eliminating hundreds of loopholes. But the spending cuts never took place. The result: from 1981 to 1985, the federal budget deficit more than doubled as a percentage of GDP, and declined slightly in Reagan’s second term only because he agreed to tax increases. Still, the basic pattern was set. If the old Democratic paradigm was tax and spend, the new Republican one was borrow and spend.”

As background, Carter's one term in office preceded Reagan's two terms. In Carter's last two years in office (1979-1980), the National Debt as a percentage of GDP was 31% and 32%. In Reagan's first five years the percentages were as follows: 31%, 34%, 37%, 38%, and 42%. In Reagan's last three years (1986, 1987, 1988) the percentages were as follows: 46%, 48%, and 49%. The numbers are in the endnotes to first chapter of *Common Sense Revisited*. That chapter discusses the so-called tax reform passed in December 2017 when the percentage had already risen to over 100%.

The Gingrich Led Republican Revolution

The Fiscal Dimensions. The Gingrich-led Republican Revolution is what we are calling the second of the Republican revolutions. It is what was identified by Zakaria in the article cited. The quote is as follows: "Round 2 was the Gingrich revolution." The rest of the paragraph (in his very brief presentation) and the ensuing paragraph, sheds light on the rising deficit. Noted was that the Gingrich Second Republican Revolution took place during the Clinton administration; a Republican revolution during a Democrat's presidency. The Zakaria article focuses on deficits. As background for our discussion that is delving deeper, the ratio of the National Debt to the Gross Domestic Product (GDP) during Clinton's eight years in office (1993-2000) were as follows: 64%, 64%, 65%, 64%, 62%, 58%, 58%, and 55%. That is compared to the previous four years of the George Herbert Walker Bush administration (1989-1992), 50%, 54%, 59%, & 62%. So, the debt burden in the Clinton's eight years in office started with a first four years higher than that of the previous administration, but then declined in the next four years to where it was below the final year of the previous administration by seven percentage points. The Democratic administration had lowered the debt burden late in the 20th century. We will shortly see what emerged from the Republican fiscal policies, so far the 21st century. First,

let us consider the power pursuit dimension of the Gingrich led Republican Revolution....

... George Walker Bush Republican Revolution

The Fiscal Dimensions. The fiscal dimensions of the George Walker Bush occupancy of the presidency for the years 2001 through 2008 may be summarized with a continuation of the percentages of the National Debt relative to the Gross Domestic Product (GDP). The numbers were 55%, 57%, 59%, 60%, 60%, 61%, 62%, 68%. The change in the national debt depends upon the size of the deficit for the surplus. The deficit occurs when expenditures exceed revenues.

As noted earlier, “The successor president, Barack Obama (a Democrat) had to use both monetary and fiscal policy for the recovery. The percentages in the ratio for his eight years starting in 2009 are as follows: 83%, 90%, 95%, 99%, 99%, 101%, 99%, and 104%. During the recession revenues drop. The data for federal deficits, from the Economic Report of the President, puts these and additional members into the table that follows:....[see pages 16-17 of the linked item.]

The fiscal malfeasance of Donald Trump as president is only part of his danger to American Democracy. That is discussed in the first section (Stage Setting for the Drama) of the opening chapter (Beyond Common Sense). The heading is *The Republican Tax Reform Leads to America’s Third Revolution*. The excerpt is in the box that follows.

The Republican Tax Reform Leads to America’s Third Revolution

The internal threat to American Democracy is greater than any of the external threats. The decay in political structure and process triggered a rejection of The Establishment as represented by both of the two major political parties. The rejection of The Establishment was reflected in the 2016 election of a president representative of the decay that

has occurred in the American culture, impinging upon the progress towards the ideals of political equality envisioned in the Declaration of Independence.

The Republican tax revision, accompanied by other changes in 2017 in the three branches of government, moves the American political structure towards a plutocracy. The outcomes of the provisions of the so-called tax reform will clearly move the wealth distribution curve to a greater concentration of wealth, handsomely rewarding the wealthy donors for their financial political support. It also will further increase the deficit, adding to the inability of the federal government to utilize substantial fiscal policy, in contrast to monetary policy, to stimulate growth after the next recession. This will be a déjà vu of the Great Recession that was preventable, but for wisdom-challenged decisions and greed. [See Lessons Not Learned or Lessons Ignored in the second chapter of [BOOK THREE](#).]

Common Sense Discarded. Common sense was discarded by many in the 2016 election campaign for president and in the 2017 pursuit of tax reform when alternative facts, statements known to be false, were generated as a political maneuver in the quest for power and its continuation of use. Its spread was aided and abetted by people with shortfalls in critical thinking. In addition to sacrificing sound for practical judgment in what is believed to be true, those shortfalls to common sense undermine the rule of law and the institutional structure of a free society organized as a democracy. This treatise is focused on going beyond common sense, using specialized knowledge, to better forecast outcomes. It was built upon an application of complexity economics and other nascent disciplines to better understand the malfunctioning of the operation of the complex adaptive system of mortgage finance that led to the Great Recession. As a result of that research, it became clear that the debacle was more of a societal issue of ethics and analytics that apparently were not used in attempts to avert and then to deal with the Great Recession.

The entire first chapter, [Beyond Common Sense](#), is linked. The book's subtitle, *America's Third Revolution*, refers to what is expected to be in the nature of America's Second Revolution, the transition from a confederation to a federation. Its nature is uncertain, but it could relate to numerous alterations in the Constitution including a redesign that would supersede the electoral college, alter the terms of federal judges to have finite limits, and the relationships between the states and the federal government.

To read more on what was expected in the nature of a third revolution, the discussion of *Analytical Systems and Action* that starts on page 10 of the [Unity Counts](#) will be quite informative. The introductory note provides more information. Additionally, the motivated learner will be interested in reading [Our Common Purpose](#) posted on the platform.

The next chapter, *After the Interim Report*, will provide a discussion of the status that appears to be the beginning of a second American Civil War, a rival to the reform movement for American Democracy. Part of the problem is the malfunctioning of the legislative branch of government.

Legislative Opportunity

Our Legislative Problem. Our legislative problem began a century ago in the roaring twenties. The Republican leadership during the decade of the 1920s, led to the Great Depression. That national economic problem of wide economic disaster was a condition that favors concentration of authority in order to improve the managerial process. The newly-elected president, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, a Democrat, responded with the leadership to transform the balance of power from the legislative branch to the executive branch with an increase in the authority of the administration at the expense of the legislative branch.

A little history of the Republican Party will shed some light on the evolution of the legislative problem as related to political leadership. In the Republican Party's first century, starting with Lincoln's presidency (1861), it started with its leadership seeking equality of opportunity in competition to protection of property as a top priority. It didn't take long to shift the priority towards the

protection of property; only a few years beyond a decade. In the last three decades of the 19th century there was a series of financial crises, largely without adequate regulation. Only two presidents were not Republicans during that time period.

The return of the Republicans to focusing on equality rights came with the election of Theodore Roosevelt. It took a long time for the next transition, that was marked by the presidency of Dwight David Eisenhower. During those times there was “...the profound tension between America’s two fundamental beliefs, equality of opportunity and protection of property.” The quote is from Heather Cox Richardson’s 2014 book, *To Make Men Free: A History of the Republican Party* [page xi]. It is cited in *STRATEGIC GUIDANCE TOWARDS IMPROVING OUTCOMES* in the section “Understanding Societal Structure and Process.” The box that follows contains a couple of paragraphs from that subsection.

In its first century, the Republican Party started with its leadership seeking equality of opportunity in competition to protection of property. It didn’t take long to shift towards the protection of property. The return to focusing on equality rights came with the election of Theodore Roosevelt. It took a long time for the next transition, that was marked by the presidency of Dwight David Eisenhower. During those times there was “... the profound tension between America’s two fundamental beliefs, equality of opportunity and protection of property.” The quote is from Heather Cox Richardson’s 2014 book, *To Make Men Free: A History of the Republican Party* [page xi].

After that first century of the Republican Party, there came a half century of [four revolutions within the party](#). Although the website contains substantial discussion of those four revolutions, here are some excerpts from the item titled [Our Democracy is Destroying Itself: Power Without Morality Is Cancerous](#).

Republican leadership dominated the first quarter of the twentieth century. The notable Democrat that served as president during that time was Woodrow Wilson, serving two terms, 1913-1921. The resumption of Democratic leadership started in 1933, the second year of the Great Depression that experienced the stock market crash of 1929. It lasted through five presidential cycles; a total of twenty years. It was followed by an eight-year interlude of Republican leadership. That leadership under President Eisenhower, beginning in 1953, was outstanding, especially with infrastructure; most notably the start of the interstate highway system. President Eisenhower had support from Democrats as well as Republicans; especially since the Republican Party was broad based.

After President Eisenhower's term ending in in 1961, our presidencies alternated mostly with eight years of service; the exceptions being a one-term presidency of Jimmy Carter, and twelve years that included two terms of Ronald Reagan followed by one term of George H. W. Bush.

The discipline of the electorate seemed to be working well. However, about a half century ago, a movement began brewing by Republican's to dominate. It became formalized with Reagan's Republican Revolution in the early 1980s designed to roll back Lyndon Johnson's Great Society.

Additional information is in a book review discussed in the box that follows.

That book review by Heather Boushey was of Nancy MacLean's book, *Democracy in Chains: The Deep History of the Radical Rights Stealth Plan for America* [*The New York Times* book review of August 20, 2017]. She wrote the following: "With this book McLean joins the growing chorus of scholars and journalists documenting systematic, organized effort to undermine democracy and change the rules." She concludes the paragraph naming several books and then begins the next paragraph with the following sentence, "Power consolidation sometimes seems like a

perpetual motion machine, continually widening the gap between those who have power and money and those that don't. (See page 272 of [BOOK IS ONE](#).)

Legislative Leadership. Legislative leadership found an opportunity for common purpose in moving more aggressively than the administration. As discussed in the opening section (Clues From the Ukraine Crisis) of chapter 6 (A Bit Beyond the First Year) there was bipartisan applause on the matter of support for Ukraine in their defense of democracy against the autocracy of President Putin of Russia. The relevant excerpt provided a box is repeated as follows:

Here is what we did. We prepared extensively and carefully. We spent months building a coalition of other freedom-loving nations from Europe and the Americas to Asia and Africa to confront Putin. I spent countless hours unifying our European allies. We shared with the world in advance what we knew Putin was planning and precisely how he would try to falsely justify his aggression.

We countered Russia's lies with truth. And now that he has acted the free world is holding him accountable. Along with twenty-seven members of the European Union including France, Germany, Italy, as well as countries like the United Kingdom, Canada, Japan, Korea, Australia, New Zealand, and many others, even Switzerland.

President Biden was severely hampered in taking greater action as a result of the history that evolved from the September 11, 2001 terrorist attack by Al Qaeda, launched under the leadership of the then president George W. Bush.

Congress has a legislative opportunity to call Putin's bluff by imposing some sort of no-fly zone. He knows he cannot win the war with the USA. That's why he was trying to negotiate our lessening

our presence in his part of the world. He is not likely willing to die for his cause, and he is intent on some sort of a legacy that would record him as a hero.

If he finds an offramp, he will declare a victory. It has to be a lie because if he really believes that he is victorious, he will continue his pursuit of greater territory. Congress should decide that it will not be intimidated by a terrorist and a leader of a country guilty of war crimes. There are two ways to deal with terrorists. One is to isolate; the other is to eliminate. We may hope for a domestic change in regime. We have learned not to initiate regime changes, but the lesson on the table is that our role as leaders of the free world is to lead. In the case of war, that should be a choice made by Congress with the exceptions that exist.

He will be looking for an offramp; and is rapidly losing the opportunity. The people of Russia may provide him with an unwelcomed one. There may be options we can't envision. We have a history of four Republican Revolutions, and we might try for a [fifth one](#) to restore the unity for our common purpose of a free society. Hopefully, one that would empower our willingness to defend our democracy, domestically and foreign, somewhat inspired by the bravery of the people of Ukraine. Also, it would also require a greater unity in the Democratic Party, and many more independent voters.

The role of independent voters goes beyond ties to a party. It goes to those who will not only focus on individual issues, but those who will consider the health of a democracy as an institution. Our greatest danger is that we have been on the road to an autocracy via a plutocracy. It is in the interests of the Democratic Party to facilitate the transition of what was the Grand Old Party founded on conservative values, on to a Grand New Republican Party that believes in democracy. The current Trumpian-led Republican Party is undermining the democracy in their pursuit of power.

We need to return to the pursuit of a common purpose with an across-the-aisle cooperation. That will require a discipline by the voting public in the election of their representatives who will do what is right for the nation in accordance with the Constitution. Making

the system fair counts big-time. The box that follows contains an excerpt from the second chapter, *An Evolutionary Perspective, of IT IS TIME TO DECIDE! DO YOU WANT TO LIVE IN A FREE SOCIETY?* It starts on page 50.

Draining the Swamp. The twenty-first century started with a presidential election that has been tested because “The integrity of American Democracy has been undermined by the pursuit of political power that is at the expense of democratic norms; norms that are not the subject of constitutional constraints.” That is according to an addendum item titled “*The Integrity of American Democracy Undermined.*” An excerpt from that addendum item continues as follows:

The first 21st century inflection point, according to my analysis (based in part upon a *New York Times* book review of the James A. Marone of the Allan J. Lichtman book, *The Embattled Vote in America: From the Founding to the Present*) was at the time of the Bush-Gore debacle of 2000 when...

Republican election officials in Florida quietly dumped 180,000 ballots, casting aside one in ten African-American votes, often for minor irregularities. Republicans on the Supreme Court invoked two centuries of jurisprudence when they stopped a recount: “The individual citizen has no federal constitutional right to vote for electors for the president of United States.” [*The New York Times*, September 16, 2018.]

The next year, 2001, contained a terrorist attack by al Qaeda on September 11 that led to an invasion of Afghanistan. It accomplished its mission of obstructing further terrorist attacks from al Qaeda, and served to discourage further terrorist attacks on American soil from foreigners.

One can make the case that what followed in that administration not only led to the dissatisfaction of the performance of the federal government, but a continuation of the trend of the Republican Party's pursuit of power at the expense of democracy that has fostered domestic terrorism.

Remaining in Afghanistan for a while was reasonable so that Afghanistan would not serve as the site for an ensuing source of foreign terrorism. The attempt to build a democracy in Afghanistan was ill conceived. Little time is devoted to conceiving a strategy that would work for a highly-diversified set of local political structures. Some of this is discussed in the appendix that draws on knowledgeable sources indicating that our strategy was a failure because we did not understand the feasibility. Sheer power is not enough.

Not only did our strategy lead to our longest war, it also led to our invasion of Iraq. Our presence there fostered the rise of ISIS in the competition with al Qaeda.

Domestically, pursuing policies facilitated a housing bubble and capital market freeze. That condition led to the Great Recession in the global financial crisis of 2008. That set up the transition to what was just discussed and the intervening presidency.

There are two key points here. The first point is that the election was stolen by an illegal dumping of ballots in order to win an election unfairly. The Supreme Court remanded the case to the Republican-controlled state that chose not to pursue the validation of the disputed process.

The second point is that the abuse of process led to unintended consequences. Had the process been verified, it is likely that some of the discarded ballots would have survived the test of the validity in favor of being counted. It appears likely that enough of the 180,000 ballots that were discarded would have been ruled valid had they been fairly evaluated. The result then would have been enough electoral votes from Florida to result in Al Gore having won the election.

Al Gore had a strong position of the dangers of global warming. It is likely that the administration under his presidency would have made some progress on that count; and it could have made a significant difference in the global warming crisis having been lessened. If we knew then what we know now things would be different.

An additional unintended consequence was that the looseness of the Republican regulation led to the global financial crisis that arose out of our unnecessary Great Recession fostered by the housing bubble and financial crisis. [See Lessons Not Learned or Lessons Ignored in the second chapter of [BOOK THREE](#).]

The third unintended consequence was related to Afghanistan. Although President George W. Bush did a fine job in his ultimatum to the Taliban leadership of Afghanistan about access to the terrorists ensconced in Afghanistan, and a military victory that took only three days, President Bush pursued an unrealistic attempt to build a democracy in Afghanistan. Had that decision to pursue the creation of democracy been made by Congress with an appropriate study of feasibility, the outcome would have been different. Additionally, and had Congress also dealt with the Iraq problem, presuming with an understanding of reality, that debacle might also have been avoided.

Congress needs substantial reform in understanding systems beyond the pursuit of political power. Furthermore, it needs to take appropriate responsibility, and work across the aisle for the common good. The process of cooperation for the common good has eroded in recent decades because of the pursuit of power for domestic control. For many elected representatives the nation's interests have been sacrificed for their personal pursuit of power, and the myopic interests of the political party of which they are a part.

The voting public has been doing a reasonable job in providing discipline to elected representatives since the Republican Party was founded in the pursuit of equality of opportunity. For most of the time of the Republican Party, when it was in power, it favored the protection of property over the pursuit of equal opportunity. It evolved to repeated damages to the economy and along the way to erode democracy.

It had some chances before it lost its conservative values. It did well with Theodore Roosevelt and Dwight David Eisenhower. But

after that, it pursued power gradually evolving to eroding norms and taking other actions that led to our democracy becoming as much of a plutocracy as a democracy on the road to becoming an autocracy. It needs another Republican Revolution based upon conservative values.

The Democratic Party would do well to help the Republican Party return to prioritizing a healthy democracy starting with the pursuit of the ideals of the Declaration of Independence and the observance of the Constitution. Gaming the system is counterproductive. The Trumpian Republican Party is pursuing the death of democracy in America.

The Democratic Party is also in the need of substantial reformation. A thin legislative margin is not sufficient for a transformative change, especially when there is a health crisis with which government was not designed to manage. The social capital has been eroding for decades, and trusting government has been eroding as well. The government needs to focus on earning trust and facilitating a public education that understands the nature of individual rights and responsibilities. We have been using the pandemic as a case to illustrate the role of education and caring in a democracy. Our nation's performance in dealing with the pandemic has been embarrassingly poor; and it's not over. We are now adding the case of globalization to the multiplicity crises. We can also utilize it in order to explain that we need to go beyond the linear analytics of the last few centuries into nascent disciplines better equipped to deal with evolutionary systems.

Weaponization of Trade. Understanding the weaponization of trade is as important as understanding the risks of direct combat, even when the adversary has nuclear weapons. Western civilization has made great progress since the Scientific Revolution and the Age of Reason, also known as the Enlightenment. The development of science in the last few centuries has heavily relied on closed systems in which relationships among variables remains relatively constant.

The weaponization of trade substantially alters relationships and produces the emergent properties, the nature of which is difficult to forecast. We have been heavily relying on the analogical model of human beings as individuals being applied to the societal structure of mankind, admittedly focusing on our domestic economy. The

weaponization of trade is substantially altering global relationships. We don't have sufficient historical examples in order to discern patterns of the new structure that will emerge if there are two semi-globalization patterns, one for the West and one for the East.

The tragic invasion of Ukraine by an ambitious autocrat, in pursuit of a legacy related to some semblance of a recovery from the collapse of the Soviet Union, has provided us with another crisis. If Putin believes he is victorious, he will continue with his attempts to rebuild some semblance of the Soviet Union. We need to expand the analogical model of human behavior and societal behavior to include the dimensions of territorial and temporal forces impacting outcomes.

As it happens, this crisis is calling for a greater emphasis on the analytical model rooted in human biology, but enhanced by the integration of the analogical model rooted in real estate and urban development. That model deals with fixity of location and a long-term commitment.

The fixity of location is drawn into the analogy because the territory is fixed. President Putin, having misjudged the use of force as a power for control, and misunderstood the role of feelings. He became greatly disappointed when his invasion of Ukraine did not quickly result in a takeover of Kyiv.

He has fired generals, lied to the public, and eroded freedom of speech in his attempts at control. He then doubles down by becoming a terrorist and war criminal in pursuit of some sort of success. He has used the plan before. But this time, he is looking to expand territory rather than just influence. Population has fled, buildings have been destroyed, but a resilient population has tasted democracy and will die in its defense, if necessary. So, we are dealing with fixity of location which calls for an understanding of a changing environment, especially over time.

The human biology analyses is critical in the blending. Human beings go through processes of birth, growth, decline, and demise. There is a regeneration in the process. All of this is heavily influenced by the environment. That environment changes over time. So, it makes a great deal of sense to utilize a long-term time horizon in making today's choices. That comes from real estate investment

and urban growth patterns as they impact choices for investment and regulation.

So, in the case at hand, we are using the weaponization of trade as a means of warfare. The strategy was straightforward. Make aggression too expensive to pursue. We have used trade sanctions with mixed success; but it works out better in at least the sense of less damage to humanity.

The basic strategy is relatively simple if seen as a minimax approach. There is uncertainty as to an outcome. The strategies are beautifully described in the 1950s book, *Strategy in Poker Business and War*. It is authored by John McDonald who applied *translational science* about a half century before the process got that name. It blended that of the work of John von Neumann, a mathematician, with that of Oskar Morganstern, an economist, drawing from the published work, *Theory of Games and Economic Behavior*, originally published by Princeton in 1944.

For our purposes, the simplest case is in gambling. One is more likely to go for broke if there is not much to lose. The basic strategic concept is to maximize benefit within the constraints of the downside. There may be uncertainty as to what is really the downside, and as to the possibility of maximization. That is where the interaction comes into play. It is not only based upon one's decision. It is also based upon the decision of others. With the roulette wheel that is honest, or a fair deck of cards, probabilities may be calculated. But when others are making choices, and their choices are uncertain, what emerges is uncertain. However, patterns may be discerned, as with the forecast of weather using different models to get feels of range. The longer the time period under consideration, the more difficult it is to discern patterns.

The weather forecasting example is the case of a complex adaptive system in which a multiplicity of variables, in which a variation of one may substantially alter the outcome. Patterns may be discerned under multiple assumptions. The range of outcomes will give a decision-maker a choice as to the likely range of the downside. The longer the time range, the wider the variations of patterns. The key is the fixity of one's location at a time pattern over which the organic change is going to take place.

We are moving into uncharted territory in which the scale is global, rather than domestic, with two, different systems as rivals for the readership. One is reminiscent of the historic empire building entities with authority arising from the top. The other is relatively new, especially over the last few centuries with a source of authority emanating from the populace. Of particular concern is our democracy which has paved the way as a great experiment. We may think of that as our common purpose.

We can start with a link to a posted item on the DEEP website. The link is to [Our Common Purpose](#). The content is a book review of *Our Common Purpose: Reinventing American Democracy for the 21st Century*, a report of the *American Academy's Commission on the Practice of Democratic Citizenship*. It was published in June 2020 by the American Academy of Arts and Sciences.

The reviewer's note mentions a trilogy of books called *American Democracy Endangered*, the [third book of which contains](#) the treatise that is the foundation of a response to the Academy's call for reinventing our democracy. The report was based upon a two-year study. It is available in print and on the web by googling the title, *Our Common Purpose: Reinventing American Democracy for the 21st Century*.

The foundation for a response was drafted five years before the report was published. It calls for a Declaration of Reform to be built upon a paradigm shift to "... What may become of a new discipline, Societal Biology: The Body and Mind of Society." On page 22 of the book review there is a start of a discussion on an analytical structure. The box that follows contains some excerpts.

The Analytical Structure

The analytical structure for Societal Biology: The Body and Mind of Society is built upon a series of layers of networks of our outer world that are analogous to the layers of networks in human biology starting from cells and on through tissues and organs to the whole person in the form of the person's inner world.

The layers in the outer-world series may be of diverse natures including communities of various types and scales, organizations for diverse purposes, and layers of government. The structure is a complex adaptive system in which interactions at various levels of networks produce emergent properties at levels macro to the generating micro level.

The interaction of information and energy result in patterns of changes in outcomes at various point in the evolutionary process of the system. Understanding these patterns is a challenge similar to understanding the patterns of the inner world...

... Taken together, these three established disciplines and the nascent branches, developed to whatever stages, for the core of Societal Biology. However, the really difficult integration is that of the neurological sciences to discover the patterns that emerge from extant behavior. Drilling down in the system is not quite a reductionist approach because it is in a complex adaptive system. However, the systemic structure can be analyzed starting with individual behavior, even though individual behavior is the emergent property of the human system. But, an aggregation of individual behavior won't work. It will take something along the lines of an agent-based model to deal with the patterns of emergent properties.

Changes in group behavior, and differences in behavior among individuals, are evolutionary processes. It operates both on an individual basis and on a cultural basis. It starts with the imbedded value systems, but operates along the lines described by Damasio in his explanation of the quote from Spinoza's proposition 18 that started with "I hold these truths to be self evident..." That was in the preceding discussion of "Linkage" in the section on "Analytical Structure."

After the discussion of an envisioned societal structure, we turn to a discussion of team building as a route to the development of the new discipline of Societal Biology: The Body and Mind of Society. That leads to a first discussion

draft of a Declaration of Reform as a foundation document to be used in an attempt to deal with the cancer of injustice in our society that includes applications of the to-be nascent discipline. It is built on the same principles as the Declaration of Independence, but focuses on empowering the populace through knowledge and participation in governance to contain the spread of malignancy in society.

These transitions take time. The use of the biological analogy was triggered by a presentation made by Dr. John Khosh about a decade ago. It was at an ASPEC seminar. An abridged form was published as Appendix C, *Consilience: A Biological Example in Abridged Form*, in the trilogy's BOOK THREE. The opening paragraph is in the box that follows.

The human body is a good example for demonstrating consilience which implies that what is true for part of nature is true for all of nature. A single set of laws of nature is applicable to all things in the universe, animate and inanimate. The laws of thermodynamic, electromagnetic, gravity etc. are subsets of the single set of laws.

The legislative leadership is going to need to build its own team on a nonpartisan basis in order to better understand the system and develop policy to better perform its function. Our democracy is in danger in part because we simply don't understand the requirements for the pluralism that is the foundation of the *Great Experiment of American Democracy*. Both the House and the Senate need to create an interdisciplinary team that can deal with the evolution of the environment, in dimensions beyond political economy.

We have weaponized globalization as an alternative to facilitating a no-fly zone that would put American forces in direct contact with Russian forces. The administration has taken that position because the administration of two decades ago botched two attempts to

build democracy using physical force abroad while setting a poor example of building democracy domestically.

The legislature should not simply demand more sooner in assisting Ukraine in its autoocracy protection of democracy from autoocracy, it should legislate. But it needs a comprehensive strategy based upon fostering democracy domestically rather than undermining it. This calls for working with the administration in developing the approach. That means both parties.