

STRATEGIC GUIDANCE TOWARDS IMPROVING OUTCOMES

Part Two - Most of the Administration's First Year Provided in Three Chapters

PREFACE FOR THE THREE CHAPTER SERIES

This component, *Most of the Administration's First Year*, PART III of Appendix A, *Strategic Guidance Towards Improving Outcomes*, is designed to be posted as a standalone item on the Motivated Learner Platform of the Declaration Era Educational Press (DEEP), as well as part of Appendix A (*Strategic Guidance Towards Improving Outcomes*) to DEEP's first overview booklet, *IT IS TIME TO DECIDE! DO YOU WANT TO LIVE IN A FREE SOCIETY?*

It is not intended to provide a comprehensive view of most of the administration's first year. Rather, it is planned to be part of a periodic update to our nation's effort to return to the pursuit of the ideals articulated in the Declaration of Independence. This is done in the context of an educational innovation designed to foster a co-evolution of the voting public and their elected representatives.

For decades, we have experienced a decline in performance of *The Great Experiment*, also known as American Democracy, with the "D" capitalized as a proper name for an institutional arrangement that made progress towards its ideals for two centuries. The opening paragraph to the prologue for the first overview booklet sets the tone for the focus that is being taken by the new administration to returning our democracy to a unified support for the Constitution, and to return to modifications with amendments that will deal with reality of the twenty-first century.

Prologue: The Price of Liberty for
It Is Time to Decide!
Do You Want to Live in A Free Society?
Our Greatest Problem

Conventional wisdom might place the COVID-19 situation in America as our greatest problem. It could be argued, however, that the situation is simply the emergent results of the multiplicity of problems resulting from a single condition, the dysfunctionality of Homo sapiens as a species, particularly in our American Democracy as *The Great Experiment*.

This booklet is an alternative introduction to the DEEP website, that includes its trilogy of books. The website is designed to foster educational innovation to help save *The Great Experiment* from failure. The *Appendix A, Strategic Guidance Towards Improving Outcomes* utilizes the COVID-19 pandemic as a case illustration for enhancing process and structure applicable to the multiplicity of crises.

The first part of the appendix, *The Pandemic as a Foundational Example*, provides a basic understanding of the nature of the coronavirus, as well its operation in the context of our society and our behavior. The second part of the appendix, *The Start of Restructuring*, begins the discussion of building back better. It starts with what we might learn from the first 100 days of the new administration. As noted, it is part of a periodic update as events unfold.

This third part starts with a discussion of **a strategic shift for dealing with the pandemic**. It then moves to using some concepts for dealing with the longest war, that started as a response to foreign terrorists producing the 9/11 catastrophe. It continues with a discussion of the building-back-better agenda as impacted by the tribalism. The discussion of *Dysfunctional System Reform* is planned for the fourth part.

MOST OF THE ADMINISTRATION'S FIRST YEAR

CHAPTER THREE STRATEGIC SHIFTS FOR THE PANDEMIC

A Strategic Approach Announcement

On September 9, 2021, President Biden delivered a speech in which he announced a shift in strategy for dealing with the pandemic. Although that is not what he called it, that is what it amounts to in our analytical approach.

Our perspective indicates that there were at least three environmental changes that came into play for the pandemic that called for a shift in strategy from (1) emphasizing containment including restrictions on contagious distribution of the coronavirus, as compared to (2) an emphasis of immunity, along with other defensive measures for protection of the population.

Containment and Immunity Background

Containment and Other Contagion Impediments. Containment is an approach that starts with restriction of contact by isolation of the transmissible virus, a living fluid that needs to latch on to a host to obtain the protein that is its source of energy. Lockdowns provide an isolation that restricts contact; but the transmutability of the fluid may be impaired by the infected person wearing of masks and maintaining social distancing.

Testing and contact tracing is a powerful means for containment in that given the time necessary for symptom development, the spread of the disease may be contained by isolation of potentially infected persons, who had contact with an infected person, before symptoms are developed, and subsequently contacted persons are infected.

Immunity and Other Defensive Measures. Immunity is the potential host's provision of a barrier to becoming infected. Vaccinations provide an organic barrier to the infection in that the virus is impeded from getting the protein for survival. Other defensive measures include the mask to protect from becoming infected, working best in layers. A person may wear a layered mask

as a defense, but an infected person wearing of mask may help someone else in their defense.

The containment strategy focuses on actions that restrained contacts permitting access from an infected person. Immunity strategy focuses on an individual's defense of measures. Masks are useful for both strategies as is the practice of social distancing.

The Common Good Approach. The common good approach is well illustrated by the [tragedy of the commons](#), the case where an unrestricted individual action, when exercised by a sufficient number of individuals, erodes the intended benefits to the group as a whole, including the individual pursuing an action in self-interest. The classic case is illustrated with grazing on common land that becomes so widespread that no one can use it for grazing.

The rate of spread is best understood using network science. Just one more grazer or infected person in arithmetic progression is one at a time. But if each grazer or infection generates two grazers or two infected persons, the results are in a geometric progression.

An excerpt from an earlier version of the *Website Content Introduced* was posted in Part II of this appendix (*Strategic Guidance Towards Improving Outcomes*). In updating, Part II is now titled *The Start of Restructuring*. That part starts with a discussion of *Learning from One Hundred Days*. It proceeds to discuss some nascent disciplines, including network science.

That discussion immediately follows the section titled *The Pandemic as a Case for Unity*. Its subsections are *Public Policy and Coevolution*. The source of that excerpt has been superseded and updated. [That source is located by clicking this link](#). The updated section is in *WHAT MAY I HOPE?* It starts on page 7. The first subsection is *Process Alters Structure*. The first two substances are (1) *The Paradigm* and (2) *Trust is Required*.

For your convenience, the box that follows contains the updated version with the relevant updates in bold type.

Trust is Required. You may hope for the building of social capital so that you, and other Americans, have a commonality of interests that will influence the array choices generating

the desired emergent properties. Trust is crucial in this process. Consider the coronavirus; and the wearing of masks, and social distancing as they may affect the contagion.

When this was first drafted late in October 2020, the spread of the virus was spiking for second time. Understanding it may be facilitated by using a paradigm that includes the application of network science in which the number of contacts made by the virus to a new host is substantially related to the proximity and duration necessary for the virus finding a new host. **At that time the dominant variant was what is now called the Beta variant. Mutations cause new variants, and transmissibility may change. Thus, the strategy for containment of contagion may vary because conditions changed impacting the relationship between costs and benefits.** Now, as this is being updated in September, 2021, the Delta variant is the dominant version of COVID-19. The conditions from which new hosts may be reached are critical in the process. **The conditions under which contacts limit to an average of one or less new hosts, produces contamination results that provide an arithmetic limitation on the spread.** If the average number of successful transfers of disease greater than one-per-person infected, the contamination will be geometrically increased. Two contaminations from each infected person doesn't simply double spread, it magnifies the spread in a sequence that would go 2, 4, 8 etcetera assuming the pattern is continued in successive contaminations. The pattern of three per infected, if persistent in the network, would go 3, 9, 27. Although it is uncertain what the number of subsequent contacts would be, the pattern for a containment strategy is to keep the average number at one or less.

It was predictable that after the holiday season at the end of last year, there would be another spike early in 2021. When this essay was being updated in February 2021, the spike was subsiding. It subsided mainly because vaccinations were increasing. But the contact precautions of washing hands,

wearing masks, and social distancing still impede the spread of the virus.

As noted, content in this website is updated as events unfold. Linking is made easy on the website. For hard copy some links are noted. Additionally, however, for hardcover there is an additional section, **SELECTED EXCERPTS FOR AN ADDENDUM**.

In the spring of 2022, Part IV (*Dysfunctional System Reform*) will have a great deal more to say about trust. It will draw on the example of how we handled the pandemic so that we may learn about not only what can we know, and what may we hope, but also what should we do.

As a nation, we have made many mistakes and as a preview to the epilogue, here are a few quotes from the founder of conservatism late in the eighteenth century, Edmund Burke:

- “The only thing necessary for the triumph of evil is for good men to do nothing.”
- “Those who don’t know history are doomed to repeat it.”
- “Reading without reflecting is like eating without digesting.”

As of the time this is being drafted, President Biden is actively participating in negotiations for compromises to get the two critical bills for the building-back-better agenda getting passed. At this time, it looks like the two-year free community college or portion is not going to make it. The personhood of this website is greatly disappointed to see that it will not be included. However, one thing this website is vigorously pursuing is providing an education that is virtually free, but exceptionally valuable for your thriving in a free society, or at least having an equal opportunity that starts with really understanding the system.

Context of This Assessment

We are using the pandemic as the leading example for a strategic approach that is fundamentally applicable to dealing with a multiplicity of crises. This *Appendix A - Strategic Guidance Towards Improving Outcomes* was added to the June 2021 revision

of the first overview booklet, *IT IS TIME TO DECIDE! DO YOU WANT TO LIVE IN A FREE SOCIETY?* The appendix then contained only two parts. Part I - *The Pandemic as a Foundational Example*, contains three sections: (1) Understanding Reality; (2) Understanding the Coronavirus; and (3) Understanding Societal Structure and Process.

Part II - *The Start of Restructuring* now contains three major sections: (1) Learning from One Hundred Days contains two subsections: (a) Introducing the Strategic Approach and (b) Power Struggle Context. The second major section is titled *The Pandemic as a Case Study for Unity*. The third major section introduces a few nascent disciplines; complexity science, network science, cognitive science, and agent-based modeling.

Since this third part of Appendix A will initially be posted as a standalone item, this background is provided as context. Access to the text for the two parts of the appendix is provided in the [recently posted version of booklet one](#) and as a separate item in the booklet section.

Pandemic Strategy as a Case Example. Those first two parts of the appendix contain substantial background on contagion and a variety of measures that relate to a strategy prevailing early in the four-year term of the new administration.

Those first two parts of the appendix also contain substantial information about governmental authority with regard to the virus. Since this Part III of the appendix may also be posted as a standalone item, the box that follows contains the first four paragraphs of the Part I (*The Pandemic as a Foundational Example*) section titled “Understanding Societal Structure and Process.”

UNDERSTANDING SOCIETAL STRUCTURE AND PROCESS

Scale and Control

Understanding societal structure and process relative to the coronavirus necessarily deals with scale. The contagious living fluid of the virus is minuscule to the human body; and

the human body is minuscule to the societal structure of the nation with the political and military power for personal protection. **In this section we are focused on societal structure and process dealing with the protection from the contagion.**

The United States of America, as a nation, has performed miserably in the containment of the contagion resulting in a huge proportion of deaths in relation to population. The societal structures that have done best in dealing with the contagion resulting in the lowest of death rates are characterized by a structure of centralized control and national health programs that include personal identification cards coded to track location. The processes include testing for contagion and tracing contacts; followed up by isolation of those infected enough to contain spreading the disease.

The virus does not respect borders. COVID-19 spread globally very quickly with the movement of hosts and multiple contacts. In the United States, preparation for epidemics was reduced during the Trump administration. The administration failed to reveal the truth regarding the extent of the danger, and lacked the proper preparation. The nature of control is split between the federal government and the states, and there was a lack of appropriate coordination in that relationship. Additionally, while there was some progress between contiguous states, a coordinated structure by region barely got started. There were significant differences between so-called red and blue states reflecting the extent of political control by state and local governments, and by the behavior of the residents, especially with the use of face masks, the nonuse of which became a political statement.

Our political structure was not designed for maximization of control for containment of pandemics. Rather it was designed to avoid tyranny. It is a great challenge to get a balance of concentration of power between the role of government under law, and the voluntary compliance for the common good. This takes us to the issue of human behavior.

This third part of *Appendix A - Strategic Guidance Towards Improving Outcomes* focuses on most of the administration's first year. However, the most dramatic transition occurred starting in mid-August 2021 with three events: (1) The collapse of the government of Afghanistan on August 15, 2021; (2) The airport terrorist attack by ISIS-K on August 25, 2021; and (3) The American led withdrawal from Afghanistan on August 31, 2021. That will be discussed in the second section (If We Knew Then, What We Know Now) of this third part of the appendix on strategic guidance.

The stage was set for this third part of Appendix A in the second part titled *The Start of Restructuring*. It dealt with the first 100 days. We are now dealing with most of the first year. As noted, you can read those first two parts of the appendix in the booklet section. However, for readers of the standalone item, we are providing in the box that follows, the first three paragraphs of that section.

LEARNING FROM ONE HUNDRED DAYS

Introducing the Strategic Approach

On the eve of the final day of the first one hundred days of the Biden administration, President Biden addressed a joint session of Congress for his first time. **His message indicated that a transformation in the role of government is underway.** He presented a platform designed to improve the quality of life for the American public.

The administration's performance in the first one hundred days started with immediate action in dealing with the pandemic. It was a prelude to a platform of the building back better, especially with compassion for societal structure, as well as the physical structure. The official Republican response to an ambitious and expensive set of programs indicated a cultural battle rather than a search for across-the-aisle compromise.

Our focus in this discussion is on the role of dealing with the pandemic as a demonstration of a strategy for improving outcomes focused on the health and welfare of the general

public. As discussed, the role of the federal government, relative to the role of the state governments, is constrained. However, federal policy is still relevant for the outreach of unity pursuit of our common interests.

Adaptation to Environmental Changes. The demonstration case, a strategic shift in the approach for the pandemic, is a forerunner for strategic shifts that may occur during the four-year administration, or at least get a significant start. These will be touched on in this third part of the appendix (*Strategic Guidance Towards Improving Outcomes*, to the revision of the first booklet, *IT IS TIME TO DECIDE! DO YOU WANT TO LIVE IN A FREE SOCIETY?*).

The extent of discussion will be brief. However, links are provided to analytics elsewhere on the Declaration Era Educational Press (DEEP) website. The strategic discussion starts with the pandemic and its encore, *the pandemic of the unvaccinated*.

The section that follows, *Progress and Obstacles for Reform*, provides some clues as to what is planned for PART IV - A THIRD OF THE WAY: Sixteen Months of Building Back Better. Depending on the events that unfold, the fourth part may be delayed and/or provided with a new title. The key will be unfolding events critical to the survival of American Democracy.

As this section is being brought to completion, it looks as though unfolding events are providing that section with a revised title, *Dysfunctional System Reform*. (This is another clue to the idea that this website is designed as an ongoing update to provide a perspective of rapidly changing events.)

Uncertainty and Contingency. *Uncertainty and contingency* are two major elements that differentiate analytics of complex adaptive systems from analytics of linear models. Our strategic approach is designed to deal with the uncertainty and contingency elements in two stages. The first is the minimax strategy that deals with boundaries set for risk exposure. The second is adjustable strategy to environmental changes that alter the boundaries of acceptable risk.

What happens globally with the pandemic, and mutations, may adjust strategy. This is relevant to what happened with the Trump/Taliban negotiation that excluded the then-prevailing government of Afghanistan, thus facilitating a quick chaotic withdrawal triggered by the collapse of the Pakistan government disrupting an orderly withdrawal. That will be discussed shortly in the next section (*If We Knew Then, What We Know Now*). By the same token, we should be prepared for a strategic shift within our domestic terrorism issue.

The key is understanding that the process influences the structure, and the structure in turn influences process.

The Three Environmental Changes

The Delta Variant. The first major change in the environment was the rising dominance of the Delta variant that is far more contagious than the Beta variant. The Delta variant was generating an impact exacerbated by the Trumpian Republicans treating the pandemic as a political issue rather than a public health issue. The initial strategy of the Biden administration treated the pandemic as a health issue with a *containment strategy* heavily dependent upon masks and other impediments for transfers, including vaccinations. Vaccinations may also impede transfer of the virus, as well as protecting the inoculated.

The environment for the health issue changed. in the environment of the Delta variant that is more contagious than the Beta variant; the containment approach is less effective because by the time the newly infected person is identified, additional persons have been infected.

Standard Approval. The second major change in the environment was a transition from the emergency approval of a selection of domestically-created vaccines to a *standard approval*. Sufficient evidence from the analyses of usage of the vaccines indicated that the scientific standard for regular approval had been met. Some portion of the unvaccinated had deferred getting vaccinated on the basis of the lack of final approval. Others were using it as an excuse. The excuse was no longer valid.

Pandemic of the Unvaccinated. The third major change in the environment was the increased infection rate of the unvaccinated

which created a *pandemic of the unvaccinated* that was not only impacting the health of the unvaccinated and the others with whom they came in contact, it was also impacting the hospital-based care availability to the hospitals' broader clientele. Additionally, the health of the economy and the welfare of the public in a broad range of qualities of life was being deteriorated because of the aversion to medically-accepted practices for the general welfare.

Under these conditions, it became appropriate to utilize a variety of federal regulations capable of dealing with some of the components. The United States Department of Labor's OSHA (Occupational Safety and Health Administration) regulations are an example.

Adaptation is an Ongoing Process. Adaptation is an ongoing process. Thus, while some progress was made with the announced plans, not all that was envisioned was feasible. However, the environment continues to change; and when school started and fall weather provides a cooler environment favorable for the coronavirus, there was an upsurge of infections in those going to schools.

The vaccination program continues, with some greater containment. In some states the regulations prohibiting mandates that require masks are not helpful to either strategy; but there is some progress.

Progress and Obstacles for Reform

The Internal Political Situation. One may argue that there was a fourth environmental change progressing, the shifts of some Republican-elected officials to endorsing vaccinations. One may also argue that some elected officials, particularly a selection of a few governors in red states digging in their heels against mandates, and in some cases seeking to penalize officials, took a different view of the responsibility for the health of those whom they had some regulatory power.

Another potential fourth environmental change progressing goes to executive action. The plan for dealing with the pandemics is controversial, but the favorable results will reach out to the public, irrespective of political affiliation. This is highlighting the difference between across-the-aisle cooperation for legislation and direct action by the administration.

At this stage signs of progress exist. However, it is too early to know much about strategic changes that are likely to occur for progress in restoring American Democracy back on the path to the ideals articulated the Declaration of Independence.

Beyond the Pandemic. Beyond the pandemic, there was a sign of progress in across-the-aisle legislation dealing with infrastructure. Headway was made in the form of a bipartisan bill for infrastructure. That may be viewed as part of an effort to restore pluralism, an essential ingredient in pursuit of the common good. It has been thwarted by tribalism. The box that follows may be viewed as a review and commentary on the Thursday, August 12, 2021, *Wall Street Journal* article by Lindsay Wise, “Connell Sees Few Chances For Deals After Infrastructure.”

The key paragraph for our purposes is shortly after the middle of the article. It is as follows:

“Three months ago, Mr. McConnell said his focus was on standing up to the Biden administration, putting a damper on already slim hopes for bipartisan cooperation in Congress on infrastructure. On Tuesday, Mr. McConnell said he has been clear for months that he saw the infrastructure as an area where the parties could do business.”

In an earlier paragraph reporter wrote that deal was “... negotiated by a group of bipartisan senators, passed by the Senate 69-30 on Tuesday.”

It is reasonable to expect that the moderate approach will have the best chance of whatever is doable with across-the-aisle cooperation. The divisions within each of the two main political parties are a serious source of problems, but the reality is that the feasibility counts; so, giving up the good outcomes in futile efforts to obtain the unobtainable may help some feelings, but supporting leadership produces more long-term progress than being a holdout from a team effort, when the only road to progress is to go with the team. The other option is to get a different team leader.

The executive action in this administration is critical for success in pursuing the common interest. It is not about the president winning a reelection, is about actually improving the quality of life of the public. The *second pandemic*, that of the unvaccinated, is a case in point. The vast majority of hospitalizations are from unvaccinated victims of the pandemic, victims, many of whom regret their choice not to be vaccinated.

We will return to the attempt to work across the aisle with an administration intent on serving the interests of all Americans based upon enhancing quality of life and equal opportunity rather than political affiliation, and certainly not the use of *legal corruption*, a distortion of representative democracy that has led our American Democracy to becoming a *de facto plutocracy*.

The Essence of Strategy

Dealing With Uncertainty

The essence of strategy in complex adaptive systems is dealing with uncertainty. Linear relationships in closed systems provide for high reliability in forecasting outcomes. Science makes great advancements utilizing the inductive approach by testing for reliability of forecasts. As expectations are tested by experiments, false assumptions are reduced by ongoing experiments. Surviving assumptions enhanced credibility.

Organic systems, including human beings and societal organizations such as political economies, are complex adaptive systems. They evolve from interactions resulting in some changes in relationships. The nonlinearity produces great uncertainty. One does not know the consequences of the change in relationships, but may gain some insights through inductive research from previous changes. However, without knowledge of what choices will be made in the change of structure that emerges from previous choices, there is substantial uncertainty because the probability analyses of a closed system are not available

Better forecasts of outcomes may be made by discerning patterns that lead to more desirable outcomes than relying on the assumption that the relevant relationships have not changed. However, inferences may be made when some changes in relationships are

observed. Even then, there remains the uncertainty associated with contingency.

The existence of contingencies may make dramatic differences in outcomes. The old story that for the want of a nail in the horseshoe, the use of a horse was lost; and the loss of a horse led to the battle to lost; and the loss of the battle resulted in the war being lost. The shortest identification may simply be the *butterfly effect*.

The Declaration Era Educational Press (DEEP) has a great deal more discussion of the strategic approach. At this stage some links are being provided. Over time, additional links will be included along with updates of this appendix to the first DEEP overview booklet, *IT IS TIME TO DECIDE! DO YOU WANT TO LIVE IN A FREE SOCIETY?*

Risk and Uncertainty Tolerance

Risk and uncertainty tolerance are key variables in the use of the minimax strategy. Risk is calculable in a closed system such as a roulette wheel and dice. A gambler with very little to lose may go for broke; there is not much of a downside. A wealthy gambler is less likely to go for broke because there is not much tolerance for losing everything. It is just not worth taking a chance.

In complex adaptive systems there is too much uncertainty for calculating the probability. However, one can get a feeling of likelihood using a consideration of patterns that indicate some experience in the behavior of the uncertainties. Sometimes multiple models are used, as with weather forecasting. However, as the timing shortens in the sequence of events leading to a critical outcome, there is a shrinking of downside uncertainties.

As the observant motivated learner will likely have noticed, the content of the website keeps evolving as events unfold. When the first two parts of this appendix were originally drafted, there was a discussion of the rivalry of two crises; the pandemic and the survival of our democracy. The presentation highlighted the actions taken by President Biden immediately and in his first hundred days.

Some notes on the evolution of updates and appendices
A & B are as follows:

The original plan for updates considered as many as six time-segments of eight months each for reporting on progress with the 48-month build-back-better agenda. Aside from the two major contenders for the lead crisis, there were at least a few additional crises. They included climate change, foreign terrorists, and social justice components.

That eight-month segment approach was blown out of the water in the latter part of August with the events of ending the twenty-year Afghanistan debacle. That received a lot of discussion in this third part, but aside from the remarkable funding combating the pandemic by using the reconciliation process, there wasn't much progress with the build-back-better agenda, except for the Senate action on the physical infrastructure bill.

The *voting bill* in the Senate was blocked four times with filibusters. Additionally, the Republican focus on the midterm elections apparently pursues obstructing success of the Biden administration. That limited bipartisan legislation, with the notable exception of cooperation in the Senate for an *infrastructure bill*.

The eight-month plan was recast as a nine-month plan, and again recast to what is now known as *Most of the Administration's First Year*. The dramatic election results from the voting day of November 2, 2021 reflecting a paucity of progress in legislation fell into the historical path of election success in down-ballot races for the political party that lost the presidential election. There is, however, more to the story

The failure of bipartisan cooperation in establishing a 9/11 type commission to investigate the insurrection of January 6, 2021 attacking the joint session of Congress fulfilling its constitutional responsibilities as a clear signal that the Trumpian Republican Party pursued power at the expense of preserving what is left of our democracy. The BIG LIE in the multiplicity of state regulations aimed at reducing voter

participation reflects the rise of danger to our democracy as a crisis greater than that of the pandemic, assuming the criteria of quality of life of Americans.

Donald Trump has been pursuing an autocracy, and is attempting to stonewall the congressional investigation by the Select Committee of the House of Representatives. That issue has risen to the level that calls for greater attention to unfolding events as the timing for taking this part three (*Strategic Guidance Towards Improving Outcomes*) of Appendix A to the point where it may be prepared for posting as a standalone item.

The unfolding event that triggered the shift to winding up the drafting of this third part of Appendix A (*Most of The Administration's First Year*) is the election results from elections held on November 2, 2021. We are about to discuss that in the context of strategic guidance for developing strategy, and strategy shifts for complex adaptive system.

As a further note on the evolution of updates, what had been started as a draft of an op-ed piece titled *Our American Crises in 2021: The Terrorist Contenders; Foreign and Domestic*, there was an introductory box as follows:

Developing an American strategy for our national security is an additional crisis added to at least the five we are already facing. The approach of the Declaration Era Education Press (DEEP) is to develop a narrative discussing the situation and providing updates as events unfold. This is along the lines of the revisions of the first two booklets providing overviews of the website, and supplements as conditions change. The [link to the first booklet is here](#).

That "...draft of an op-ed piece titled *Our American Crises in 2021: The Terrorist Contenders; Foreign and Domestic* was transformed into becoming appendix B that focuses heavily on

terrorism. As a result, it contains substantially more material on the Afghan case than is contained in the Appendix A. As a result, we are shortening the discussion of the Afghan case in this third part of Appendix A, but supplementing it with some copy from Appendix B. Also, some material from Appendix B is excerpted to this appendix. In both cases they are identified and boxed.

Both appendices are independently posted as standalone items, as well as being an integral part of the first booklet. The staging of development of copy to reflect unfolding events is facilitated by the posting of additions as standalone items before they are integrated into being posted as part of the first booklet.

The content of the box that follows illustrates the process. It is an excerpt of the discussion of strategy from Appendix B, not yet completed. It is especially relevant for our current presentation. This section is headed “Strategy is Our Concern.” It has three subsections. Only two subsections are provided here. Only some of the links have been completed at the time this is being posted.

Since this version of Appendix A is designed for hard copy, as well as digital presentation, and it will also be a standalone item, it contains an addendum with a few items. The excerpted copy in the box that follows has been modified to provide identification in brackets.

STRATEGY IS OUR CONCERN

Many Ways to Tell a Story

A story may be told in many different ways. The listener senses incoming information in many ways. It is dealt with by feelings as well as reasoning.

The teller may intend to convey truth. Alternatively, the intent may have little regard for truth [1 - Social Media Exploits]; and seek to exploit the listener for a variety of

motives. In any case, the listener would do well to exercise critical thinking in making choices. The quality of outcomes is heavily dependent on the integrity of the process.

Our American Democracy is facing multiple crises. We are going to use at least one of them in analogies as a means to show how stories are told and impacts on the quality of outcomes. When Donald Trump was president, he intentionally misled [1 - Social Media Exploits] the American public on COVID-19 matters because his priority was reelection; the result was excessive damage to the health of the American public. When he negotiated with the Taliban for a withdrawal of American troops, he was again prioritizing his reelection and neglected an assurance of protection of our allies, Afghans who helped us in our assistance in the twenty-year war.

Morality is a significant issue in survival of states, especially on matters of corruption. Part of the failure of Afghanistan to survive as a state, after the last two decades of aid, was corruption by the government. Corruption is a cancer as are some other shortfalls in morality. The shortfall in former president Donald Trump's morality was cancerous, not only with regard to the COVID-19 pandemic[1 - Social Media Exploits], but also to the agreements he made with the then Afghanistan government.

When Joe Biden was elected president, his first action after his inauguration was an executive order to mitigate damage to the health of Americans. He later reversed withdrawal from some agreements with allies, but did not rescind or renegotiate withdrawal of American troops from Afghanistan. In retrospect, release of 5,000 prisoners was a big mistake. Additionally, the failure to provide for our allies' safety after our withdrawal turned out to be the problem because of the sudden collapse of the government. The government was not a participant in President Trump's direct negotiations with the Taliban regarding our withdrawal.

When President Biden took office, it appears that he thought that we should have withdrawn from Afghanistan a long time ago, and was not anxious to go beyond the most

essential reversals of former president Donald Trump's actions; so, he passed up an opportunity to negotiate a better deal with regard to taking care of our allies in Afghanistan.

There was uncertainty associated with the withdrawal, but President Biden was blindsided by the Afghanistan leadership abandoning the country and the exceptionally fast collapse of the Afghanistan military forces that outnumbered the Taliban forces four to one. It is rumored that the military forces were threatened by death if they fought the Taliban, not only of the soldiers, but also the murder of their families. Talk about morality, and there is a new lower standard, assuming that the rumors were based on fact.

There may be other explanations for the sudden collapse, and some members of Congress are looking for a congressional investigation of the brouhaha out of concern for Afghans who helped America in its role during the twenty-year war. Some Republican members are looking to use the situation for political purposes, especially for the midterm elections next year.

We are looking to tell a story with an understanding of choices made, and problems inherited. Evolutionary processes alter structures. We are looking to understand strategies consider the formal evolutionary process of individuals and the societal structures.

Our Concern Here

Our concern here is with use of a strategic approach in order to effectively deal with the uncertainty, especially in complex adaptive systems [2 -Not Rocket Science]. The intent is to improve outcomes. Complex adaptive systems are evolutionary by nature. The processes influence the structure, and the evolution of the structure alters the environment. The changed environment may impact relationships; hence, critical thinking calls for going beyond historical linear relationships so as to consider the likely paths that will result from one's own choices, but also from the choices of others.

The most significant aspect of this approach is that the outcomes are impacted by more than one's own choice; others in the network are also making choices. The outcomes reflect the emergent results of the interactions; properties (characteristics) that are not simply summations, but rather conditions that exist in a network macro to the micro network generating the emergent characteristics.

Our focus here is the consideration of Afghanistan as a case in point for understanding how to better deal with our national security through foreign policy, especially with great reliance on diplomacy and relationships relevance to the multiplicity of considerations, including the relative strength of our military forces. We have placed too much reliance on having the most powerful military on earth and too little reliance on actually demonstrating how pluralism can work. The fact is, we are failing at pluralism and the seeds of a civil war have been sown by domestic terrorism as part of the January 6, 2021 attack of the U.S. Capitol building disrupting a joint session of Congress working to fulfill its constitutional responsibility.

Our concern here is the development of a viable strategy that will protect us from terrorism, foreign and domestic. As to the foreign — the Taliban insurrectionists that represented only about a third of the population, and the opening of the door to a multiplicity of jihadists. This discussion will be pursued in the section titled *American Strategy for National Security*.

This is to be developed in the context of Afghanistan's future under control by the Taliban; the question of what other realistic influences we and our allies have on their behavior. They are facing humongous problems in attempting to construct the political economy with the majority of Afghan with their local focus on the tribalistic concerns. A truly representative government not in the cards.

Aside from humanitarian issues, we are, or should be, concerned about the Taliban providing a territorial base for future, terrorist attack. Thus, we are exploring the use of

strategic approaches with *Afghanistan and the Taliban* as a case in point among our other crises.

Our strategic failures have been accumulating in recent decades; and the costs to cure are higher than the costs to prevent. As a nation we have had two top crises, up until Thursday, August 25, 2021. One is the domestic terrorism obstruction of the peaceful transfer of power exemplified by the January 6, 2021 insurrection disrupting the joint session of Congress. For context see *Restructuring American Democracy on the Digital Platform*. [The link is located here.](#)

The other crisis is the COVID-19 pandemic of 2020 and its 2021 variant that caused excessive infections and deaths fostered by politics overriding health management. That is discussed in the latest revision of the first overview booklet, *IT IS TIME TO DECIDE! DO YOU WANT TO LIVE IN A FREE SOCIETY?*

Our strategic failures in Afghanistan and the Taliban during the last two decades have now led to an additional crisis, the existence of a territory that is likely to accommodate the presence of a terrorist base that will be a threat to our national security. The airport terrorist attack by ISIS-K on Thursday, August 25, 2021 killed 13 persons serving in our military forces. President Biden's response — “We will not forgive. We will not forget. We will hunt you down and make you pay.” — has heightened ISIS-K as a target in our war on terror, especially as to its forces in Afghanistan.

The Terrorism Background

The Minimax Approach

The minimax approach to strategy deals with uncertainty by attempting to maximize favorable outcomes within the constraints of tolerable downsides. The gambler with little to lose is more likely to go for broke than the gambler that possesses substantial assets.

Such a gambler with substantial assets will only expose to risk an amount of assets in proportion to potential gains and the likelihood of desired favorable outcomes to produce those gains. The downside of going for broke is out of proportion for smaller gains when going for broke means losing a lot.

In games such as roulette and dice, there are probabilities mathematically calculable because it is a closed system. In games such as poker, and enterprises such as business and war, the system is complex because of the uncertainty of the behavior of others. A classic work translating this theory of games into a bench to bed approach (translational science) for the lay public is in a 1950 book by John McDonald, *Strategy in Poker Business and War*. The opening two sentences are as follows:

“The subject of this book is strategy — not military strategy alone but strategy in general. It concerns the elusive nature of the thread of opposition and conflict that runs through the various interrelationships of men, from striking a bargain in the market to the dread clash of war.”

That book was written decades before *complexity science* became a nascent discipline. Complexity science, and its relative network science, have been blossoming in recent decades. They are widely applicable in organic systems that require going beyond linearity into dealing with nonlinear relationships that evolve over time. For our purposes here, the simplest way of looking at the strategy for dealing with the uncertainty is to consider patterns that are likely to evolve from choices made by the strategist, with the consideration for grasping the choices that others may make in the networks that will impact the emergent outcomes.

There are two more elements to be mentioned here that relate to the measurement of risk and/or the design of strategy relating to context. The first is mentioned in Appendix B that develops the application of complexity science to dealing with Afghanistan. The quote is as follows:

This is not rocket science. It is harder. It is harder because the structure changes as a result of processes changing, and processes change as a result of structure changes. Getting a man to the moon was very difficult because it involved a multiplicity of disciplines. Instead of working in a silo structure with a multiplicity of disciplines in an outsourced network, an interdisciplinary team was formed to blend specialized knowledge to better assess likely outcomes. This enterprise, Declaration Era Educational Press, is being designed to be part of a gift to a to-be-formed, not-for-profit organization that will assemble a team of experts that can carry forward what has started as the pursuit of a paradigm shift that will facilitate not only dealing with the multiplicity of crises being confronted, but will avert some would be successors. [The paragraph is excerpted from Connect the Dots, the second side heading in the PROLOGUE of Appendix B - The Terrorist Contenders.]

The quote refers to understanding the evolution of organic systems. That involves understanding more about strategy. The link refers to the first four paragraphs that uses the game of blackjack as an example for understanding how uncertainty changes. The three paragraphs are as follows:

This is not rocket science; it is harder. It is harder because the structure changes as a result of processes changing, and processes change as a result of structure changes. Thus, relationships within the system and to become nonlinear as the institutional arrangements evolve. In rocket science it is much less difficult because the linear relationships have a consistency that provides a predictability that works better because the relationships are constant.

The example is comparing odds at a game of *Twenty-One*, also known as *Blackjack*. A card counter with a superb memory that played at a table with five other players, besides the dealer, sitting at the fifth position, when the dealer only had one deck of cards, could recalculate the odds of whether or

not to take other card as the game proceeds. The uncertainty of the five closed cards (four for the other players plus the dealer) shifts substantially depending upon the number of decks. With one deck, there are forty-five undisclosed cards.

As more hands that are played, fewer undisclosed cards are left and the easier it would be to calculate the odds. By using multiple decks of cards it makes it more difficult for the card counter. And, the frequency of shuffling changes the numbers of undisclosed cards. It is doubtful if a professional gambling house would permit a player to bring a computer and an assistant.

If there is only one player at the table, and the multiplicity of decks are reshuffled after each hand, you are dealing with a complex adaptive system in which the shuffling process keeps changing the structure. The point is we are dealing with the evolving processes and evolving structures.

That entry in the addendum to Appendix B is not completed, but it is also posted here because it goes on to deal with the Taliban. We are using it because we are supplementing it with the discussion of a game that it draws from — contract bridge. The point is simply stated as “The best way to play the suit may not be the best way to play the hand.”

That game also has a structure in which understanding probability and risk is helpful in making choices. The relevant variable for the bridge players is who will have the lead if the trick is lost. The odds may favor a finesse, but if it loses to the wrong opponent, winning the game will be in an added danger.

Translated that means, the right move focusing on one component in a set of components, may sometimes be the wrong move. The problem is that what is right for that interest may endanger the larger interest. As this is being written, that is happening with the Senator Joe Manchin from West Virginia where he is obstructing the legislation of a wide array of programs because there is one that he feels very strongly about.

This is leading us to discussing *more on complex adaptive systems*, the next topic identified by that name as the paragraph heading.

More on Complex Adaptive Systems

More information on complex adaptive systems is contained in Chapter 4, Harnessing Complexity in the Twenty-First Century, of the trilogy's first book, *Common Sense Revisited: America's Third Revolution*. excerpts from the table of contents of that chapter are in the box that follows.

Changes in Process and Power	92
Adaptation is Critical for Survival.....	92
Disruptions from Failure to Accept Transitions	93
Building a Better Understanding of Reality	94
The Process Generates Structure	95
A Few Key Issues	97
Contributions to Production and Reciprocity.....	98
Institutional Arrangements.....	100
Isolation, Frustration, and Sense of Place	101
The Side Trip.....	102
The Changing Structure of American Democracy.....	102
The Lens of Complexity and Network Science	104
Diversity as a Choice	107
Recirculation as a Vehicle.....	111
Three Levels of Meeting Problems	113
Niche and Hierarchy	114
Coevolution of Individuals and Society	116
Concluding Thoughts.....	117

A review of the topics will at least provide a feel for the complexity of our democracy and the system heavily dependent upon interrelationships in networks that impact outcomes; outcomes that are known as emergent properties.

Additionally, the third section (The Changing Structure of American Democracy] of the fourth chapter of BOOK ONE is in the addendum (4 - The Changing Structure).

The Relevance of Emergence

Social Capital is An Emergent Property

The relevance of emergence is that the interactions of the nodes in the networks produce outcomes that are not a summation of the components, but rather a set of conditions that has properties above and beyond those in the components. Social capital is such an emergent property. It is discussed in Part I of Appendix B (The Leading Foreign Contender) in the section titled “The Longest War in Context.” The indented heading is A Global Perspective. It is part of excerpts from BOOK ONE. See pages 32 - 34 of the book for the endnotes. The key paragraph is as follows:

The social capital concept is used by Francis Fukuyama in his 1999 book *The Great Disruption: Human Nature and the Reconstitution of Human Order*. In it, social capital is defined as “a set of informal **values or norms** shared among members of a group that permits cooperation among them [p. 16].”

Those values, or norms, influence behavior. That behavior is an asset for the group, and for the individuals in the group, not only because it facilitates predictability, but also because it influences outcomes. If you want to produce a product, or an outcome, by combining a series of components, there needs to be a reliability that the component will produce the services or product it is expected to produce.

In the case of land, it might relate to the fertility, for agricultural purposes, or ability to support a structure for purposes of construction. If its purpose is for a structure, there are components of the structure that provides services. The components may be acquired by the use of financial capital. It may be the same for labor, or in the case of a barn raising, the labor may be acquired by the utilization of social capital.

Obviously, not all contributions to the outcome are necessarily limited to being acquired by financial capital. The social capital may be what puts the team together, or the group, for whatever is expected from a commonality of interests. It is a significant asset in

impacting the outcome of any productive effort. Thus, social capital may be seen as an emergent property from the behavior for the common good.

In the case at hand, we are looking at what may be considered a clash of interests. From one perspective, the common interest is protection from the pandemic. From another perspective, the common interest is the pursuit of political power. These perspectives, and other perspectives, are best understood as complex adaptive systems. As such, they evolve.

Choices made may vary for time dimensions considered and/or prioritized. Concern for long-run interests may generate expectations of what will evolve; and influence one's own choices and the choices of others. Reacting to short-term interests, without understanding the evolution of the system, may seriously conflict with desired long-term outcomes.

Understanding Systems. This is all about understanding systems. Readers who fully understand the content of this website are entitled to at least an undergraduate degree. It is designed so that you may delve as deeply as you choose. And, it is in the process of being facilitated with a great many links. Feedback from motivated learners will be appreciated.

The Declaration Era Educational Press (DEEP) project, of which this is a part, is being designed to provide a database for educational research that will indicate paths for connecting concepts that improve the productivity of the energy being used to understanding of systems. Essentially, it is connecting dots of linear relationships of a network that generates characteristics of a network macro to the micro generating network. The complexity is increased because the emergent properties that alter the structure emanate from processes, and the evolving structure impacts the choices made in the ensuing process.

The particular system under discussion is the generation of the emergent properties essential for social capital. The political tribalism is undermining the social capital essential to the survival of our democracy. While this is going on, the coronavirus is also engaged in an evolutionary process that produces new variants that are increasingly threatening the health of human beings.

That threat to human beings operates locally, in what amounts to a portion of a global network. But it is severely impacted by government action at various levels, in the context of federal policy. Additionally, policies of foreign governments, and behavior of their populations, make a significant difference. Essentially, human beings are living in a global system that is not, as a whole, effectively managed to deal with the threat of the coronavirus to life and death, and especially to the quality of life. The quality of management varies by the nature of government and the behavior of people, especially with the concern for common interests. Social capital plays a significant role as does the nature of political structure.

As we will discuss, *truth* and *trust* are two components of social capital; an element of structure in our political economy. We are using the example of the coronavirus pandemic to explain process impacting structure, and structure then impacting process. It is an evolutionary process for the electorate and the elected representatives. It is also an evolutionary process for the coronavirus which produces a multiplicity of variants in its evolution.

The first draft of this Part III (*Most of the Administration's First Year*) of this treatise (Strategic Guidance Towards Improving Outcomes) was mostly written in October 2021, shortly after President Biden's speech in September that essentially provided a structural shift in federal policy for dealing with the COVID-19 pandemic. Since then, the discovery of the Omicron variant in November has further indicated that our nation's use of information technology is inadequate for tracing the emergence of the new variants. This calls for our obtaining a better understanding of the sequencing leading to variants of greater transferability and greater power for damaging human health.

The wake-up calls keep sounding. The latest, as this draft is further developed, is a *New York Times* December 5, 2021 article by Stephanie Nolan, "A Variant On Dirt Roads And in the Lab: Why Covid Mutations Rise in South Africa." The science indicates that the length of time the virus remains in the body influences the number of mutations. The survival of the virus in the body depends upon the health of the immune systems. Individuals whose immune systems have been weakened

because of other medical conditions provide an opportunity for the creation of more mutations.

The science keeps advancing, and human response varies. In about the two weeks after the alarm sounded with the Omicron variant, having fifty mutations, some of which are on the spike that is in the first line of resistance, there was a spurt in vaccinations in some areas of the United States. That is a wise response, more comprehensive view is essential to the next strategy shift.

This treatise is written by the personhood of the Declaration Era Educational Press, that as yet does not have the essential array of experts in a diversity of disciplines necessary to effectively design ongoing strategic improvements. The ensuing subsection, *The Omicron Amendment*, provide some information on the historical quest leading to this pursuit. Comments by experts that will clarify a lay understanding of the epidemiology, and other sciences involved, will be appreciated.

That subsection, *The Omicron Amendment*, provides a couple of paragraphs that alludes to a couple of earlier eras of scientific advancement of societal change. We may well be involved in a third one now, if we can bring humanity and morality back into our evolution as human beings. With no offense being intended, the reality is there are still vast portions of our society, presumably pursuing *The Great Experiment*, or at least participating in societal processes with a shortfall in knowledge, aside from those with impaired capacity for understanding reality. We are targeting motivated learners who have the capability and the motivation to better understand a multiplicity of systems that are impacting our quality of life. We are looking for the analytics and morality for improve choices; and doing so to providing education, and fostering its evolution to be more productive.

In pursuit of those goals, we are opening the discussion of the paradigm under development for strategic designs to deal with the uncertainties we are facing in multiplicity of crises. In this case we are continuing our focus on the evolution of the coronavirus

The Paradigm in Action. Our approach is to take you to discussion of demonstrations of the paradigm in action. The idea is that if you understood the likely consequences of the choices that you make,

and others make, you and the others with better reasoning and morality could improve outcomes. Make no mistake of failing to understand that our freedom and the pursuit of liberty and justice for all is in danger and the undermining of truth and trust in a free society with a representative government is negatively impacting our quality of life. The better understand how to use social capital to deal with the pandemic, and better understand how to use it to return to the path of progress in pursuit of the ideals articulated in the Declaration of Independence.

The relevance of emergence is demonstrated by the arrival of the Omicron variant in November 2021. It added another player to our discussion of to the co-evolution of *The Great American Experiment*, a constitutional republic. The progression from the Beta variant to the Delta variant and on to the Omicron variant indicates an increasing threat to our public health. We are dealing with evolutionary processes, both for the coronavirus and for human beings, especially in our attempt to overcome the handicap of tribalism. There is the possibility that what evolves with the pandemic becoming an endemic will bring us a unity for our common purpose.

We may reasonably expect that the evolution of the coronavirus will shift from having generated a pandemic to becoming an endemic that will impact our societal structure in many dimensions. We are not organized to effectively deal with it. In early December of 2021, the Biden administration started with an additional shift in strategy to further deal with the changing environment going beyond the plans announced in September. Those plans are being obstructed by the Republican Party in its pursuit of political power. We will have more to report before the segment goes to press in hard copy. And, of course, will be providing updates in 2022.

The key players making human decisions, in the paradigm we are using, are human beings. The two clusters of human beings that are most relevant to our discussion of the co-evolution are (1) the electorate and (2) the elected representatives. There are clusters within the clusters, especially as existing in political parties. Our discussion happens to focus on both major political parties.

For the Democrats we are looking at the Biden administration's transformation of federal policy to *Building Back Better* as a central element in restoring America's path back to the pursuit of the ideals articulated in the Declaration of Independence. For the Republicans, we are looking to a hope for their return to their first hundred years in dealing with the tensions between the equality of rights rivaling the priority of property rights, instead of continuing the trend of the last half-century. That trend of the last half-century has taken them to the pursuit of a plutocracy, most recently with a leader hell-bent on pursuit of an autocracy. As we will discuss, the present path of the Republican Party is in danger of resulting in chaos.

Dealing with Coevolution. Our strategy for dealing with coevolution is based upon an education to better understand the system. The multitude of variables that are rooted in the creation of Western civilization and its continued evolution calls for an interdisciplinary team, especially including social scientists. The understanding of the system generates power, but the exercise of power uses reasoning and feelings that are heavily dependent upon morality. Power without morality is a threat to the survival of our free society.

Although the DEEP website has substantial discussion that deals with understanding the system, a brief identification of the two major eras of our evolution as a free society will be sufficient as a start for dealing with the relevance of emergence, along with what we consider the coronavirus to be, an organic being that leeches its protein from our bodies. The coronavirus that does not have the capability of creating its own protein.

We as human beings do create their own protein. We have behaved as being at the top of the food chain. Human beings, as species, has abused the health of the planet. We are now becoming aware of the fact that we are not really the top predator. The emerging variants of the coronavirus are claiming that position.

As human beings, among our greatest challenges is the survival of the human health. Additionally, we have the challenge of the health of the planet, in a great many dimensions, not the least of which is suitability for human survival.

Our *Great Experiment* has not done as well with the planet as was being done by those from whom we took control of the land that is now United States of America. It was not organized to deal with nature. It was organized to deal with tyranny. We will return to that shortly.

Coronavirus attempts at attachment may be repelled by antibodies, when effective. Its attack upon our health over the last two years is taking us from an old normal to a new normal that we had not even envisioned. Although it is a global player, our focus is on a strategic approach for the United States of America to deal with the health issues. However, that will heavily involve what is left of our leadership role in Western civilization calls for a continued substantial concern for the human health globally.

As previously noted, “The wake-up calls keep sounding. The latest, as this draft is further developed, is a *New York Times* December 5, 2021 article by Stephanie Nolan, “***A Variant On Dirt Roads And in the Lab: Why Covid Mutations Rise in South Africa.***” Our paradigm calls for a substantial innovation in data development for understanding the system and in management systems for exercising control. Those systems need to deal with tracking in dealing with the evolution of variants and our response as humans in mitigating the damage to our collective health.

We opened this discussion of the third segment (*Most of The Administration’s First Year*) of the treatise, *Strategic Guidance Towards Improving Outcomes*, with a section titled “Strategic Shift Announced for the Pandemic.” We identified the environmental changes that called for a strategic shift in the administration’s strategy for dealing with the COVID-19 pandemic. As previously noted, that was prompted by President Biden’s announcement in September, and our starting this draft in October. However, the appearance of Omicron variant in November is triggering another strategic shift.

The problem is exacerbated by motivations of the Republican Party to focus on midterm election to gain power, rather than dealing with the common good of protecting against damages to public health. They are utilizing a political structure designed to protect from tyranny of the despot rather than being designed for public health.

The ensuing strategic shift is likely to be tempered by the reality of what will be politically feasible given the division of authority between the states and the federal government.

Another Strategic Shift

The Early Clues. The first clue for another strategic shift was the rapid global expansion of the presence of the Omicron variant in November. It was flourishing in South Africa and other southern African countries with low vaccination rates. As noted, “the Omicron variant, having fifty mutations, some of which are on the spike that is in the first line of resistance.” That is facilitating its rapid expansion globally. It heavily hit Europe, where in varying degrees, some countries had begun returning to some semblance of normal. They are now dealing with a new reality.

The gut reactions led to numerous countries banning travel, at least for a period of time to bolster preparation for training to deal with a new variant that apparently had a greater transferability than the contagious Delta variant that had taken over from the Beta variant of COVID-19 that has been dominating the infections.

As this stage of the narrative was being drafted, at the very beginning of December, there was only one case of the Omicron variant being reported in the United States. That was by a vaccinated traveler returning to San Francisco after a visit to South Africa. Globally, however, the spread already looked alarming. Since then, there has been a rapid expansion.

President Biden, according to *The New York Times* December 2, 2021 article (“*Facing Two Crises, Biden Projects Normalcy and Optimism*”), by Jim Tankersley, provides the key quote from President Biden that opens the second paragraph, “We’re looking ahead to a brighter and happier December.” That paragraph continues noting administrative actions for the short run.

The same page (A16), there is an article by Emily Cochran titled “*G.O.P. Threat Of Shutdown In a Dispute On Mandates*.” It leads off reporting that “A group of Senate Republicans is threatening to delay action on the spending bill needed to avert a lapse in federal funding on Friday unless it also bars enforcement the Biden

administration's vaccine-and-testing mandate for large employers, heightening the threat of a government shutdown. Republican leadership blocked that approach as going too far.

In this treatise (*Strategic Guidance Towards Improving Outcomes*), the third part (*Most of The Administration's First Year*) moves from this opening section (*Strategic Shift Announced for the Pandemic*) through a transitional section (*If We Knew Then, What We Know Now*) through to the main thrust *Saving The Great Experiment*. That main thrust examines the potential for evolution and the current century's third decade, that will take us through the presidential elections in 2024 and 2028.

Our concern is with understanding evolution of complex adaptive systems. That is aided by starting with a historical perspective, examining unfolding events and choices, and considering potential outcomes based upon what we know now, or at least believe that we know. We look for patterns of process and evolving structures and make some assessments for the future.

We are in an ongoing process that will continually call for updating. Considering where we are now, after most of the administration's first year, we are making assessments of what will happen with the coronavirus to demonstrate an analytical approach to our other major crisis, the threat to the future of our American Democracy. A critical variable in the process is the evolution of the Republican Party.

We have just noted that some Republican leadership blocked a few zealots in the Senate caucus from using the objection to the mandates from blocking the spending bill. It would have been a step too far. We are looking to understand process as it is going to influence the future Republican Party. As a preview, what follows is an excerpt from the third section (*Saving The Great Experiment*). It is in the final subsection, Parts of Potential Structural Change.

Lines Not Crossed. The future of the Republican Party has been heavily impacted by what has been happening in recent times. It is being further impacted by the *now* that will become the *then* for the next generation, and the generations to come...

...We are concerned with the lines drawn in individual behavior of the elected leadership, in the context of what will become a co-evolution of the electorate and the leadership....

The future of the Republican Party is going to depend upon where the lines are drawn for behavior in a democratic society. If the lines are not drawn, Donald Trump will move our democracy to an autocracy. So far, we have not seen where he will draw the line, even though he has been impeached twice, although not convicted; but emboldened with his baseless claim of a stolen election.

For Mike Pence, serving as vice president, the line was drawn at the violation of the Constitution. It was a line he would not cross. The pressure was immense, emanating from a plan designed to pursue power at any cost. The process included an insurrection in which there were shouts of “Hang Mike Pence.”

Although this is a nonpartisan educational enterprise, the analytics indicate that at least two political parties are essential for democracy in order for the voting public to be able to exercise the discipline on the executive and legislative branches of government. Knowledge and truth count; as does integrity. Additionally, caring and action counts if you want to live in a free society.

It did not take long for more cases of the Omicron variant. And, on Friday, December 3, the federal funding was extended. There is however a continuation of the obstructionism to President Biden's strategic shift, dealing with what was announced in September by the president, and discussed in our opening presentation on the discussion of most of the administration's first year, under the title *Strategic Shift Announced for the Pandemic*. That shift in strategy was from a primary focus on containment (including lockdowns and social distancing as well as masks) to primarily defensive measures, especially vaccination. It calls for many measures opposed by the Republicans, especially in the Red States. Those are the states that generated the *second pandemic*, generally of the unvaccinated.

The initial strategy of the Biden administration treated the pandemic as a health issue with a containment strategy heavily dependent upon masks and other impediments for transfers, including vaccinations. The president's first executive order (January 20, 2021) was clearly within presidential authority as exemplified by its application to federal property. It was in an early stage of COVID-19 vaccinations that not only provide protection to the inoculated, but also impede transfer of the virus.

The three environmental changes that prompted the strategic shift were: (1) the Delta variant; (2) standard approval; and (3) pandemic of the unvaccinated. The opening paragraph dealing with adaptation to environmental changes is as follows:

Adaptation to Environmental Changes. The demonstration case, a strategic shift in the approach for the pandemic, is a forerunner for strategic shifts that may occur during the four-year administration, or at least get a significant start. These will be touched on in this third part of the appendix (*Strategic Guidance Towards Improving Outcomes*, to the revision of the first booklet, *IT IS TIME TO DECIDE! DO YOU WANT TO LIVE IN A FREE SOCIETY?*)

Some Additional Clues. Some additional clues are arriving as to the nature of the strategy evolving. The biggest clue to the evolving strategy is the development of knowledge, not only by research,

but especially by data development providing information in a timely manner.

In all candor, the environmental change triggered by the global spread of the Omicron variant accelerated our having to deal with what was planned for the third segment (*Saving The Great Experiment*) of this third part (*Most of the Administration's First Year*) of this entry titled, "Strategic Guidance Towards Improved Outcomes." There will be a lot more in the assessment of what needs to be done to save *The Great American Experiment*. What we have here is a major step in strategy adjusting to the rapidly changing global environment of the pandemic that is underscoring our need for constant adjustments in strategy.

The lockdown era is gone. It was a significant element before the availability of vaccines. Vaccines are still essential, but not enough. It appears that the new strategy only deals with mask mandates in a very limited manner, focusing on transportation, especially airlines, but in some degree the ground transportation of crowded carriers. The expectation is that mandates will be limited in time and conditions.

The strategy shift includes a better understanding of the evolution of the variants dealing with sequencing process that enables the mutations. The genomic surveillance is increasing; we need to understand the enemy. Consider that we are at war with a predator who needs our bodies for protein to provide their energy. They operate organically without the benefit of science that can improve their outcomes. We have that benefit of science, but we have been under utilizing it because we are tribalistic, preventing our unification for creation of social capital.

We'll talk more about that when we discuss *Saving The Great Experiment*. For now, what we need to know is how to retard coronavirus evolution from providing greater transferability and damage to our public health. This means constraining the formation of new variants. That includes helping the world get vaccinated, but it also includes testing and tracing so we can focus on targeting locations in a timely manner.

There is still heavy reliance on individuals making choices. It seems clear that the time has not arrived, as yet, when the public

policy with regard to health protection from the COVID-19 pandemic will be strengthened by a rebuilding of social capital. The proposition being advanced here is that an effective strategy for dealing with the rising mutations from the pandemic is that sometimes we have to deal with building of social capital to amend the Constitution with a design sufficient to manage a public health system with locally generated database and distributions of authority and responsibility among local, state, and federal government.

That development of social capital will call for a coevolution of the electorate and the elected officials. The premise is that the evolution of COVID-19 is going to continue beyond Omicron. That evolutionary process is heavily dependent upon education. What is briefly introduced in the section that follows is a start on understanding the context from which the coevolution

The Omicron Amendment

Our Constitution Design. Our Constitution was designed to protect our nation from the tyranny of a leader at the head of a hierarchy. It was not designed to manage a public health system. What emerged as *The Great American Experiment* was a pluralistic structure to transform the Confederation to a constitutional republic with delegated authority for the common good.

The design emerged from the Age of Reason, also known as the Enlightenment. It had substantial overlap with the Scientific Revolution. It was the second great philosophical transformation for human beings as a species. The first was centered around Athens in the era of Socrates (470-399 BCE), Plato (428-348 BCE), and Aristotle (384-322 BCE). For his role in science, we can add Epicurus (341–270 BCE). Having done so, we might move ahead to include Lucretius (c. 99/95 BCE-55 BCE.) moving from a little less than two centuries to have a total of a less than four centuries.

In all fairness, Epicurus and Lucretius were dealing with “The notion of atoms which originated in the fifth century BCE with Leucippus of Abdera and his prize student Democritus, [that] was only a dazzling speculation; there

was no way to get any empirical proof and wouldn't be for more than 2000 years." [See page 73 of Stephen Greenblatt's book: *The Swerve: How the World Became Modern*, W. W. Norton and Company (2001).]

That book by Greenblatt provides a fascinating story of a book hunter, Poggio Bracciolini, who in 1417 was able to find the poem, *De rerum natura* (*On the Nature of Things*) in a monastery in Fulda, Germany. It was the predecessor to the second philosophical transformation picked up from Lucretius having in poetry presented the science approach of Epicurus. A lot of time was lost because the poem, *De rerum natura* (*On the Nature of Things*), written in the era of Cicero in ancient Rome, was suppressed by the Catholic Church probably related to his "...The narrow of the souls in mortality and for teaching at pleasure is the end of life." [See front matter, page viii of John Selby Watson's translation of *On the Nature of Things* authored by Lucretius Prometheus Books (1997).

The time for redesign is not arrived yet because we don't have the social capital that would make it feasible. The time for redesign will depend upon what evolves.

A Time for Redesign. The time for a redesign was envisioned when the first book of this trilogy, *American Democracy: The Declaration, Pursuit and Endangerment* was written. That was written around seven years ago. It was simply a call for a first step towards a Declaration of Reform. An excerpt is introduced as follows:

A Declaration of Reform

*Such a Declaration of Reform might start off
along the lines of the following:*

Whereas in the course of events the injustices of a free democratic society erode the political rights of the populace, depriving the majority of equality of representation through a malstructuring abilities to effectively achieve representation; and whereas equitable distribution of the fruits of economic

distribution is denied through a structuring of the regulatory system that is deficient in balancing the natural forces of the market; now therefore it is resolved to assemble an array of scholars from a variety of disciplines that by being blended can provide a better understanding of the organic functioning of society in its evolutionary process, and along with enablers and practitioners with abilities to foster societal change enhancing social justice as envisioned in the Declaration of Independence and facilitated by the Constitution and Amendments thereto, along with such appropriate changes as are necessary for the ideals of liberty and justice for all.

Furthermore, it is therefore resolved that the team will develop and disseminate the body of knowledge to the society as a team writ large so that its self-organization in empowering its representatives will do so in a manner favoring the flourishing opportunities for all on an equitable basis. And, when a creative destruction is involved in societal transitions emerging from technological innovation, societal innovation will equitably deal with the fallout.

That is excerpted from pages 149-150 of the third overview booklet, *Great Danger Emerges: Democracy Challenged*. That is a section titled *Team Building in Development and Dissemination of Knowledge*, starting on page 148.

The discussion continues noting that others are pursuing a similar path. Here is an item excerpted on from page 150.

Most dramatic change is occurring this year (2020) with the pandemic and the associated recession underway. Those are discussed in in two overview essays (*IT IS TIME TO DECIDE!* and *Great Danger Emerges*) beyond the central overview essay focused on the timely trilogy, *American Democracy Endangered*. All of this leading to the discussion of a project started two years ago by the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, resulting in a just released (in June 2020) “final report of the bipartisan Commission on the Practice of Democratic 151 Citizenship. It includes 31 recommendations

to strengthen America's institutions and civic culture to help a nation in crisis emerge with a more resilient democracy."

That report provides six strategies oriented to action that will alter the structure of the system. They are identified as follows: ... Achieve Equality of Voice and Representation ... Empower Voters ... Ensure the Responsiveness of Political Institutions ... Dramatically Expand Civic Bridging Capacity ... Build Civic Information Architecture that Supports Common Purpose ... Inspire a Culture of Commitment to American Constitutional Democracy and One Another ...

In large measure, that two-year project accomplished a great deal of what was envisioned in the concluding phrase illustrative draft for a Declaration of Reform. That phrase is as follows: "and along with enablers and practitioners with abilities to foster societal change enhancing social justice as envision in the Declaration of Independence and facilitated by the Constitution and Amendments thereto, along with such appropriate changes as are necessary for the ideals of liberty and justice for all."

This educational innovation project is supportive of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, particularly in its work through its bipartisan Commission on the Practice of Democratic Citizenship. By happenstance, by June 10, 2020, massive demonstrations protesting "Dysfunctional Systems," inspired hastening the writing of an essay dealing with the evolutionary process. In particular, the essay, *Unity Counts*, was about halfway drafted. The four sections are titled (1) Now Hear This; (2) An Evolutionary Process; (3) An Educational Innovation; and (4) Analytical Systems and Action. The three subsections to "Now Hear This," are titled (1) Massive Demonstrations; (2) Dysfunctional Systems; and (3) The Voice of the People. Here are the two opening paragraphs:

Unity counts, and so does voting. But that is not enough. It will take a systemic evolution to save our freedom. That evolution may have already started. The first clue is the massive demonstrations. They are an emergent phenomenon

arising in the environment containing the combined impact of the pandemic and the recession.

That deterioration of environment had already disproportionately affected the Black portion of America's population. It was in this environment that the public viewed an outrageous abuse of police power. That injustice led to a needless death inflicted by a police officer who had the suspect under control, handcuffed and on the ground. The police officer, was charged with second-degree murder, having persisted with the stranglehold using his knee for more than eight minutes, while the victim was pleading, "I can't breathe." Three other police officers stood by while the crime by the police officer was being committed; and not one of them attempted to try to save the life of the suspect who was allegedly being murdered.

It was prompted by two presentations written a few years earlier. Both of those are now appendices to what is now the third book of the trilogy. The titles are for Appendix A, *Liberty and Justice for All Some*; and for Appendix B, *Divisiveness in America*. They were written a few years earlier.

It will take more time for a redesign. The opening discussion of the constitutional design mentioned two areas of great advances in philosophy. It may take a third, which we've been calling a *New Age of Enlightenment*, that may have started in the twentieth century. Or it may simply be from a jolt such as the Great Depression from the early 1930s.

Emergence from Chaos. The future is quite uncertain. We have substantial discussion of the history of the Republican Party and its internal revolutions over the last half-century, including The Fourth Republican Revolution. As noted earlier, we are hoping for transition of what was the Grand Old Party (now the Trumpian Republican Party) to what is envisioned as a *Grand New Republican Party* with genuine, enlightened conservative values in the tradition of its origin, and the origins of conservatism.

We will be discussing more about terrorism, foreign and domestic, and the House of Representatives pursuit of the truth as to what

led to the invasion of the Capitol building on January 6, 2021. We will be discussing more the future during 2022, especially as to the significance of the outcomes of the midterm elections.

At this point, the greatest concern for the future of American Democracy in its pursuit of the ideals articulated the Declaration of Independence, in the avoidance of chaos. The problem with chaos is that its emergence is likely to be in the form of a dictatorship. Self-organization is much harder to achieve. Furthermore, it is not easy to keep in the absence of truth or justified trust.

MOST OF THE ADMINISTRATION'S FIRST YEAR

CHAPTER FOUR IF WE KNEW THEN, WHAT WE KNOW NOW

The Paradigm Applied

Lessons Learned or Maybe Not

An Amazingly Brief History. Human beings learn in many ways. As infants, we learn a great deal by imitating. However, we are born with a genetic structure that has evolved over a very long time. It very heavily favors survival and gratification of physical needs. However, over time it develops beyond the genes to include the memes, the imitated patterns of behavior; learned lifestyles.

This learning takes place in highly-diverse cultures. The cultures evolve over time with adaptations that occur from interactions with other cultures. Historically, the development of sovereign states occurred with dominance of a single culture, sometimes with a hierarchal structure headed by royalty achieved by force and endured by inheritance supported by force and/or culture. Sometimes the hierarchal structure evolved headed by religious leaders and endured by faith and designed discipline. Both designs of hierarchal structure placed a great value on conformity.

Then came *The Great American Experiment*, a confederation of thirteen sovereign states that evolved to become what is often called a *constitutional democracy*, but is more accurately described as a *constitutional republic*. It flourished for its two first centuries as a pluralistic society in which the federal government did not prescribe a religion and the source of leadership in the political structure was designed to emerge from the citizens with limited qualifications. That start was with male property owners of age who voted for the leadership in their sovereign states, originally thirteen. Those states organized a federal government under the Constitution. The Constitution started with amendments for the protection of individual rights; and evolved to broaden the electorate.

The diversity that valued pluralism significantly contributed to the American Democracy's leadership in the free world. Pluralism that deals with values have substantial commonality among the

diverse cultures that are represented in the political economy. It is the freedom in representation in the electoral system that provides the foundation for discipline by the electorate to preserve its freedom. That discipline is heavily relied upon a two-party system, sometimes with emergence of an additional party. A one-party system will by its nature destroy the democracy.

An Evolutionary Educational System. Our educational system is antiquated in many respects. According to Matt Ridley, in his book *The Evolution of Everything: How New Ideas Emerge* (2005), he wrote that compulsory, class-based education in preparation for exams “is one of those universal things nobody ever questions.” He traces the idea back to Napoleon’s defeat of Prussia in 1806 that sparked “...compulsory and rigorous education, the purpose of which was mainly to train young men to be obedient soldiers who would not run away in battle. It was these Prussian schools that introduced many of the features we now take for granted.”

It is evolving with games that provide simulations in which the motivated learner will grasp concepts by seeing events emerging from interactions. It is also evolving by the use of case studies that demonstrate examples. It sets up analogies in order to indicate relationships.

Historically, specializations in knowledge that developed disciplines kept delving deeper and branching into disciplines leading to a quip that one could learn more and more about less and less until one knew everything about nothing. The detail, however, became very valuable when it was blended in an interdisciplinary approach.

The silo construction in universities has been moving from multidisciplinary approaches to interdisciplinary approaches. Additionally, models have been shifting from closed models to analyses of evolving systems where relationships change. Forecasting outcomes becomes more difficult because of the changing relationships. What has become very useful is the multiplicity of models which forecast changing weather. The reliability of any single model is limited. However, a multiplicity of models can show a range of options that are feasible. Liars drawing in lines for political purposes is less than helpful.

Considering a number of reasonably potential outcomes is a good step for minimax strategy. That is helpful, especially when tolerance for loss is very little. We discussed that with the use of a minimax strategy.

This treatise by focusing on the pandemic has been explaining in the use of science in dealing with the contagion and potential drastic consequences to the health of individuals and communities. Additionally, we are also starting the development of the understanding of terrorism and public policy. Although we now turn to a start of illustrating the paradigm in action for the pandemic, will also begin consideration for dealing with terrorism, foreign and domestic.

The Paradigm in Action

The paradigm is built upon using the human body as an analogy for dealing with uncertainty in societal issues. The strategy utilizes a minimax approach.

In human biology, the system functions on information and energy. In the societal analogy it also functions on information and energy; however, for our analyses we need to deal with three stages instead of just two (information and energy). Basically, we are looking at knowledge, analytics, and action.

In the framework we are using, knowledge starts with information; but it must be processed for use. Human beings have numerous sensory sources for information inputs. The sensory system gives clues to expectations and the processing of the inputs is influenced by the expectations that may rely heavily on experience. Consider *Moneyball* by Michael Lewis

A contemporary statement is in a book by Michael Lewis, *Moneyball* (2003) ... referring broadly to psychology and economics (really behavioral science) but particularly in the case of the baseball draft decisions... ” There was, for starters, the tendency of everyone who actually played the game to generalize widely from his own experience... Thirdly — but not lastly — there was the bias toward what people saw with their own eyes, or thought that they had seen.”

The processing may also be heavily influenced by emotion. Credulous people may be exploited. Consider the risk of the tyranny of the masses. A very fine quote, relevant to the envisioned role of the senators is from a Virginia DeJohn Anderson's book review of *The Problem of Democracy*). The reviewer reports that John Adams took the position, around the time of the constitutional convention that "...a new national legislature must have a senate with 'illustrious' and well-educated members serving as a counterweight to representatives elected by 'credulous' voters."

Information may be accepted at face value, or may be verified, or otherwise exposed to critical thinking. The result of the processing provides knowledge that is credible, or beliefs that may or may not conform with reality. In the case of believers in the BIG LIE and associated impacts, including not wearing masks and/or not getting a vaccine for COVID-19, unnecessary illness or even premature death has likely resulted for some people.

The behavior that results from the information, however processed, is heavily impacted by morality, or the absence thereof. Between the poles of amorality and commitments to moral behavior, even at the expense of one's own life, there are many stages. Truth and honesty play a big role in this process, as does the priority in value systems. Of particular importance is understanding the role of government, and constitutional protections and restraints.

The behavior that results emerges from a combination of beliefs as to reality (a quality of knowledge) and morality, is a product of a ranking of priorities of individual objectives. These priorities may be related to clusters of various sizes of groups moving to two critical levels beyond the personal or professional realm. The first is the protection provided by a sovereign state as to one's life and property, as well as a variety of interests. Misunderstandings of the relationship between the self and society, especially the rights and obligations in a free society, is currently endangering American Democracy.

The larger scale, in our two-scale analysis, is that of planet earth. Our concern is with an organic system occupied by other human beings. Concern for the others starts with humanitarianism. Additionally, the current pandemic provides a danger of evolution

to new variants more contagious and dangerous than that which we have experienced. There is also the danger of aggression that could make the planet Earth uninhabitable by human beings. Additionally, there are intermediate stages of damage from climate change. In short, human behavior has been endangering the quality of life on planet earth.

In the discussion that follows we utilize the concepts of understanding reality in the sense of knowledge that reflects reality, and caring about others in various dimensions as a matter of morality, and finally the actions that result from one's choices and the choices of others.

In summary, *human beings* may be viewed as a dysfunctional species that is endangering itself because it regarded itself as being at the top of the food chain, and now finds itself providing the protein for a minuscule coronavirus. The audacity of not dealing with reality has consequences.

What We Should Have Known About Pandemics

Knowledge of the System. Starting with the Trump administration, we should have known that it was unwise to reduce the administration's capability for dealing with epidemics. Additionally, we should recognize the extent of the danger of the coronavirus.

Our Centers for Disease Control and Prevention is organized as a research organization with a priority on producing publishable findings to understand the system. That is a useful purpose, but it is not designed to contain the spread of the disease from an administrative perspective. The organizational structure that starts at the local level is capable of assembling the current information as to contagion source through testing and tracing. It is a case of network science.

The Organizational Structure Was Inadequate. The organizational structure of our democracy was to protect us from a tyrant in hierarchal structure. It is not designed to protect from contagious diseases. Furthermore, we should have restructured the system to be able to identify and contain the contagious sources. Instead, the Trump administration politicized the pandemic under

the leadership of a president whose priority was reelection, and not the health and welfare of the nation.

Many Choices of Humans Were Faulty. When it comes to knowledge of the masses as to the essence of a democratic system, there is a significant shortfall in understanding that in a pluralistic society, such as American Democracy, the diversity is an asset. Furthermore, the individual rights claimed in the Declaration of Independence rely on a sovereign government for protection; and that calls for the rule of law. That lack of knowledge by credulous people left many open to exploitation by leadership interested in their power, not the health of the populace.

There is a significant shortfall in the morality of the system. Not only is there a shortfall in individuals caring about other individuals, but there is a shortfall in the elected representatives actually representing the interests of the constituency. The complexity of the system is compounded by the gerrymandering that puts some elected officials in districts so safe that they extort for personal and professional gain to the point that the functioning of a democratic system is impaired to the point where elected representatives focused on power at the expense of the survival of democratic system.

The faulty choices of some of the credulous people have led to their death and the illness of others because of their behavior. For the survivors, their two greatest challenges are in understanding reality and reorganizing for a better representation. In short, it will take a coevolution of the electorate and the elected to improve the quality of knowledge, morality, and actions on planet Earth, but especially on the territory of *The Great Experiment* which made progress for two centuries, but is in danger of survival as a free society.

In short, we did not have adequate information; we did not have appropriate analytics; and we did not take appropriate action. If we knew then what we know now, we could have done better.

Considering that our *now* will in time become the *then*. Whom will you hold responsible?

The Terrorism Wake-Up Call

The Foreign Terrorism on 9/11. The Foreign Terrorism on September 11, 2001 took almost three-thousand American ^[87]

lives with significant destruction of property in New York and Washington, D.C. It was a wake-up call. Within a few days the then President George W. Bush issued an ultimatum to the Taliban regarding access to the perpetrator, a terrorist group called al Qaeda, led by Osama bin Laden. The response was unacceptable, and shortly thereafter the United States, supplemented by military support of NATO, under Article 5, invaded Afghanistan and took control of the country.

The American retaliation was quick and decisive in the reduction of the threat from the al Qaeda; although it took a decade to track down and kill Osama bin Laden. The follow-up action, that evolved in an unrealistic attempt to bring democracy to Afghanistan, was accompanied by a twenty-year war with the Taliban as domestic terrorists, or insurrectionists, in Afghanistan.

That twenty-year war was a strategic failure of the United States. More of that is discussed in this update and its substantial supplemental material, especially in a book that is briefly reviewed in the text that follows.

The Troop Withdrawal from Afghanistan. The Troop withdrawal from Afghanistan in late August of 2021 was an astounding tactical success in light of the collapse of the government of Afghanistan on August 15, 2021. That collapse was accelerated by threats of the Taliban to not only kill the members of the Afghan military forces opposing them, but also their families, according to some reports.

There were substantial criticisms of the failure to get more of the Afghanistan's out that supplied support for the military and humanitarian missions. However, the negotiation for withdrawal was in early 2020 by the then President Donald Trump's representative, directly with the Taliban. The Afghan government that had been created in an effort to build democracy, and operated for the two decades, was not included in the negotiations.

Furthermore, in the efforts to build a democracy the strategy was based upon power without understanding the realities of the nature of the cultures that composed a state with a history of political instability. More this is discussed in the text and references that follow.

The point of all of this is, if we knew then, what we know now things would have turned out differently. A successful strategy could have been conceived.

The fact is that the multiplicity of crises prevailing in the United States today are part of the “then.” That “then” emerged from a power-hungry political party in a plutocracy that was moving towards an autoocracy; that is how obstructing a domestic democratic process winds up with an emergence of domestic terrorism.

It was an arrogant foreign policy of the United States that not only failed in state building of Afghanistan, but compounded the problem fostering additional terrorism, with the attempt of state building in Iraq.

The invasion of Iraq was built upon misinformation and was supported by untruths distributed to the public. It turns out that it fostered disinformation about what was really happening. Then it fostered the development of ISIS because of the internal political situation in Iraq. It was a continuation of the American public not been told the truth about what was really happening in our failed nation building efforts.

About Afghanistan and Terrorism

Understanding the Taliban

Its Origin. Understanding the Taliban starts with knowledge about its origin. It started in the 1980s when a group of Afghanistan students went to Pakistan to study, and blended in with the Pakistani Taliban who subscribed a very strict interpretation of Islamic law, Sharia. That amounts to what we would see as a denomination among other denominations in the Sunni family of denominations as compared to the Shiite family of denominations.

Late in the ten-year war between Afghanistan and the Soviets, the Afghan Taliban fought alongside the mujahideen (<https://www.bing.com/search?q=Mujahideen&filters=sid%3aaa250065-48e1-b52a-4605-d1ab6aea1902&form=ENTLNK>), an array of local rebel forces representing a variety of tribal interests to defeat the Soviet invaders. They were joined by al-Qaeda in 1988.

Its Rise to Power. After the ten-year war (1979-89) with the Soviet invaders, the multitude of Afghanistan societal structures,

including warlords and tribal structures of diverse cultures and faiths, fought among themselves for control of the country. It turned out that the claim of power was so diverse, without a viable option for shared centralized control, that the traditional Afghanistan local powers were not able to resolve the issue.

The Taliban, a substantial and well-organized fighting group, was in 1996 able to defeat the highly-fractionated opposition, and forge what it called the *Islamic Emirate of Afghanistan*. That government survived only until 2001, when the Taliban failed to comply with the ultimatum, regarding al Qaeda, issued by the then United States President, George W. Bush.

The Taliban is organized in a variety of dimensions beyond military. It has a religious structure and the political structure. However, its territorial focus is on Afghanistan and its observance of its interpretation of Sharia Law. That law is strict in observance and punishment. It is not only intrusive, especially to the rights of women, but it is exceptionally cruel in punishment.

Taliban Relationship with al Qaeda. The al Qaeda was organized as a terrorist organization annoyed by the United States for its support of Saudi Arabia. Not only is it against the United States, it had it in for Saudi Arabia as a power play.

The bond between the Taliban and Al Qaeda started with their fighting side-by-side against the Soviets for the independence of Afghanistan from Soviet domination. Afghanistan has a history of failures as a state over the last half-century. A discussion in the essay that was under construction, *Our American Crises in 2021: The Terrorist Contenders; Foreign and Domestic* provides the following list:

- 1) The one in 1973 if you count the end of a 40-year peaceful kingdom;
- 2) the quasi-Communist structure that ended with the Soviet invasion of 1979;
- 3) the end of the war in 1989 with the Soviet defeat and the ensuing localized rivalry without a recognized sovereign state;
- 4) the taking of control by the Taliban in 1996 (and then setting the shortest record);

- 5) with the removal of the Taliban in power until 2001; and
- 6) the return of the Taliban in 2021 with the fall of leadership of the corrupt government fleeing from Afghanistan.

That essay has been superseded by what is now *Appendix B - The Terrorist Contenders: Foreign and Domestic*. It provides substantial additional detail.

The Taliban government of Afghanistan established in August 2021 is seeking global recognition. In its governance during the five years at the turn of the century, as the Islamic Emirate of Afghanistan, it received recognition by only five sovereign states. It does not have an easy road ahead.

We had a strategic failure in our twenty-year war relying on military power without really understanding the systems operating in Afghanistan. During that time, we provided a very poor example of a democracy, and developed a strategy bound to fail.

More Background on the Taliban

When this appendix was originally drafted, for more background on the Taliban, we grew from an essay then under development. It was titled “Our American Crises in 2021: The Terrorist Contenders; Foreign and Domestic.” Part of that essay amounted to a book review. The book’s author is Craig Whitlock of the *Washington Post*. He provided substantial coverage over time.

The flyleaf indicates “The *Washington Post* sued the U.S. government twice to unearth the documents that form the basis of The Afghanistan Papers. The full title is *The Afghanistan Papers: A Secret History of The War*. It is published by Simon & Schuster, with a first edition in August 2021.

The assigned reading for the motivated learner starts with a ten-page forward. From the perspective of the paradigm, we are using for our analyses, in what amounts to a book review. Here is a key quote, “Key Taliban leaders were interested in giving the new system a chance, we didn’t give them a chance.” That was the concluding sentence in the paragraph that started off as follows:

“A major mistake we made was treating the Taliban the same as Al Qaeda,” Barnett Rubin, an American academic

expert on Afghanistan who served as an advisor to the United Nations during the Bonn conference, said in a Lessons Learned interview.

The paragraph quoted for this review appears on page 26. The reference to the “Bonn conference” relates to the first paragraph on that page. That paragraph is as follows:

Attending were two dozen delegates from four different Afghan factions — a mix of warlords, expatriates, monarchists and former Communists — plus their aides and hangers-on. Officials from Iran, Pakistan, Russia, India and other countries in the region also participated.

Now for the third paragraph on that same page. It is as follows:

On December 5, the delegates reached an accord that was hailed as a diplomatic triumph. It named Hamid Karzai as Afghanistan’s interim leader and laid out the process for writing a new constitution and holding national elections. But the Bonn agreement had a fatal flaw that was overlooked at the time: It excluded the Taliban.

There’s a lot more in that chapter titled “*Who Are the Bad Guys?*” The next page makes note of our ignorance of the country. Our readers are urged to at least read that chapter, even though the entire book is being recommended. Delve as deep as you wish, but the case being made in the paradigm advocated is that we, the Americans, are the bad guys. We not only fell short on knowledge, we also fell short on analytics, and action.

That book and another that was not available when this was drafted are discussed in Appendix B. An excerpt from the prologue is in the box that follows.

The second book was ordered at the same time, but delivery was not available until October. It is authored by

Carter Malkasian who was identified on the flyleaf as having been “...Special Assistant for Strategy to Joint Chief of Staff Chairman General Joseph Dunford in 2015 to 2019. He has extensive experience working in Afghanistan through multiple deployments throughout the country...”

The book is titled *The American War in Afghanistan: A History*. The opening paragraph of the flyleaf is as follows: “The American war in Afghanistan, which began in 2001, is now the longest armed conflict in the nation’s history.” The flyleaf contains additional information about the author.

About Terrorism

There is a lot that we should have known about terrorism, especially as it relates to Afghanistan, Taliban, al Qaeda, and al Qaeda’s terrorist rival, ISIS. The 9/11 attack on American soil was by al Qaeda that happened to be headquartered in Afghanistan, having been ousted from their previous location.

Here is an excerpt from the previously cited item (*Our American Crises in 2021: The Terrorist Contenders; Foreign and Domestic*).

As discussed in the appendix (written in 2004) to this editorial,

The war on terrorism [the endnote for defining terrorism is linked] may turn out to be the longest war in the history of civilization. If that happens, it will be attributed to two factors. First, it is a different kind of war. Second, our strategy for fighting it was not well suited to dealing with the underlying causes.

The Concept of War

Since terrorism is a tool of war, some clarification may be needed as to whether the war is against those who use the tool, the terrorists, or the use of the tool, as in the war against drugs or crime.

A great deal of information is essential in order to understand the development of an appropriate strategy for

dealing with both those who use the tool, or use terrorism to achieve their objectives. This article, as an opinion piece, will go beyond the series of historical facts and focus on understanding process and structure. We are interested in presenting the story of how the external threats to our democracy evolved, and place them in the context of the evolution of our domestic terrorism and the tribalism that is cancerous to our society.

About Our Twenty Years in Afghanistan

What We Should Have Done

Assembled Knowledge. We should have assembled knowledge of the problem. Problems may be defined in many ways, including components in various stages of the evolution of the system. The most obvious set of components included the following: (1) our intelligence systems had not revealed the forthcoming 9/11 attack; (2) the terrorist attacker was identified as the al Qaeda, and their locational host (the Taliban of Afghanistan) were not willing cooperators for our taking what we saw as an appropriate action.

We also needed knowledge of the environment and potential reactions to responses that we might take. Essentially, we received some strong sensory information, and the processes of it in the context of the way we thought about things, and how we operate.

As the most powerful nation on Earth, with an exceptional military capability, our thinking apparently went along the lines of our being the good guys, they are the bad guys. We can go there and take them out. We responded within days

Consider the strategy shift for dealing with the pandemic. Conditions had changed, and the containment of terrorism against us that shifted to our domestic assets as well as our foreign assets. We need to protect ourselves by eliminating the form threat on our soil, so we were going to disable the capability. Since the Afghan government of the Taliban did not respond favorably to the ultramodern, we were going to go in to their territory and eliminate and/or disable the capability of al Qaeda, or at least the deter further terrorist acts.

Analyzed Potential Outcomes. The first stage in dealing with the problem moved very quickly with the utilization of the NATO agreement of Article 5, an attack on one is an attack on all. So with support from our allies, we were able to defeat the uncooperative Taliban government and significantly damaged the al Qaeda capability. Osama bin Laden escaped to Pakistan. Although it took about a decade, American forces found and killed him.

In the meantime, we switched strategy from destroying the terrorist capability to trying to build democracy in a culture that did not have the capability essential for a successful democracy.

What Might Have Evolved

What might have evolved is highly uncertain. What is clear is that a *good guy* versus *bad guy* approach does not work unless there is a community agreement as to what constitutes being a *good guy*. In Afghanistan there has over the last half-century been a diversity of cultures in a multiplicity of local structures in which each of the local structures considers itself the *good guy*.

Had the George W. Bush administration really believed in pluralism and democracy, and really understood what it takes for the system to operate, it would have known that democracy was not feasible for Afghanistan at that time. The forty-year kingdom had apparently run its course and adopted a very loose centralized government with a semblance of Communist structure. The Soviet Union wanted to centralize with greater national power and invaded the country. It lost a ten-year war, in some measure because democratic societies provided some support in addition to support by the Taliban and al Qaeda.

The diversity of local cultures united against the Soviet invaders, but not against the Taliban. The self-organization against a domestic group did not rise to the level of commonality of interest against a foreign invader. When the Taliban was defeated and a provisional government was established, the Taliban, the defeated “bad guys,” should have been considered as participants in a form of a confederation with constitutional protections for the diversity of local governments.

There was a very limited role for centralized government. The United States should have learned from the dissatisfaction of the Soviets with a quasi-Communist structure, that a strong central government was not in the cards

The strong central government was not in the cards for a diversity of cultures. It is not clear whether or not a confederation would have been workable. There was very little that the local administrations would look to a national government for. It was clear that they would unite for the common defense, which is what they did when the Soviet Union tried to exert the power for greater centralized control.

The United States started with an example of the Confederation that opposed a despotic king. It took about a decade to unite with delegated authority to a central government for the common defense and foreign policy. The Constitution provided for other delegated authority with the first ten constitutional amendments providing a Bill of Rights for the individuals. Other adjustments followed.

Declaration Era Educational Press (DEEP) has substantial material indicating that the Republican Party had for at least a couple of decades been on a route for concentration of power at the expense of democracy. The box that follows contains an excerpt from the trilogy's BOOK ONE, *Common Sense Revisited: America's Third Revolution*.

...This from Heather Boushey's comments in reviewing Nancy MacLean's book, *Democracy in Chains: The Deep History of the Radical Right's Stealth Plan for America* [New York Times book review of August 20, 2017]. She wrote the following: "With this book MacLean joins the growing chorus of scholars and journalists documenting systematic, organized effort to undermine democracy and change the rules." She concludes the paragraph by 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."

Boushey, earlier in the review, wrote “So Buchanan came to a radical conclusion: Majority rule was an economic problem. ‘Despotism,’ he declared in his 1975 book, ‘*The Limits of Liberty*,’ ‘may be the only organizational alternative to the political structure that we observe.’” The reviewer continues in the next paragraph with “Buchanan therefore argued for ‘curbing the appetites of the majority coalitions’ by establishing ironclad rules that would curb their power.” [See endnotes pages 162-4]

A further discussion of the concentration of power at the expense of democracy is provided by the following link to an excerpt from Excerpts from Appendix 1 D - Adapt to Change a Reality the trilogy’s first book, ***Common Sense Revisited: America’s Third Revolution***.

It appears that Republican-led American Democracy had a view of political power in a democratic system that was not feasible for Afghanistan. We were not the good guys going in to save the country with a feasible plan for that country. We were just another bad guy invading their territory. More about that is in Appendix B.

MOST OF THE ADMINISTRATION'S FIRST YEAR

CHAPTER FIVE SAVING THE GREAT EXPERIMENT

The Attack on Pluralism

The Erosion of Norms

Pluralism is critical in dealing with the common interests of a free society. A case in point is that the denial of pluralism has gone beyond the bounds of decency in the pursuit of power; having placed party above country in the pursuit of personal interests in possessing power.

There are legitimate differences in values among segments of our society, and the choices of processes for pursuit of one's interests. The Constitution was designed to prevent the abuse of power by a tyrant, but the system has been gamed **undermining the integrity of the system to the extent that the survival of American Democracy is in danger.**

“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.” The box that follows is an excerpt from the excerpt posted in the *Addendum*: provided for Appendix A of this booklet.

From BOOK ONE -

Common Sense Revisited: America's Third Revolution

Appendix 1E -

The Integrity of American Democracy Undermined

[Excerpted from the opening section starting on page 269.]

THE INTEGRITY OF AMERICAN DEMOCRACY UNDERMINED

The Erosion of Norms in the Elected Political Leadership

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 denial of pluralism has fostered tribalism that has extended to impeding the general welfare, including the health issue of dealing with pandemics. The misuse of the concept of individual rights to override governmental authority for the common good is a vestigial remnant of the Trump administration.

The Time Horizon

Ways to Tell a Story. As discussed earlier, “A story may be told in many different ways.” It goes beyond feelings and reasoning as experienced in the short run; it goes to context in the long run.

That long-run context can best be understood relative to an evolutionary process that is built upon the history that led to the current condition. It is not simply a blame game, it is the understanding of how organic systems evolve. That evolution has a great deal to do with what was not done to prevent the problem, or crisis, so that did not occur. It also has to do with what was done when it did occur. Most importantly, it has to do with the health of the organic system to be able to deal with the problem.

This appendix is utilizing the COVID-19 pandemic to illustrate the analytical process that can improve outcomes. In the case at hand, in assessing the progress of the Biden administration during most of its first year, we need to consider what happened in the previous administration. As discussed, the previous administration left office with a disgraceful performance in not lessening the great damage from the pandemic, and with the exception of getting a vaccine developed, a miserable performance in handling it. Furthermore, it damaged the organic system of our democracy by politicizing the health of the population.

Even with that handicap of the remnants of the previous administration, the Biden administration immediately started to deal with the issue, based on the then-current conditions. When those conditions evolved, especially with the Delta variant, the strategic approach was revised. We have some discussions of the program including the mandates, especially with the OSHA regulations that take effect January 4, 2022.

There are lawsuits emanating in 27 states that are challenging the OSHA regulations. It is a remnant of the politicization of the

pandemic. It is reasonable to expect that sometime in the latter part of 2022, the pandemic will evolve to become an endemic. The short-term mandate fatigue, and the long-term economic recovery process already accelerated political pressures. It remains to be seen how the midterm elections will unfold. Historically, the congressional representative changes favor the party losing the presidential election.

Although this appendix has also started a discussion of the exit from our longest war, twenty years in Afghanistan, this website's major analysis of that case is provided in Appendix B. The shortest summary is that the war was a strategic failure, and getting our troops out was a tactical success. However, the short-term political consequences of the chaotic exit may adversely affect the long-term benefits of ending the war. It is uncertain what will evolve from the divisiveness in the Democratic Party.

The November Developments. On the whole, the nationwide results of the off-year election were a wake-up call for the Democratic Party. Beyond the divisiveness that had developed between the two major political parties, there was a divisiveness within the Democratic Party. The political necessity of pairing two historic proposals for building back better led to disastrous results for the Democratic Party on the November 2, 2021 elections.

Fortunately, it only took a few days to get done what would have been wiser to do months earlier; pass the *Invest in America Act* (H.R.3684). That infrastructure bill was held up by the Progressive Caucus in the House of Representatives in the effort to tie it with a closely-related support bill designed to strengthen the social structure, as a companion to the physical structure.

It is too soon to tell how the long term will be impacted by the divisiveness in a political party that has razor thin margins for legislative action; especially faced with an opposition party designed to pursue power, even at the risk of endangering the health of our democracy, *The Great Experiment*. However, in the spring of next year, we will be updating the discussion of the discussion of the administration's progress in pursuit of its agenda. We will do so in the context of developing the analytical system that is able to delve deep enough to take a time horizon that is essential for making

choices to better pursue the health of our society, with particular attention to individual rights.

In the meantime, we have some more to say about the denial of pluralism and the health of the political economy. We do so by utilizing the pandemic as a case study. This is in the context of the structural changes in the environmental conditions related to the pandemic. It relates to the appropriate use of executive authority to press ahead in facilitating improving the quality of life that was being impaired as a result of political motivations of the previous administration in its pursuit of power. This is presented in the context of legislative performance, as well as structural changes in the environment of the political economy.

Legislative Performance

Executive Authority. Executive authority has been *de facto* on the rise with a substantial deterioration of legislative performance of Congress in its responsibilities. Division within the parties, as well as division between the parties, has obstructed the legislative process.

The representative system is dysfunctional beyond gerrymandering and drastic disproportionate voter population representation in the Senate. Some legislative representatives in the House of Representatives have demonstrated incredible behavior in the form of failure to observe traditional norms. Some of them are so secure in their districts that the process facilitates obstructionism and incredible behavior denying pluralism. The Select Committee may obtain some information relative to some of the representatives facilitating the attack on the Capitol.

The involvement of the elected representatives facilitating the insurrection is a key element in the development and enforcement of standards of behavior of members of the legislative body. Additionally, the House of Representatives, on November 17, 2021, censured Congressman Paul Gosar for his posting a video on his social media account with a cartoon depicting violence against fellow Representative Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez. The rise of violence is a significant

element in the use of domestic terrorism as a threat to the survival of our democracy.

Two major legislative proposals have not made progress in the Senate. The voting rights bill and the proposed regulation of police behavior. However, the administration has pursued some administrative action in dealing with chokeholds and no-knock warrants. The future use of the filibuster is still uncertain.

As discussed earlier, “When Joe Biden was elected president, his first action after his inauguration was an executive order to mitigate damage to the health of Americans.” Then, seven-and-a-half months later, “On September 9, 2021 President Biden delivered a speech in which he announced a shift in strategy for dealing with the pandemic.

As part of the plan, the United States Department of Labor’s OSHA (Occupational Safety and Health Administration) authorities were used to require companies with 100 or more employees to be vaccinated, or be tested weekly; effective January 4, 2022. As was noted earlier, “There are lawsuits emanating in 27 states that are challenging the OSHA regulations.” It is a remnant of the politicization of the pandemic.

The excessive behavior of Donald Trump as president led to two impeachments, but no convictions in the Senate. It led to the formation of a Select Committee, within the House of Representatives, investigating the attack on the Capitol building that interrupted the joint session of Congress tallying the votes from the Electoral College.

The Select Committee has started the process of issuing subpoenas. So far, it initiated criminal charges to at least one recipient who has been indicted by a grand jury; and the Department of Justice is proceeding with its normal routines. The legal processes take time.

At risk is delays beyond the midterm elections, generating a Republican majority in the House of Representatives that would eliminate the Select Committee in its pursuit of the truth of what led to the attack on Congress. That attack jeopardized the lives of the elected representatives, especially the then-vice president, Mike Pence.

The strategy of delay using judicial procedures denies testimony and documents to be used in arriving at the truth of what led to the attack on the Capitol on January 6, 2021. Under the circumstances, President Joe Biden has not invoked executive privilege that would obstruct obtaining documents relative to discovering the truth of what led to the insurrection that disrupted the peaceful transfer of power called for by the constitutional process.

If a sufficient number of Republican-elected congressional representatives were interested in finding out the truth, there would have been a bipartisan commission design similar to the commission design for getting to the roots of the 9/11 terrorist attack in New York city and Washington, D.C.

Bipartisan Cooperation. The key bipartisan cooperation was on the infrastructure bill in the Senate where nineteen Republicans supported the legislation, even though their top priority appears to be focused on defeating the Democrats in the midterm elections. The decades of falling behind in federal provision of infrastructure provided a major exception to the Republican strategy of obstructionism.

As will be discussed, the message from the electorate on November 2, 2021 was the loss of congressional progress on the build-back-better agenda. Finally, within a few days of the Democratic Party's losses, it passed the *Invest in America Act* (H.R.3684). Although six of the progressives did not support it, there were 13 Republicans who broke ranks from their fellow Republicans to vote for the bill. Those Republicans who run for reelection are likely to be primaried. Some of their elected colleagues called them traitors.

Six of the far-left progressives did not support the bill; generally, from safe districts. That was more than offset by 13 Republicans who voted for the bill. Representative Marjorie Taylor Greene, from a safe Republican district in Georgia, was quick to criticize those Republicans voted with the Democrats, as were some of her colleagues.

The case may be made that the far left as well as the far right have a potential for an extremism that could

endanger the democratic process. This is in the context of the pluralism issue.

As will be discussed, the Democrats would do well to facilitate the development of a *Grand New Republican Party* so that there would be a conservative party that would work across the aisle. Otherwise, the Trumpian Republican Party may simply erode to become isolated terrorists and moderate Republicans along with enlightened conservatives would join moderate Democrats. The second party of the two-party system could evolve to be progressives.

That would work unless progressives went too far left and become obstructionists, and resorted to terrorism. Violence has been increasing nationally, and terrorism on either side is a danger to democracy. More will be discussed in Appendix B - *The Terrorist Contenders: Foreign and Domestic*. We will learn more about the relationship of Trumpism to the January 6, 2021 insurrection, and the identification of domestic terrorist organizations.

Hopefully, there are still some issues in which Republicans in the House and the Senate will participate with the Democrats, even though the issue is part of the agenda of the Democrats. Issues such as the infrastructure are so important to the constituents of some representatives in the House and Senate, that the elected representatives voted in the interests of their constituents, and not simply in terms of their own political ambitions, and concern about hostility from Donald Trump. The erosion of the Republican Party's use of platforms in favor of treating the opposition as an enemy instead of a rival is a big issue that will impact the future of the Republican Party.

Legislative Profile. With the exception of the results of the 2018 midterm elections, and some successes for the Democrats in the 2020 elections, the democratic process has not had a significant movement of profile of members of the House of Representatives moving in the direction of the profile of the electorate. The current profile has emboldened the

progressives, but the majority of the Democrats is so slim in the House of Representatives, that when coupled with the split in the Senate, legislative progress has been very difficult. It is not simply platform issues. It is the priority of the Republican leadership pursuing power with a primary objective of defeating the opposition rather than improving the quality of life for the majority of their constituents.

The Republican leadership has developed a strategy that treats its fear of the changing profile of the electorate by developing tribalism and altering the electoral process to deter voting by the opposition through the misuse of regulations. In its first hundred years it made great sporadic progress with a focus on equality of opportunity in its rivalry with property issues. In the last half-century, it has undergone a series of internal revolutions transitioning through a plutocracy on a road to autocracy. As will be discussed, it was aided by a strategic error of the Democratic Party that started a half century ago.

The nation's results from the off-year election of November 2, 2021 sounded an alarm for the Democratic Party. The Infrastructure Bill could have been passed in August had the progressives not insisted on pairing it with the bill having an array of well-needed related programs. Then, in September the Senate passed an infrastructure bill that had bipartisan support, and the House of Representatives had another chance in October.

A strategic shift is underway in the Democratic Party. The need for a better communication of proposed legislative content is obvious; but there are more fundamental elements of evolutionary changes that relate to our discussion of *If We Knew Then What We Know Now*.

It is also time for the Republican Party to consider a discussion of *If We Knew Then What We Know Now*. So far, in the twenty-first century, the Republican Party has been destroying its future as a conservative party providing a balance to a liberal party where the combination had for two centuries made progress towards the ideals articulated in the Declaration of Independence.

Some Environmental Impact Errors

A Strategic Error Decades Ago

Somehow, the trilogy's first book, *Common Sense Revisited: America's Third Revolution*, loosely referred to as BOOK ONE, has a chapter that provides a historical perspective. It was written in 2018, triggered by the so-called Tax Reform Act, passed in December 2017.

BOOK ONE was designed to raise the level of consciousness of motivated learners as to what was unfolding, and to lead to the other two books of the trilogy: *Perspectives for A Sense of Place: Voter Empowerment*; and *American Democracy: The Declaration, Pursuit, and Endangerment*. Those two books are loosely referred to as BOOK TWO and BOOK THREE.

BOOK ONE reports on **the strategic error of the Democrats at the beginning of the information revolution that had a dramatic impact on what evolved over the next half century.** The box that follows contains two excerpts from **Chapter 3 - A Historical Perspective.**

In order to accommodate our purpose in presentation, the two excerpts are provided in a reverse sequence.

The Twentieth Century's Fourth-Quarter. The tapering of growth, in the fourth quarter of the twentieth century, is a loose categorization that marks the time after the fourth quarter of the hundred years between 1870 to 1970, as discussed by Robert J. Gordon in his book, *The Rise and Fall of American Growth*. The thrust of his message is in a paragraph on the second page of his Postscript (what amounted to his provision of an additional chapter beyond the basic structure of his book).

That postscript starts with the sentence, "The timing of the stream of innovations before and after 1970 is the fundamental cause of the rise and fall of American growth." He continues with, "In recent years, further downward pressure on the growth has emerged from the four headwinds that are slowly strangling the American growth engine."

Then, in the same paragraph he summarizes his concluding chapter, which is titled “Inequality and the Other Headwinds: Long-Run American Economic Growth Slows to a Crawl.”... [BOOK ONE, p. 63].

The Twentieth Century’s Third-Quarter. The twentieth century’s third-quarter is being loosely used for the quarter of a century between the end of World War II late in 1945 and 1970. That period of time is significant because it was the last quarter of a century in the context of great economic growth generated by the Industrial Revolution, but occurring before the Information Revolution.

The structural transformation that occurred along with the suburbanization of America went well beyond the boom in housing construction and the great increase in productivity associated with the production of consumer goods for households with increasing income and wealth. It went to public policy that led in fear of another depression. In a sense, the federal government passed legislation intending to outlaw depression. The text of the Employment Act of 1946 included the statement that it was the “continuing policy and responsibility” of the federal government to “coordinate and utilize all its plans, functions, and resources... to foster and promote free competitive enterprise and the general welfare; conditions under which there will be afforded useful employment for those able, willing, and seeking to work; and to promote maximum employment, production, and purchasing power. The Employment Act of 1946 was signed into law by President Harry S. Truman in February 1946 having been passed by the Senate late in September 1945 followed by version in the House of Representatives and a reconciliation by committee....

What follows is another excerpt from the same chapter. It addresses “**The error of the Democrats at the beginning of the information revolution...**”

Returning to Political Evolution. Returning to political evolution, but now in the twentieth 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 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*]....

...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." See BOOK ONE, pages 63-4.]

The web copy has links to that section and chapters. For hard copy, the Part III Addendum contains a continuous segment from BOOK ONE's third chapter starting with the section titled, *Skipping to the Twentieth Century*. The excerpt runs from page 61 though page 65 of the print copy.

Context for Some Recent Errors

Social Sciences. The context for some recent errors continues to be in societal transitions where the social sciences have lagged so far behind the physical sciences that the decisions in the political economy did not do as well in improving outcomes as do decisions in the physical sciences. It has to do with methodology; sometimes referred to as physics envy, referring to physics having an experimental capability more powerful probing to understand linear relationships. The social sciences deal with organic systems that contain nonlinear relationships that are not amenable to closed models doing well in forecasting outcomes. The *Long-Term Capital Management* debacle is the case in point.

Unfortunately, the statistical models that are generally used are built upon past relationships, but the relationships have been changing so that the linear analyses used for closed models just don't work. Ask investors in Long-Term Capital Management that relied on a couple of Nobel Prize winners for their understanding of the system in which they could make a fortune for a period of time, until the environmental structure changed beyond expectation.

They made a lot of money for a period of time, then the losses were so great the federal government stepped in to lessen the consequences to the economy of the failure of the enterprise.

More discussion of the differences in methodology and models is presented later. Our concern now is on shortfalls of systemic

understanding of how the changing environment has set the context for more recent errors. Our focus is on the pairing of two major pieces of legislation by the majority party, with very thin legislative margins.

Voter Attitude. Voter attitude at the margin is especially important in an environment in which margins in the legislature are very thin. Failure to deliver endangers reelection. This will be discussed shortly.

The problem is further intensified if the minority party is dominated by leaders who pursue political power at almost any cost. They are endangering our freedom, especially if they retaliate when their legislative members cross party lines in the interests of their constituency.

Our concern is with choices made based upon various gradations of morality, as well as the depth of understanding of likely outcomes. This applies to both political parties and is relevant to behavior considering the interests of the nation, the party, the constituency, and the political representative.

The recession from the pandemic was deep, but the recovery started quickly. In the Great Depression it took a long time for the recovery; and **the voting public was tolerant of dramatic changes.** The situation is different now because recovery is underway, but there are still barriers to return to a new normal, including the concern about inflation.

The monumental program changes that occurred in the recovery from the Great Depression occurred because there was a great **unity for change.** The recovery from the pandemic was significantly impaired because the previous administration had politicized the pandemic.

Time Tradeoffs. The public tends to focus on how they feel in the short run at the expense of trade-offs for their long-term interests. The shift from what was considered normal to a pandemic has imposed unwelcomed changes. There has not been a general acceptance that the pandemic is generating a shift to an unwelcome endemic, an ongoing impact of the coronavirus. It is not only that the changed structure is impacting some desired norms, it is the painful process of transition.

These changes are happening so rapidly that it is a great challenge to stay current with discussions of unfolding events. So, we went ahead with a preliminary posting of Part III of this appendix in early November, and we are now providing an updated version, hopefully within a month. However, there is enough information to indicate that the new normal will involve a structural change. Thus, our intent is to shed light on understanding short-term choices in a long-term context of progress related to structural change.

We are doing this in context of using our societal behavior in dealing with the pandemic to facilitate a better understanding of how errors have been made, and are being made, not only by the government (including administrative units as well as elected parties), also the voting public.

We are about to discuss the rising threat of inflation, including its current bulge, not only from the money supply but also the shortage of available goods. Additionally, we will be discussing related budget deficits. In so doing, we need to consider the context of the institutional arrangements, especially the elements of trust and behavior at all levels of the system.

The line of reasoning starts with choices that individuals make. In the COVID-19 case, choices made obviously affected the individuals becoming a victim of the pandemic because of their choices as individual persons. Their choices also impact their passing on the virus, whether they suffer from it or not. This danger to others expands beyond the individual damage, to become a damage to the societal structure. Add to this, the role of the social media vehicle for misinformation and disinformation. With that in the context of legislators exploiting the public for their own political interests, this is only part of the dysfunctional system.

The system is not designed for healthcare; and the United States is a rare example of a democratic society not having a national healthcare program capable of unified control. The system was designed to protect from tyranny, not from pandemics. There is more, and aside from our discussion in this appendix, the reader is referred to the outstanding article by Zeynep Türeci, *Can We Learn From Failure?* It is on pages 4-5 of the November 21, 2021 *New York Times*, Sunday Review Section.

The Grand Old Party. From a historic perspective, the Republican Party in its first century had a tension between the pursuit of equality of opportunity and property rights. In its recent half century, it has had a series of internal revolutions taking it away from pursuit of the conservative ideals. At issue is whether it will continue through its pursuit of a plutocracy on to autocracy, or whether it will reform as a Grand New Republican Party with conservative ideals in pursuit of equality of opportunity with the morality of respect for tradition.

As noted with regard to the change of legislative profile in the 2018 midterm elections in the House of Representatives, there was a significant move towards the correspondence in profiles of the elected representatives to that of the population at large. The Republican Party leadership appears to have a strategy of restricting immigration so as to preserve what remains of what was the dominance of a Caucasian European electorate, and to impose at the state level voting regulations that would suppress the changing reality of the growing electorate.

Such a strategy would work for a while. It takes the country on the road to become an autocracy, without a peaceful transfer of elected authority of the president. It is a further distortion the representative profiles relative to the electorate. That appears to be the route being pursued by the Trumpian Republican Party.

The box that follows provides some background to the emergence of a variety of widely quoted poems that would be of some guidance to Republicans who would like to preserve their freedom.

The item posted, “First they came...” By Martin Niemoller was posted by R.T. Smith, who is identified on the posting: “First they came...” by Martin Niemoller - Shenandoah (shenandoahliterary.org)

First they came for the Socialists, and I did not
speak out —
Because I was not a Socialist.
Then they came for the Trade Unionists, and I did not
speak out —

Because I was not a Trade Unionist.
Then they came for the Jews, and I did not speak out —
Because I was not a Jew.
Then they came for me — and there was no one left to
speak for me.

R.T. Smith provides the following information about the author.

“The author was a Lutheran pastor and theologian born in Germany in 1892. This quotation and many variations of it appeared in his public addresses in the 1930’s, and in the 50’s people began to line it out as poetry, which further boosted its popularity.”

The structural changes in the Republican Party in the direction of an autocracy proceeded with the use of identity being capitalized on by the leadership for their own purposes, not for the benefit of their populist followers. The key sentence from the Ezra Klein book, *Why We’re Polarized* is as follows: “a theme of this book has been that we, as individuals, aren’t just responsible for changing the political system; we are also being changed by it. [Page 261.] Klein goes on to polarization and manipulation, and “...a few ways we can change our relationship to politics that can be both healthier for us and our country: identity mindfulness and rediscovering a politics of place.”

The [movement of change in the Republican Party for its fifth revolution](#) started when long-time Republicans began leaving the party because of Trumpism. That included the elected representatives and noted conservative authors as well as some rank-and-file. However, the core of the base was strengthened because of the feelings that they had that was serving their felt needs; not necessary their long-term interest.

The convictions of assailants on the Capitol building have started, and there are signals that there will be an erosion of believers in the BIG LIE of a stolen election. It is still too soon to assess the pace of enlightenment of the voters.

There is a trend in the lines being crossed as the amoral behavior is being increased by fealty towards Donald Trump. The great uncertainties include the erosion of his base, the battle for his base without him, and the potential of rival Republican candidates for the 2024 presidential election.

There is also some hope with the beginning of the bipartisan legislation, but it is a process that will take time. The potential is for the development of a Grand New Republican Party. The question is how slow the voters, as learners, actually learn about their long-term interests and living in a free society, and how long it will take to replace the leaders who are either short of morality or knowledge, or both. That structural change will take time if it actually unfolds. If it doesn't, one direction is an autoocracy; the other direction is an isolation of Trumpism and extremists who fall into the classification of domestic terrorists.

It is time to decide, do you want to live in a free society?

Twenty-First Century's Third Decade

This Is The Then

This is the then of what will emerge. It is also time to make choices.

There are different ways to tell the story of what happened for most of the new administration's first year. Thomas Kuhn tells of how a physicist and the chemist looking at the same phenomenon can come up with different analytics and explanations of what happened. This presentation is using an interdisciplinary approach, including nascent disciplines, dealing with the evolutionary process and changing structure of our society.

The perspective taken is the pursuit of the ideals articulated in the Declaration of Independence in the context of the survival of *The Great American Experiment*, a republic built upon pluralism with constitutional protection for individual rights and equity in representation of the electorate in the emergence of public policy.

It is about societal evolution providing an equality of opportunity in a free society. We are in the early stages of what has the potential of becoming a New Age of Enlightenment that blends humanities with the sciences. Stay tuned!

The Timing of Events

This appendix, *Strategic Guidance Towards Improving Outcomes*, that also serves as a standalone item on DEEP is integrating nascent disciplines into traditional analytics dealing with complex adaptive systems. It provides periodic reporting and analytics of unfolding events focused on events in a four-year presidential term generating what could be a potential emergence of a New Age of Enlightenment.

The generic uncertainty in analytics about the future in complex adaptive systems is exemplified by weather forecasts that can be reasonably accurate in relatively short-term time dimensions, especially with multiple models that are synthesized. The longer the time horizon, the less likely the accuracy of the forecasts.

We are using a decade for this appendix because it will include two more presidential elections. They will be critical for the survival of *The Great American Experiment*, a republic built upon pluralism with constitutional protection for individual rights and equity in representation of the electorate in the emergence of public policy.

It is not intended as a comprehensive review. Rather, is an exploration of an educational innovation that just happened to pick an exceptional issue at an early stage. It is nonpartisan and part of an attempt to build an interdisciplinary team that can enhance improving outcomes in a free society, especially by improving education of the electorate and the elected.

For our current discussion we are focusing on four critical topics: The Pandemic and its Evolution; The 2020 Presidential Election; Foreign and Domestic Terrorism; and The Build Back Better Program.

The Pandemic and Its Evolution. The twenty-first century's third decade, starting in 2020 with the pandemic, provided a candidate for having the doubtful honor of being the nation's leading crisis for the decade.

Timing of events in the third decade of the twenty-first century is altering the structural change in many dimensions. As a start, there was a pandemic early that started in the year 2020, for which the nation was ill-prepared. It occurred at a

time in which it appeared that the then president was more concerned about his reelection than the health of the American public. As a result, he misinformed the American public and politicized the federal response.

Fortunately, the then president Donald Trump, facilitated the rapid development of vaccines. Unfortunately, the vestigial remnants of misinformation and the rise of disinformation generated the second pandemic in the states with lesser vaccination rates; the pandemic of the unvaccinated. Then, other unfolding events led to the new administration shift in strategy. That is discussed in this Part Three opening section, *Strategic Shift Announced for the Pandemic*, in its first subsection, *A Strategic Approach Announcement*. It uses the pandemic to provide an analogical example for dealing with other crises impacting our quality of life.

There is further discussion of the pandemic in this third part's second section, *If We Knew Then, What We Know Now*. It starts with knowledge of the system, moves to organizing, and closes with human choices. That is the basic analytical message. The high point, however, is understanding that as conditions change, strategy needs to adapt. That is dealt with the discussion of the president's September 9 announcement of a shift in the strategy.

The 2020 Presidential Election. Since this appendix is about strategy and analytics for improving strategies to improve outcomes, it is useful to consider strategies of others in the networks from which the outcomes emerge. Understanding the strategy underlying behavior of Donald Trump is relevant for dealing with a multiplicity of crises being faced by the nation today and during the rest of the decade.

As it happens, the second section of *Strategic Shift Announced for the Pandemic* is titled *The Essence of Strategy*. It contains an excerpt from an Appendix B in progress that covers two topics; (1) Many Ways to Tell a Story; and (2) Our Concern Here.

From the original draft, here is a marked-up excerpt of the excerpt.

Many Ways to Tell a Story

A story may be told in many different ways. The listener senses incoming information in many ways. It is dealt with by feelings as well as reasoning.

The teller may intend to convey truth. Alternatively, the intent may have little regard for truth [1 - Social Media Exploits]; and seek to exploit the listener for a variety of motives. In any case, the listener would do well to exercise critical thinking in making choices. The quality of outcomes is heavily dependent on the integrity of the process.

Our American Democracy is facing multiple crises. We are going to use at least one of them in analogies as a means to show how stories are told and impacts on the quality of outcomes. When Donald Trump was president, he intentionally misled the American public on COVID-19 matters because his priority was reelection; the result was excessive damage to the health of the American public. When he negotiated with the Taliban for a withdrawal of American troops, he was again prioritizing his reelection and neglected an assurance of protection of our allies, Afghans who helped us in our assistance in the twenty-year war.

Morality is a significant issue in survival of states, especially on matters of corruption. Part of the failure of Afghanistan to survive as a state, after the last two decades of aid, was corruption by the government. Corruption is a cancer as are some other shortfalls in morality. The shortfall in former president Donald Trump's morality was cancerous, not only with regard to the COVID-19 pandemic, but also to the agreements he made with the then Afghanistan government.

As to our concern, the multiplicity of crises has in varying degrees relationships to the former president unwilling to commit to a peaceful transfer of power. More of that will unfold when the Select Committee of the House of Representatives has its report on the invasion of the Capitol building on January 6, 2021. It all has to

do with the BIG LIE, and a variety of events unfolding related to Donald Trump seeking the presidency in 2024.

Foreign and Domestic Terrorism. The start of the second section, *If We Knew Then, What We Know Now*, provides a second example of the paradigm application. The foreign part is dealt with in two stages. The first stage may be summarized in a few sentences excerpted from *The Terrorism Wake-Up Call* (located in *The Paradigm in Action* subsection of *The Paradigm in Action*) *If We Knew Then, What We Know Now*. They are as follows:

The Foreign Terrorism on September 11, 2001 ... was a wake-up call. Within a few days the then President George W. Bush issued an ultimatum to the Taliban regarding access to the perpetrator, a terrorist group called al Qaeda, led by Osama bin Laden...

The American retaliation was quick and decisive in the reduction of threat from the al Qaeda; although it took a decade to track down and kill Osama bin Laden.

The second stage may be summarized by the failure of a strategy to build a democracy where it was unfeasible, but the success was in the tactical solution for withdrawing the troops after a longest war; one that lasted twenty years. That withdrawal took place at the end of August, 2021.

The domestic terrorism is marked by the January 6, 2021 assault on the Capitol building in an attempt to disrupt the joint session of the legislative branch pursuing their constitutional responsibility.

The discussion of terrorism in this appendix is brief. An Appendix B is under development. It already has substantial material about the Afghanistan case, but is awaiting the Select Committee report of the House of Representatives that is pursuing the use subpoenas in its search for truth.

The preceding brief recap of a selection of unfolding events during most of the first year of the new administration's activities takes us to two key components of the Build Back Better program.

The Build Back Better Program. The two key components of the Build Back Better program amount to a dramatic change in public

investment. The first part, the infrastructure bill, was negotiated by a small bipartisan team in the Senate, five members from each side of the aisle. It was passed in the Senate with nineteen Republicans joining fifty Democrats.

Approval in the House of Representatives was delayed because of the Democrat strategy of pairing it with a bill dealing with the human resource component of building back better, as compared to roads, bridges, and other physical assets that the Senators could varying degrees claim for benefits to their states.

After the off-year election results of the November 2, 2021 elections, the Democrats in the House of Representatives worked through an approval in which thirteen Republicans voted with the Democrats, more than offsetting the six of the progressives in the Democratic Party that did not support the bill.

At the time this is being drafted, a human resource bill was passed in the House of Representatives and has gone to the Senate, possibly to be resolved in December. There are two senators on the Democrat side of the aisle whose votes are critical. The issues are composition and size of the bill along with its funding. It is designed to pass using the reconciliation approach that only requires a simple majority. That simple majority is not easy to obtain.

We now turn to the drama of the evolution of the political structure, and pick up with this last item in a discussion of the potential of structural change.

Parts of Potential Structural Change

Representative Pressure on Leadership. One part of the potential structural change leading to the revitalization of the Republican Party as a conservative party, driven by values and platforms (instead of greed for power), willing to work across the aisle, is evidenced at two levels. The first level is the legislative level, at which there is an implied representative pressure on leadership to vote in the interests of their constituency; a pressure which is greater than blocking the political agenda of the Biden administration in the battle for political control.

A somewhat early clue (for the time covered by this section of the appendix) was from the Senate. Our earlier discussion at the

beginning of this third part focused on *Strategic Guidance Towards Improving Outcomes* was a prelude to the discussion. That prelude is in the *Beyond the Pandemic* subsection [preceding *The Essence of Strategy*] where the discussion had moved from the pandemic to “a sign of progress in across-the-aisle legislation dealing with infrastructure.” The clue is a quote from an August 12, 2021 article previously cited (in the section identified). For the reader’s convenience, the boxed item is repeated here as follows:

The key paragraph for our purposes is shortly after the middle of the article. It is as follows:

“Three months ago, Mr. McConnell said his focus was on standing up to the Biden administration, putting a damper on already slim hopes for bipartisan cooperation in Congress on infrastructure. On Tuesday, Mr. McConnell said he has been clear for months that he saw the infrastructure as an area where the parties could do business.”

In an earlier paragraph reporter wrote that deal was “... negotiated by a group of bipartisan senators, passed by the Senate 69-30 on Tuesday.”

In the House of Representatives, it took time for the Democrats to work out some of their internal differences. However, within a few days after the November 2, 2021 off-year election results causing great alarm to the Democrats, the House of Representatives passed the infrastructure bill. Although six Democrats did not vote for it, there were thirteen Republicans in the House of Representatives who crossed the aisle and voted for the infrastructure bill. That serves as evidence of the erosion of at least some obstructionism that is still a threat to democracy. It also generated some slanderous comments from some other Republican members of the House, including calling the thirteen Republicans who voted for the legislation “traitors.”

The thirteen representatives did what they saw that was best for their constituency and the country, even though extremists in their

party have leveled death threats. The bipartisan vote in the Senate with the nineteen Republican Senators voting for the infrastructure bill in August did not generate the same type of response. The Senate Minority Leader, Mitch McConnell, voted for the bill. The minority leader in the House of Representatives, Representative Kevin McCarthy, has taken a more extreme view in opposing any success of the Biden administration.

This only provides a ray of hope. It is not yet a pivotal point. That pivotal point is contingent upon Trumpism gaining the political power to take us further on the road to autocracy, or eroding to become a historic era that led to domestic terrorism and a response that hopefully provides our survival as a free society.

These minority leaders have different relationships with Donald Trump. Although Senator Mitch McConnell did not vote to impeach then President Trump, what he did do immediately after the Senate vote was to level criticism that drew a harsh response from the then President Trump. He later said that he would vote for Trump if he were the Republican candidate in 2024.

Mr. McConnell was just reelected to the Senate for a six-year term and appears confident that if the Republicans have the majority in the Senate, he would be the leader.

The minority leader of the House of Representatives, Representative Kevin McCarthy, also leveled criticism of the then President Trump shortly after the Senate trial. However, it did not take long until he went to Mar-a-Lago to kiss the ring in reversing his attitude. It appears that his ambition to become Speaker of the House is exceptionally highly ranked in his mind. The great irony of the century would be if the Republicans won the majority in the House of Representatives as a result of the midterm elections, and they selected Donald Trump to become Speaker of the House.

That first level of legislative action is going to be dependent upon piece-by-piece legislation that not only depends upon merits as seen from the political vantage point relative to the electorate, but from the fear of the political power of Donald Trump.

The second level of legislative action is going to depend upon the electorate. We will return to that in our discussion of a co-evolution approach after some background on the location of economic activity.

Lines Not Crossed. The future of the Republican Party has been heavily impacted by what has been happening in recent times. It is being further impacted by the *now* that will become the *then* for the next generation, and the generations to come. We will in the next section, *A Co-Evolution Approach*, be discussing how process influences structure. At this point in the narrative, we are looking at current events, and trying to understand the status of significant components in the evolutionary process.

We are concerned with the lines drawn in individual behavior of the elected leadership, in the context of what will become a co-evolution of the electorate and leadership.

Some of the thirteen Republican Representatives in the House of Representatives that crossed the aisle received death threats, presumably from rank-and-file Republicans. Those domestic terrorists are encouraged by the behavior of some of the other elected Republican representatives in the House of Representatives, and the cartoon posted by the censured Congressman Paul Gosar.

On November 17, 2021, the House of Representatives censured Congressman Paul Gosar for his posting a video on his social media account with a cartoon depicting violence against fellow Representative Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez. The pursuit of power by Republican leadership in the House of Representatives, and some of its followers, is focused upon denying any success for the Biden platform. The lines for what individual leaders will not do to cross vary by the leaders.

The future of the Republican Party is going to depend upon where the lines are drawn for behavior in a democratic society. If the lines are not drawn, Donald Trump will move our democracy to an autoocracy. So far, we have not seen where

he will draw the line, even though he has been impeached twice, although not convicted; but emboldened with his baseless claim of a stolen election.

For Mike Pence, serving as vice president, the line was drawn at the violation of the Constitution. It was a line he would not cross. The pressure was immense, emanating from a plan designed to pursue power any cost. The process included an insurrection in which there were shouts of “Hang Mike Pence.”

For the Republican leader in the Senate, Mitch McConnell staying silent in his criticism of the then President Donald Trump on the impeachment trial related to the January 6 attack on the Capitol was a line he would not cross, even though he did not vote for conviction for the then president. Immediately following the vote, Senator McConnell sharply criticized the then President Donald Trump. Even though that drew sharp criticism from Donald Trump, he has felt secure in his position. He is so secure that he was one of the nineteen Republicans in the Senate that voted for the infrastructure bill.

This concluding section, *Saving the Great Experiment*, of Part III of Appendix A (*Strategic Guidance Towards Improving Outcomes*) is dealing with *The Attack on Pluralism* and *A Coevolution Approach* that is providing some education that would facilitate a resuscitation of what historically became a *Grand Old Party* that through a series of Republican Revolutions no longer exists in its fundamental forms, although there are some adherents to the philosophy that could provide a core for a Grand New Republican Party.

The second level of the legislative part of the potential structural change leading to the revitalization of the Republican Party as a conservative party, driven by values and platforms, is in the exercise of discipline on elected representatives by voting out of office those whose behavior fails to respond to the “...implied representative pressure on leadership to vote...” in their interests. This discussion will be further developed as events unfold and part four of this appendix is drafted.

Location of Economic Activity

Physical Location Counts. In using the pandemic as a foundational example for understanding the use of strategy to improve outcomes, we are starting with two dimensions of activity, and their environmental impact.

First is the contagion of a mobile entity. It could be a human being or it could be a virus. In either case we are dealing with network science in which the entity is considered a node, and its contacts are other nodes. The contagion refers to the linkages, the connections that deal with the communications between the nodes.

As discussed earlier, the coronavirus does not create its own protein. It needs a connection to an entity from which it can satisfy its needs for protein. Analogically, human beings have needs for other human beings in multiple dimensions. Human beings that serve as a carrier for the coronavirus are mobile and move within networks with changing contacts and strengths of linkages. That mobility impacts the contagion.

The strategy for dealing with contagion before vaccines were available was built upon separation to reduce contacts; and testing and tracing to reduce the transmission of infection by the emergence of viral attachments to the contacts. In the context of business administration, the analogous field of study is known as *transportation*.

Now consider that human beings have evolved from hunting and foraging to developing communities, and they invest in physical structures that are fixed in location. That fixity of location facilitates making investment into structures that produce services over a long period of time. In the context of business administration that deals with the subject, the analogous field of study is known as *real estate*. It calls for investing now for future benefits and may be paid for by incurring debt, a deficit finance that may be paid off over time or rolled over.

At those locations, relationships are developed in a wide range of activities, but especially in economic activities that deal with the production and distribution of goods. Depending upon scale, it could be the economy, the business enterprise, or the human resources. Those human resources operate in many dimensions. They require

long-term investments, but they are mobile to some degree, depending upon their connections in a wide variety of networks.

The evolution of the coronavirus with the shift to the Delta variant that is highly contagious, and more dangerous to the health of humans than the earlier variants, is impacting the location of economic activity. The extent of that impact will be dependent upon a great many variables, not the least of which will be what happens globally with the pandemic, especially the emergence of other variants. That is in addition to what we do domestically in dealing with what will evolve as an endemic.

Some of what we will discuss doing domestically involves a diversity of disciplines and specialties, including aspects of real estate starting with the density of development. In the case at hand, the evolution of the coronavirus will impact the density of development, both from the intensity of use at a particular site and the lengths of linkages among sites.

The extent of remote activity, especially for the business enterprise, not only impacts the location and density of development, it impacts the demand for infrastructure. Additionally, it calls for a sociological structure for dealing with the environment. That sociological structure is heavily dependent upon human behavior. Commercial as well as residential uses of land are heavily dependent upon both infrastructure and societal structure.

The societal structure goes beyond the political economy to heavily dependent upon human resources. That deals with individual education and the emergence of social capital, both of which heavily involve trust and veracity.

It is too soon to tell what that nature the sociological structure will soon to be like. The dysfunctionality of our current system has led us to conditions that are exceptionally hard to deal with because **we did not have the foresight to understand what was likely to evolve**. Add to that, **current events** and **feelings** have a disproportionate effect on what evolves in the long run.

We have been talking about that issue in the context of if we knew *then* what we know *now* current conditions would be different. We will illustrate the concept with our discussion of inflation that has negative short-term effects, but was generated as part of the

evolution of an organic system with excessive disruptions in its search to achieve homeostasis, a systemic balance. It is especially difficult to obtain a balance when the system has been messed up as was the case with the coronavirus in the United States and the war in Afghanistan.

The Relevance of Context. In the context of physical location counts, we will consider three major components of what we are looking at doing now in the context of the administration's Build Back Better program. The first has to do with the infrastructure. The second has to do with human resources. The third has to do with building social capital.

For the present context we are looking at three organs in the system. The first is what we used to call the *urban plant*, the physical externalities that support the economic activities within the structures. That was especially relevant in World War II era suburbanization. Today we are faced with extensive replacement requirements and upgrades as well as technological additions such as broadband access. Today we use the term infrastructure.

That infrastructure requires human activity and capability essential to facilitate the economic and other activity for a societal productivity. As it happens, these two dimensions are part of the administration's Build Back Better program. The first part received bipartisan support, as previously discussed.

As of the time this is being drafted, the House of Representatives has passed a bill that deals with the second part. This section is likely to go to press before the Senate deals with the legislation. It is being presented as reconciliation legislation that is not subject to the filibuster restrictions denying a vote. In the Senate, there are two members of the Democratic Party, who for whatever their reasons are, will cut the bill down in coverage and budget. But something will likely be passed.

Interestingly enough, it is not likely that Republican senators will cross the aisle on this legislation. There is a mobility to those human resources that make long-term investments less agreeable because the location of the benefits is not necessarily fixed for them. The human resources, as noted, have a mobility not ethically constrained by physical construction. Politically, while

there may be some uncertainty of discipline from voters at the ballot box, there is not much uncertainty to consequences from fellow Republican legislators, especially Trumpians with efforts to undermine Biden's agenda.

In the longer run, a Republican-controlled House of Representatives and/or Senate resulting from the midterm elections in 2022 will be obstructionists to legislative progress of their political rival's agenda. Unfortunately, the Republicans are treating the rivals as the enemy with whom they will rarely compromise. Furthermore, their gerrymandering and recognizing whatever they can to gain legislative control will undermine the resilience of the political economy. Although uncertainty will prevail in the return to normalization, in a new normal with the viral endemic, obstructionism in the search of political power will cripple the administration in avoiding another Great Recession.

Although an addendum to this Part III of Appendix A may be added to in time for its initial release, it is fair to say that the analytics will take us to the third item, *Building Social Capital*.

That third item is a lot more complex because it keeps evolving. It is the building of social capital that is related to the functioning of society as well as the role of government. It was discussed in the subsection *The Relevance of Emergence* immediately preceding *If We Knew Then, What We Know Now*. The quoted definition is "a set of informal values or norms shared among members of a group that permits cooperation among them."

We can identify *The Gingrich Led Republican Revolution* as discussed in [The Fourth Republican Revolution](#) as having served to erode the norms of behavior. It was an inflection point. The box that follows has an excerpt from page 15, the Trump administration and the January 6, 2021 attack on the Capitol building disrupting the peaceful transfer of power will be additional markers.

Power Pursuit Dimensions. Power pursuit dimensions during the Second Republican Revolution will be discussed

with reference to a few books. The recently published book, *Burning Down the House: Newt Gingrich, the Fall of a Speaker, and the Rise of the New Republican Party* (2020), authored by Julian E. Zelizer has an advertisement as follows: “The story of how Newt Gingrich and his allies tainted American politics, launching an enduring era of brutal partisan warfare.”

Through the erosion of social capital by Trumpian disregard for norms, his refusal to concede for a peaceful transfer of power, and a heightened obstructionism, we are looking at the Republicans weaponization of the inflation as an additional erosion of social capital.

Within that broad context of environmental impact, we are looking at inflation and deficit financing as economic elements that are heavily impacted by the rapidly-evolving environment.

Understanding Inflation

The basic concept of inflation is too much money facing too few goods. Normally, we use markets to make the allocation based upon price. However, in wartime we use rationing because the normally-functioning markets are not capable of adjusting the supply because the resources have been redirected. Systemic disruptions, from whatever cause, provide challenges based upon system capability.

The evolution of our system capability has been heavily impacted by business enterprise. Prices paid by consumers have been significantly lowered because of *just-in-time* deliveries to retailers and the dependence upon products shipped from foreign sources. Strategies of those suppliers is not likely to change to a *just in case* approach. The information revolution technology has been used to favor the retailers in the pursuit of profit rather than the other stakeholders, especially consumers.

Smaller scale retailers may have different inputs for the mathematical calculations. They don't use just-in-time mathematics because their prices allow for larger inventory relative to sales. They may not be subjected the same volatility of sales to inventory.

Furthermore, the pricing may not be as exploitive because relationships differ. For some suppliers the net profits have increased with the inflation because they have simply exploited the pricing to increase markups over that series for covering the costs

The manufacturers face a different situation. The disruption of the supply of electronic chips used as automobile parts results in an inventory of automobiles not quite ready for distribution because of the missing parts. You can expect an adjustment in strategy by the manufacturer. It could be a switch from *just-in-time* to *just-in-case*. Or, it could be changed in the source of some supplies from foreign to domestic. Or, some automobile manufacturers may start manufacturing computer chips for their vehicles.

The rising price level of homes in California's coastal districts has already prompted moves to the inland areas where housing prices are essentially less. That is simply an example of changes in composition of spending as market prices change. Sometimes, the inflation is quite transitory once the supply problem has been adjusted because of transportation bottlenecks. Some inflation is transitory on its own, and some inflation is simply a change in relative prices especially related to location.

Government Responsibility. As discussed earlier, the text of the Employment Act of 1946 included the statement:

...that it was the “continuing policy and responsibility” of the federal government to “coordinate and utilize all its plans, functions, and resources... to foster and promote free competitive enterprise and the general welfare; conditions under which there will be afforded useful employment for those able, willing, and seeking to work; and to promote maximum employment, production, and purchasing power... .

In short, the Employment Act calls for balancing of employment and inflation while pursuing the promotion of “...free competitive enterprise and the general welfare;...”

Understanding the current inflation calls for grasping the concept that the definition of too much money chasing too few

goods is not simply the quantity theory of money, and the role of monetary policy. It calls for grasping the concept that economic progress in the form of recovery and growth, and its restructuring in times of stress, deals with the lack of availability of goods and services in the marketplace at the locations for transactions. That structural supply issue can also be a cause of inflation. And it can be exacerbated by business enterprise exploiting rising costs as an opportunity for increasing profits.

It calls for connecting the dots beyond the quantity theory of money, not only in terms of supply, but also velocity. So, money accumulated during federal support to deal with lost incomes resulting from the pandemic may or may not have been spent in the same time pattern of lost income, it may be spent at a higher rate at a later time. Additionally, the structure of spending may be different over time because of the availability of goods and services, a supply issue.

Although it can be an either/or proposition for understanding the emergence of an inflation, what we are experiencing now is a multiplicity of processes. On the money supply issue, in addition to the federal government fiscal policies, even justified, we have a monetary process of the Federal Reserve pumping money into the economy by purchasing financial assets for its portfolio, even justified. Reliance on markets is a reliance on emergence from a multiplicity of choices. There are limits to the extent of control, not only on philosophical issues, but on the practical issues of the mechanics of the system.

At the same time, we have been experiencing a reduction of delivery of goods to a marketplace, in part because of a shortage of labor, but also in part because of structural systemic inadequacies for rapid shifts in availability of components, such as computer chips for automobile production. The long wait for unloading cargo ships is a serious problem, as is the availability of getting the cargo transported to locations for retail distribution. The empty shelves in a retail establishment signals the structural problem on the supply side.

Building on the opening discussion of the environmental impact, including locational aspects of economic activity focused on inflation and deficits, we also need to deal with the location of inflation.

Localization of Inflation

Pundits and others are fond of making comparisons of prices that indicate new heights of some measures of inflation and/or components. A six percent rise in a national index in one month over the same month the previous year is eye-catching, but it depends upon the base and the conditions of the previous year. We have discussed that in the context of the availability of money and the supply of goods and services. Now, let us consider components of inflation by looking at their price levels at points in time in the changing environment.

Our analytical interest is in understanding what has historically happened in order to get some feeling for patterns likely to emerge based upon choices we are making, or not making.

As a start for discussion, we experienced an inflation problem at the end of World War II. It was in the structure of production that shifted from serving wartime needs to serving consumer needs. The federal government, fearful of a depression, and an inflation passed legislation to promote high levels of income, output, and employment in the Employment Act of 1946. That was preceded by the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 designed to provide benefits for returning veterans to transition to a new economic structure. The combination made a significant impact over time because the nature of production changed from war material to consumer goods for what amounted to the last few decades of the Industrial Revolution.

The impact was upon the location of economic activity, as well as the structure of production. The location of economic activity was a substantial expansion in suburbanization. That not only included residential, commercial, and industrial location; it called for a substantial infrastructure development. The interstate highway program significantly altered the location of economic development.

The location patterns changed with the shift from the last segment of the Industrial Revolution to the Information Revolution. That shift started taking place around the last quarter of the twentieth century. It led to higher concentrations of economic activity, especially on the coasts.

What we are experiencing now is being generated by environmental changes. The pandemic is likely to become an endemic that will lessen the density of development. The experience with working from home

will for many individuals become a living style change calling for more space in the home and less travel.

We can expect that suburban areas and small towns will experience growth because of the aversion to high density development. Additionally, industrial location for domestic production is likely to take place in lower density in the locations.

Global warming is impairing development in some locations and the rising price of real estate is fostering inland development. Fuel costs are impacting residential location as well as the price differentials between coastland and inland locations.

Social Science Advancement. Understanding inflation goes hand-in-hand with understanding budget issues. However, both are part of the understanding of social sciences that has significantly lagged as compared to understanding of the physical sciences.

Over the last few centuries science has made dramatic progress in understanding the physical sciences. That progress may be expressed on a chart that represents the speed by which man can travel. Visualize such a chart representing the change in speed over time first by running and then by horseback riding. Next go to the mechanical means using vehicles powered by engines covering distances on the Earth's surface. Next go to flight and getting to the moon.

Rocket science is best done by teams blending disciplines to produce an interdisciplinary understanding of process. If you think that is difficult, consider understanding organic systems such as human beings, and the minds representing the brains at work. That process goes beyond the linear analytics observing cause and effect to grasping processes in which the system is evolving. The relationships change as a human body evolves from infancy through childhood and onto being an adult. If it is fortunate, it will survive long enough to go through a decaying process until its life is over.

Now extend that biological analogy to the evolution of society. Now try to understand the miserable job that human beings have done in dealing with the planet Earth. Furthermore, try to understand failed governments abounding in the globe. And look at what is happening to *The Great Experiment of American Democracy* that made progress for two centuries but is now losing its global leadership role

in building democracy and suffering from a threat of its own survival as a free society.

You may say it's not rocket science to deal with the social sciences; but consider the case that it is more difficult than rocket science. It is more difficult because the evolution of the social sciences, especially in politics, economics, and sociology, deals with changing relationships. If we use the same principles applied to the human body for analyses of the operation of society, including its political economy, it becomes even more difficult. It's not rocket science, it's much more difficult because the relationships are changing.

That is what has happened to our political economy where some of us thought that we were at the top of the food chain, only to find out that the pandemic has infected us with a contagious virus that feeds off us to obtain the protein for its survival. When the pandemic started, there was an inflation in the price of equipment to support breathing of infected people. Beyond respirators, there was an inflation in the price of masks.

The Republican leadership has the audacity to weaponize the inflation that it fostered through fostering the second pandemic that generated structural adjustments, including inflation. That was in the wake of the Trump administration that not only lessens the nation capability for dealing with epidemics and pandemics, but also lied to the public about the reality of the pandemic that required excessive government funding to deal with what could have been a lesser health crisis.

A Co-Evolution Approach

The Realm of the Pandemic

In the realm of the pandemic, there is still great uncertainty. Some state governors are opposing federal authority in implementing the revised strategy of the administration in dealing with the evolution of the pandemic. The state governors who are resisting the federal administrative authority are endangering the health of the population. Yet, some of the governors are getting vaccinated.

The ambitious program, requiring some employers (generally with 100 or more employees) to mandate vaccinations, or other precautions, has made progress. The Occupational Safety and Health

Administration (OSHA) has set rules calling for vaccines or weekly testing by January 4, 2022. Some companies had made progress on their own and with the cooperation of unions. We are looking at a co-evolution process, not only of individuals and governments; we are looking at the role of business enterprise.

During most of this first year of the Biden administration, there has been some restoration of business enterprise pursuing interests of a diversity of stakeholders, beyond just focusing on profits. The health of employees and clientele are a case in point. Additionally, the labor market has tightened, resulting in higher wages and additional benefits.

The Realm of Individual Responsibility

Additionally, the pandemic has yielded some progress in the realm of individual responsibility. Some survivors infected by COVID-19, while still in the hospital, came to the realization that they should have gotten vaccinated, and not listened to disinformation, or even misinformation, distributed for political purposes or out of just plain ignorance. It is reasonable to expect that relatives of those who have been infected, especially fatally, have reassessed their information sources and become more responsible with regard to their sources of information.

It is somewhat less dramatic for some people to learn that “my body, my choice” is not among the first ten amendments to the Constitution. Individual rights are significantly regulated for the common good. Getting an education from social media is very expensive in terms of understanding consequences, even when they don't pay the vendor for the information.

Getting an Education

At this point it looks as though federal financial support will be provided for progress on preschool education. That will be significant progress for voter education. The sad fact is that our voting public is undereducated. More on this is discussed on the website, particularly in the form of classroom education derived from an earlier era.

Also discussed on the website is the nation's founder's concern for credulous voters needing enlightened representatives in the United

States Senate. More of this could be discussed in updates; but the topics are put together to set the tone about progress in the first year of the new administration.

The update may well discuss the case for free community college, even though it was cut on a budgetary basis. That free community college provision relates to not only vocational education, but also provides for the broader foundation of a liberal education. The liberal does not refer to political perspective, but for the broader understanding for living in a free society. Education at all levels is a critical evolutionary issue.

The co-evolution process also refers to the political leadership, at all levels of government. That is discussed in an ensuing section within this concluding segment (*Saving the Great Experiment*) of the *Most of the Administration's First Year*, portion of the *Strategic Guidance Towards Improving Outcomes*, the third part of Appendix A

The Rising Role of Nascent Disciplines

The analytics we have become accustomed to are rooted in linear reasoning of cause and effect. As discussed in slightly more detail elsewhere on this website, inductive reasoning built upon experience in a closed system may be sufficient. However, when the system is evolving, resulting in changing relationships, it may not be sufficient.

Late in the twentieth century, substantial advances were made in the organization of knowledge and in the development of paradigms that gave rise to nascent disciplines, especially complexity science and network science. In short, individual transactions in markets may provide a linear result for the transaction. Those exchanges at the microlevel provide interactions in a network that generates a macro level that contains properties not necessarily present in the microlevel. Those emergent properties arise from the interaction.

This is relevant for individual decisions that produce byproducts, where there is uncertainty as to what the byproduct will be. In the case of bridge, the probability of a finesse working may be known, within a range of unplayed cards. However, there is uncertainty as to the consequences of the failure of the finesse depending upon which opponent has the critical card and can make a devastatingly lead.

The success or failure will be known when the next four cards are played. That is the science that underlies the proposition that the right way to play the suit may be the wrong way to play the hand.

It is part of what we will consider when we look at restructuring strategy for dealing with an evolving system. We used the case of the pandemic early in this treatise to indicate that the shift in several environmental conditions called for a shift in strategy. In that case there were differences in consequences because of the extent of contagion. The increase in contagion was a force that called for a shift in strategy. There were other forces. Sometimes it takes a combination of events to generate enough force to shift the strategy.

We also have been developing the discussion of the issue of timing of knowledge: the *if we knew then what we know now*. That analytic approach is now going to be applied to dealing with the corruption of our democratic process. The extent of the nature of corruption will affect survival. Knowledge of the events, not only as individual events, but also in interaction with other events, can enhance the selection of choices that will produce desired outcomes, and/or avoid undesirable outcomes.

This now is particularly relevant because for years we have been evolving with a series of events that are a threat to our survival as a free society.

