

WORK STARTED ON December 15, 2019.

The Prince II: Discourse on the Citizen and the State

By William Young Wu

Preface: How Life Is Lived Forwards But Can Only Be Understood Backwards.

It is necessary that men live their lives facing forward, yet cannot understand the meaning or the trajectory of their lives except by looking towards the past. For it is understandable that we must use our senses to look forward in order to not crash into anything, yet often major bumps and accidents on the path of human history come without warning and must be predicted without being seen. These accidents may only be predicted accurately if one slows down or stops completely to look back at the way one came, in order to learn the recurring elements in the land one has already traveled, so as to better predict and manage future uncertainties and variations in the land. But more often than not, men do not seem willing or even capable of slowing or stopping, (for numerous reasons which I will consider later), so that the inevitable speeding up of human affairs leads to an ultimate catastrophic crash. Yet even when men do stop and look back at the road they have travelled, often they may interpret it wrong, or they may simply not be able to see the road.

Thus, in order to help the people of the Information Age as to how to proceed, I have taken it upon myself to write down this modern discourse, which touches upon common currents in human affairs that have come up repeatedly, so that those with less knowledge of history and less acuteness of vision may have still have my conclusions to rely upon as a guide to avoid the inevitable recurring accidents of men. For despite all our advancements, no man is immortal and has an infallible memory of all things past. But even if there was such an immortal man with an infallible memory, he might still not be able to interpret events close to the Truth. For despite the fact that Cain killed Abel, it is still debated for what reason Cain killed Abel, who was right or wrong, and what lessons we should draw from the entire sequence of events. From this one sees that a single set of facts might produce a whole array of understandings, lessons, and narratives, many of which might conflict with each other. Indeed, I say that the short hands of man can never grasp the shining star of Truth, though he might reach close to it. Any serious student of History will quickly realize that this is an undeniable fact, and that because of it, we must continually revisit and re-analyze our understanding of the past. For often different parties may have different narratives, or a narrative may be suppressed due to the times, or a narrative may be completely altered by the appearance of an extraordinary discovery.

For these reasons, I do not wish for my work to seem as a rejection or an upstaging of my colleagues of the past. And indeed, to any well-read person it is clear that the ancient thinkers have written far greater works than I have, and were clearly of far greater intellect. Rather, I wish my work to be a humble continuation of the thoughts of thinkers past. For although their contribution is important and surely worthy, and not to be dismissed, the sheer novelty of recent

events necessitates an updating, a re-viewing, and a continuing of their work. It is thus vitally important to add to their thought with modern works of our own, for human history is not a static thing, but a continually growing affair, and the burden of keeping the knowledge of the past, which is proof of our present, is pushed on to the next generation again and again.

Section 1 The Individual And Self-Interest.

1.1 What Is Necessary For The Functioning of Life.

Human life, like any other advanced life on planet Earth, has certain set requirements to sustain it. First, men require food and water. Second, they require protection from the elements, or at least an environment in which the elements are not lethally hostile to them. Third, they require spouses with which to reproduce (although technically this third requirement is not necessary for the continuation of one's own life). These are the three basic conditions of all advanced life on Earth.

1.1.1 That Resources Are Limited For The Sustenance Of Life, Which Results In Inevitable Conflict.

From these three above conditions arise certain consequences which are inevitable to all advanced life. First, there is only so much food and water on Earth. Second, there are only so many safe places from the elements. Third, there are only so many spouses available. It thus may be said that there are only so many resources at any given time that may go around between all men, and this supposes that there will inevitably be conflict for said resources. It is because of this reason that all animals, man being no exception, have a self-interested nature. *The individual self-interest is thus a result of the conflict between men for the limited resources of Earth.* For it is a good to pursue the continuance of life, despite that in doing so one may cause evil to other living things, the Earth, and other humans.

1.2 The Self-Interest Of The Individual.

If we examine self-interest solely in the context of an individual organism, the self-interest of the individual is therefore a good thing. This is because self-interest compels an individual to sustain their own life, which is good. And when it is pointed out that love of wife or children, or charity, or good public works do not really work in favor for the self-interest of the individual, I say that these actions too, are self-interested. For love of wife or children is essentially discrimination, you are not loving everyone, but only these few. Furthermore, by loving wife and children you expect to get some return, whether that is household help, good conversation, financial savings, sexual gratification, love, and so on. Charity and good public works seen by many people are also self-interested, since to be seen by others as a good man gives you a better and more secure position in society. But that these actions are less common than actually making money or directly amassing resources suggests that they contribute less to

the satisfaction of the individual self-interest than the latter actions. But self-interested they still are.

Thus, in order to see how much an action is self-interested one must only look at how often men perform it. Many men go to work, make money. Less men are good husbands and fathers. Even less men donate to charity regularly. And an action is assuredly not very self-interested at all when one has to die, since dying presumes the loss of life, and thus the loss of the essential individual good. And men are self-interested for the reason of preservation of their own life, not its destruction. But indeed, even death may be self-interested in the extreme sense, in that by dying one might save one's children, and through them, one might "live on". But this phenomenon is rare, and although many men profess a willingness to die for their children and homeland, few do so.

1.3 The Ever Increasing Self-Interest Of The Individual, And What Is enough?

Though it may be satisfied at various points, the self-interest of an individual is always once again whetted by numerous factors. The very first of these factors is that some few men possess inordinately great appetites, which compel them to amass much more amounts of resources than normal. Because of this, sometimes not enough resources are left for lesser men, who wish only to get by. As a result, there arises a conflict between the few great and the many weak, since the few great think their massive resources necessary, depriving it from the many weak, which in turn make the lives of the weak miserable. Thus, through the actions of the few great, the many weak will strive (through any means) to achieve higher standing in life, in order to reach the position of greatness, since they are envious of the few great men, or simply lack adequate resources to survive. The second factor is that increased trade will increase fortune, and when there is new fortune to be made, everyone wants a part of it. This explains the tulip mania in 1600s Netherlands, the .com boom of the 2000s, the recent housing bubble crisis, or the Bitcoin mania. And the third factor is new inventions in technology. Because technology cannot go backwards (for reasons which I will explain later), men are always being accustomed to new modes of living with technology. For example, to Americans touch-screen phones are now a way of life, despite the fact that merely twenty years ago we survived on a day-to-day basis with pay phones, land lines, and fax machines. To go backwards in technology is akin to death for most modern individuals and states (and this is especially so, in terms of military technology).

Thus, because of these three main reasons, I will say that the self-interest of the individual is never satisfied, although it may be placated for a short while. And this fact can be most concretely seen in the movement of peoples from poorer countries to advanced western countries. For when these poorer peoples have seen the western states on TV, they are naturally envious and try to obtain that life, whereas the peoples of western states do not wish to go to live in poorer states. Thus, even if people living in China in fact lead much better lives than their ancestors did during the time of the emperors, they are still restive and unsatisfied, seeing the much more sophisticated and comfortable lives that Europeans and Americans lead. Thus, what

is enough is always relative, since to have less than someone else always arouses that primal fear in man which tells him that he will not survive for lack of resources, since if others obviously and visibly have more than him, they must have more for a reason, that reason appearing to be the fact that it is necessary to have that much more to survive. (One should note the circular nature of this primal reasoning, which cannot be assuaged except by very high level of education or very coherent social organization, as I shall discuss later).

1.4 Conflict Arising From The Self-Interest Of The Individual.

From this single individual good, the self-interest of an individual, thus arises many evils. Namely, that multiple self-interests will inevitably collide and conflict with each other. For at any point in time, there might be an infinity of conceptions of what “enough” and “necessary” are. For any man might reasonably ask, who is to determine how much possession is enough or necessary? If one man judges that he requires more resources to live securely than another man, then either the former will try to produce more resources through self-replicating methods (such as farming or raising livestock), or pillage them from someone else. And if another man judges that he does not need as many resources as the former man, the latter will defend his resources with utmost vigor, since he will see the former man as greedy and intruding upon what is rightfully his. Or in another case even if there is no open conflict, the lesser man might become envious of the greater man and his wealth, and seek to steal it in some way. From these things results war and death, which are inevitably bad.

Section 2 The State And The Similar Self Interest

2.1 The Similar Self-Interest Arises As The Symbol Of Agreement Between Individual Men’s Individual Self-Interests, And What Steps Are Necessary For Its Continuance.

Since men cannot go on warring forever, without either exhausting their resources, for which they are fighting for, or dying in combat, which is bad, they must arrive at a peaceful conclusion between each other, and form an agreement so as to preserve their own resources and lives, which is good. Because of this, a state is formed, in which a state similar self-interest is agreed upon by all members of the state.

After this, there are Three Objectives which the state must accomplish to maintain the similar self-interest (which when maintained well creates the well-being of the state and its citizenry). The First Objective of the State is that it must uphold the similar self-interest that is agreed upon by its citizens, with its similar conceptions of “necessary” and “enough”, and that the citizens must positively identify with their similar self-interest. The Second Objective of the state is that its similar self-interest must not use more resources than it can generate or obtain from other entities (whether through creation, commerce, coercion, or conquest). The Third Objective of the state is to protect its citizens against entities who wish to attack its similar self-interest. *From the fulfillment of these three objectives arises the well-being of the state and*

the citizenry. Thus, any state that cannot maintain a unified conception of similar self-interest between its citizens, cannot obtain enough resources to feed the consumption of its similar self-interest, and cannot defend its similar self-interest against external enemies, is destined for ruin.

2.2 The State's Similar Self-Interest Is Much More Complex Than The Individual Self-Interest, Which Is Always The Same.

Because the state is made up of many individuals, and each individual has their own background, wants, and etc, and because each individual has their own definitions of what “enough” and “necessary” are, the state self-interest is therefore infinitely more complex than the self-interest of any one individual. However, despite the variation on what each individual might think is “enough” and “necessary”, the ultimate goal of each individual self-interest is the same, that of the sustainment of their individual lives. *Therefore, the ultimate goal of each state's similar self-interest is the well-being of the state and the citizenry, which in other words, is the fulfillment of each individual's self interest, that of the sustainment of their individual lives.* This individual self-interest, is, after all, why states are formed by individuals in the first place. And the goal of this individual self-interest is, (despite variations in the understanding of “necessary” and “enough”), the same for every individual on this Earth.

2.2.1 Why It Is Called The SIMILAR Self Interest.

The immense complexity of the amalgamation of individual self-interests into one state self-interest, requires that I add the adjective *similar*, since no state's self-interest can be completely merge the different individual definitions of “necessary” and “enough” into a single point, but that at least the amalgamated definition must be *similar* enough to unite its citizens under a state.

2.3 Seven Main Elements Inform A State's Similar Self-Interest.

The seven main elements that inform a state's similar self-interest are geography, resource type, resource abundance, individual self-interests, the previous history of the founding people, accidents and opportunities (chance), and enemies.

Geography is the landscape of a state, it is comprised of continents, islands, weather, flora and fauna, hills, mountains, coastlines, plains, rivers, and so on.

Resource type and resource abundance which inform a state's similar self-interest refer *only* to physical, material resources. They do not include such “resources” as manpower, capital for production, patents, brainpower, and resources gained from other states through commerce, coercion, or conquest. Individual self-interest has already been discussed of.

Previous history of the people refers to the where, what, why, when, who, and how of a people. Were they convicts sent to a faraway island? Colonists in a brave new world? Nomadic horse riders of the Steppes? Seafarers between islands in a vast ocean? Formerly scattered

peoples of a now unified nation? Revolutionaries from an oppressive autocratic regime? Ancient little cousins of a much larger neighbor?

Accidents and opportunities, or chance, refer to the part that chance plays in human affairs. For example, chance had it that the European colonists who came to the new world were much better armed and willing to engage in wholesale genocide than the native inhabitants. Chance also had it that the young United States was blessed with vast resources, weak neighbors, and two large oceans acting as shields on both sides. But chance isn't simply an active blessing upon a people. It must be seized and utilized correctly. For even though Russia has vast resources and a sizeable population, it is still a relatively backward nation even today.

Enemies are actors who wish to threaten a state's similar self-interest. Enemies do not include things such as the weather and fauna. Enemies are specifically hostile human actors, be they foreign or domestic, with a view to damage or destroy a state's similar self-interest.

With these informing factors in mind, let us move onto now how we may examine the influence of these factors on a state's similar self-interest.

Geography						
Resource Type						
Resource Abundance				OBJ 1: Unity & Maintenance of Similar Self-Interest		
<u>Individual Self-Interests</u>	<i>together produces and informs</i>	<u>State Similar Self-Interest</u>	<i>is sustained by</i>	OBJ 2: Satisfaction Of Consumption of Similar Self-Interest	<i>makes for</i>	<u>Well-Being of State and Citizenry</u>
Previous History of The People				OBJ 3: Defense of Similar Self-Interest		
Accident & Opportunity (Chance)						
Enemies						

2.4 Through What Lens We May See A State's Similar Self-Interest Manifest.

Because the elements that inform a state's similar-self interest are various, and the individuals extremely numerous, the similar self-interest becomes very complicated to examine. But there exist a few lens through which we may analyze the similar self-interest and its manifestations. Through these major lenses, we will be able to better understand any given state's similar

self-interest: tradition and religion (culture), politics, thought (language), individual self-interests, arts and entertainment, people, and technology.

Geography	Resource Type	Resource Abundance	<u>Individual Self-Interests</u>	Previous History of the People	Accident & Opportunity (Chance)	Enemies
			<i>together produces and informs</i>			
			<u>State Similar-Self Interest</u>			
			<i>may be examined through these lens</i>			
Tradition & Religion (Culture)	Politics	Thought (Language)	<u>Individual Self-Interests</u>	Arts & Entertainment	People	Technology

2.5 What Exactly Is The State's Similar Self Interest, And How The Seven Main Elements, the Similar Self-Interest, and the lens interact with each other.

Reader, up to this point, you may have asked yourself why I have laid out so much groundwork around the concept of the Similar-Self Interest, but that I have not actually explained what exactly the similar self-interest consists of. You may have also noticed that I have left it a vague term, with its essence unclear. However, it is exactly all this groundwork which is necessary to understanding the concept of the Similar Self-Interest. I will now attempt to explain and map out the concept of the Similar Self-interest, its relation to the individual self-interest and the other main elements that inform it, its relation to the Three Objectives, and through what lens we might be able to examine a state's similar self-interest in order to differentiate it from another state's similar self-interest.

Since I lack a better analogy, I will use this one: even though we have a name for a disease, for example, such as consumption (tuberculosis), this disease is meaningless (and indeed invisible) to us unless we are able to *see* its symptoms and learn its *causes*. For example, consumption can be described through the *lens* of its various symptoms. And in terms of causes (or what *informs*) consumption, we can say that bad hygiene, a sickly body, unhealthy living conditions, and of course the bacteria itself, causes consumption. Thus, like a bacteria (again, I apologize for this bad analogy), the individual self-interest is clear and always the same. All diseases are caused by some form of physical bacteria, just as all individual self-interests are

caused by the same physical desire to sustain life through the accumulation and consumption of resources. And thus, like symptoms, the manifestations of a state's similar self-interest are various and unique. For without seeing these symptoms and manifestations we would not know that a bacteria or similar self-interest was there at all.

Thus, the reason why it is so difficult to explain the concept of the State's Similar Self-Interest is that it itself is not anything at all: it is an immaterial concept caused and understood through material and immaterial things. This example illustrates the issue: an island with many natural ports, lacking adequate farmland, may create a similar self-interest where whaling and fishing is a part of the national heritage. Though it is clear what the informing elements and resultant lenses are, the essence of the similar self-interest is not clear. This is because the similar self-interest is only detectable through its manifestations, which we must view through the aforementioned lenses. Therefore, to those astute readers who were wondering if culture, or tradition, or politics, are interchangeable with a state's similar self-interest, my answer is yes, they are indeed interchangeable. The similar self-interest is at the same time all these things together: a nation's traditions, its people, its language, its thought, its culture, its technology, and so on. And thus, one might say that Japan's Similar Self-interest includes their old maritime tradition of whaling and fishing.

Seven Causes	<i>inform and produce</i>	<u>An Immaterial State Similar Self-Interest</u>	<i>which can be examined through</i>	Seven Lenses	<i>And whose cohesion, maintenance, and defence, make for</i>	<u>Well-Being of State and Citizenry</u>
--------------	---------------------------	---	--------------------------------------	--------------	---	---

2.6 How The Original Question From the Individual Self-Interest Of What Is “Necessary” and “Enough” Is Resolved By The Application Of The Seven Causes, And How The Results, As Interpreted By The Seven Lenses, Form A Part Of The Similar Self-Interest Itself, And Even Help To Preserve And Realign The Similar Self-Interest.

Let us look to Switzerland in order to see how the original issue of what is “necessary” and “enough” can be answered. There, farmland is sparse, and greater (and formerly autocratic) states surround it on three sides. Given these two basic causes, we see that Switzerland has developed a highly republican, resource-efficient, and defensive society. Because it is small, its citizens are highly militarized. Because they are surrounded by autocracies which cannot rule their mountainous lands, they adhere to their Republican values. Thus, each man receives whatever training necessary to defend their nation (which has considerably more guns and than most developed nations), and receives enough only to eat and keep comfortable (which explains their lower obesity levels among developed nations). Thus, when Switzerland was confronted by nations which were autocratic such as Nazi Germany, they refused to give in, because submitting to a dictatorship would mean forfeiting their similar self-interest.

Of course, it may be argued that it was because Switzerland was Republican that allowed it to defend its mountains, and not that its mountains gave rise to Swiss Republicanism. I will not contend against this line of thinking, for it could very well be that the nature of the people create the people rather than the environment of the people. (Essentially the argument is Innate racial qualities vs Environmental qualities). To me, the debate between nature and nurture is pointless, since it is clear that each race of men on Earth has defining characteristics, whose beginnings cannot be traced, since no one has lived since the beginning of mankind. But it is also clear that many people, who have left their ancestral racial home, have changed and adapted to their new homes, becoming in essence, a different person. And often great men produce cowardly children, as Plato discusses. Thus, in response to this nature vs nurture argument, I think both impact the other, and that they do not exist in a vacuum.

In another example, Germany in its history has always been hemmed in on the West and East by other great states (ironically, much like Switzerland), and limited in its landmass. With a large population, and not much resources, Germany had to innovate and adapt in order to compete with its great neighbors, France, the UK, and Russia. Thus, Germany became extremely productive, forwarded scientific research, and prioritized organization and efficiency. These aspects of the German people are still today present in its advanced chemical industry, its leadership in luxury automobile goods, its leadership in advanced medical machines, its high quality metals and weapons industry, and its general high degree of education and coordination among the citizenry. Because Germany doesn't have large scale production/population or large resource reserves to exploit, it has historically been forced to develop an organized, efficient, and advanced society in order to remain competitive (much like modern Japan and South Korea).

It is necessary here to point out (however morally devoid doing so may be), that there is no such thing as a *correct* similar self-interest. For just as people live and die, so too will nations and their similar self-interest. From a historical standpoint, whether or not Germany's similar self-interest during the Imperial and Nazi eras were good or bad is not for us to judge. The point we must take away is that, because of their geographically weak position, they had to make up for their resource deficiency by means of *bewegungskrieg*. This operational solution to their strategic problem has appeared again and again in their history, from the offensive-defensive wars during the unification of Germany to the *kesselschlacht* battles during the Nazi reign. Thus, if perchance Germany had continued to win in WWII by means of its *bewegungskrieg*, we today might say that its similar self-interest was indeed successful. But their failure makes us think today that it is not the case.

Again, I must point out that it is not our place to judge the morality of any state's similar self-interest, but to learn from its successes and its failures. If we are to judge, then we might judge Nazi Germany's similar self interest by its ultimate demise. Obviously, a similar self-interest in which the absolute conquest and annihilation of "lesser peoples" is necessary is not sustainable.

In another example, the United States has in the modern era always been the leading superpower because of its technological prowess. Ever since detonating the atomic bomb over Hiroshima and Nagasaki, the United States has demonstrated that its technological innovation and power cannot be matched: its technological advancement is the basis of its modern status as superpower. Indeed, we can trace the United States' obsession with technological supremacy even to the days of the civil war. When the Confederates challenged the United States' control of the sea with their new Ironclads, the United States responded with many of their own. When the British successfully transitioned into the industrial age with numerous new inventions, the United States quickly followed with their own innovative production lines. When the Soviets developed hydrogen bombs with massive yields, the United States responded with warheads that were fast and highly accurate. Thus, when the Chinese today challenge the United States' control over the technological communications market with 5G and the One Belt One Road plan, the United States naturally becomes alarmed. For, to challenge the United States' technological supremacy in the world is to directly threaten the similar self-interest of the United States itself.

THIS IS SECTION 3. SECTION 3 DEALS WITH UNITY, 4 DEALS WITH CONSUMPTION, and 5 DEALS WITH DEFENSE. basically , 3, 4, and 5, follow the THREE OBJECTIVES.

Section 3 The First Objective: The Unity Of The Similar Self-Interest.

3.1 A Similar Conception Of Self-Interest Is The Key To Unity In A State.

Because there are limited resources in the given controlled space of a state, the state must attempt with utmost effort to make its citizens adhere to the shared conception of self-interest, with its definition of “enough” and “necessary”. For even if one were to assume the whole Earth was under one state, with no external alien enemies, then the third objective disappears, the second objective becomes halved (there is no more coercion or conquest, only creation and commerce), and only the first objective remains in its entirety. (This proves that the first objective is indeed the primary reason for the founding of states and the most important objective of the state. However, I am not trying to belittle the Third Objective, since no state can survive if it does not defend itself, and our planet is not currently under one state. However again, one often sees in history that a state that successfully carries out its First Objective often is able to achieve its Second and Third Objectives with much more ease than those states which do not achieve their First Objective). Since every novel invention or product that comes into society will whet the self-interest of every man anew, the state must find some way to maintain the

similar conception of self-interest between the citizenry so as in order to prevent poverty, wealth and social inequality, discontent, rioting, civil war, and ultimately, revolution. For without the similar conception of self-interest, different men might do different things, some unscrupulous, which will lead to the unbalance of the citizen body, split between the few great and the many weak, as I have mentioned above. Of course, the state may do a bad job of maintaining the similar conception of self-interest, creating enough discontent and discord that revolution occurs. At that point, revolution will create a new state and impose a new conception of the similar self-interest. But the point of the first objective is to avoid this waste of resources and lives, which results from a violent imposing of a new similar self-interest by revolution. Therefore, it is imperative that any and all measures be taken to maintain the similar self-interest, *since any cost taken to maintain the similar self-interest will still be less than revolution*.

For example, nearing the end of the Roman Republic, the many peasants and urban mob were slowly being squeezed out of a livelihood. Because wealthy nobles were able to buy up huge swathes of land, dedicate them to cash crop production (luxuries like wine and not essentials like grain), and employ thousands of slaves, the majority of the poorer Roman citizens were left without property and jobs, and slowly pushed out of political life. Because of this, they were easily swayed by populists like Marius, Sulla, and Caesar, who promised them glory and riches. As we can see, the similar self-interest founded at the beginning of the Republic in legendary times was not present during the end of the Republic. Not only was the Roman mob propertyless, but they were increasingly marginalized from political life, a right that was set forth from the start of the Republic. If the Roman nobles had reopened political office to the poor, given more land to the people, and set up a government-based salary system for the military, perhaps Augustus' revolution would not have succeeded or happened. Even with this massive expenditure, the cost of redistributing land and wealth would have been much less than the cost of tens of thousands of Roman lives and huge amounts of plundered Roman and provincial gold. But because the nobles forgot about the similar self-interest, and thought only of their own, the people, discontent, gave rise to Augustus, who engaged in three civil wars, instigated the first state-led mass purge in recorded history, and ended the 500 year old Republic.

3.2.1 Different Nations Will Place Different Emphasis On A Certain Lens In Their Similar Self-Interest, Thus Leading To The Neglect Of The Other Lenses. That A Similar Self-Interest Must Adapt To Survive, It Must Not Let Itself Stagnate.

For different nations there may be different priorities. For example, in the Roman Republic and the Roman Empire, philosophy was never looked upon favorably as a good occupation. Although it may be argued that Rome did not rely on philosophy to create and maintain its empire, one can still at least say that they did not have a flourishing philosophic tradition, which obviously has left posterity with a dearth of philosophic works, whereas the Greeks have left a rich tradition of philosophy behind them. Although it seems like philosophy is one of the less impactful lens of a similar self-interest, it, at times, may have a great impact on

historical events. For example, because the peoples of Europe did not consider communism or facism as credible threats, they let these two political philosophies grow into monstrous proportions, one of which still exists today in multiple countries. Thus, although every lens plays a different part in the similar self-interest of each nation, and each lens may have different impacts at different times, invariably they will all contribute to the rise or fall of a nation, since even if a nation has the most powerful weapons, such weapons are self-harming if they are not controlled by good government, or useless if they are not wielded by properly trained soldiers and generals.

Thus, indeed I say, it is never a good thing when the people place too much importance on one lens of the similar self-interest to the detriment of the others. For often this imbalance leads to the non-fulfillment of the three objectives. For example, the Qing Empire chose to maintain a firm grip on political and social life, instead of attempting to modernize its technology and military. Eventually, by the failure to defend itself, the Qing Empire crumbled. Thus, even though investing in technology may have changed the societal fabric of the empire, and perhaps may have not been the most comfortable thing to do for the Qing Monarchs, in fact, such an action would have best preserved their empire over any other action. Thus, at times, it is in fact necessary for a similar self-interest to change in order to survive. And this is alright, since the survival of the similar self-interest, is a good thing.

On the other hand, the United Kingdom after WWII, seeing that it could no longer maintain its colonial empire, changed its similar self-interest to no longer prioritize the maintenance of a colonial empire. By doing this, it has not only managed to spread english across the world, but also managed to maintain its dignity and independence. Although much smaller now than it was before, the United Kingdom still exists and exerts great economic and cultural influence across the world.

3.2.2 Sometimes A Similar Conception Of Self-Interest Will Lead A State To Ruin, Because It No Longer Resembles Its Spiritual Condition At The Founding.

In this case, the similar-self interest has deviated too much from its original being, and prone to either internal or external manipulation and coercion, such as in the case with the fall of the Roman Republic as mentioned above. One example of this is the United States during the Civil War. Although from the very beginning the Founding Fathers of the USA said that all men are equal, they evidently did not put this into practise. Thus, because the cancer of slavery was allowed to grow from the start, and that the difference of opinion on what constituted the nation's self-interest continued to widen, slavery not only posed a cultural problem, but one of economics and even military. For by relying on slave labor the South slowly fell behind in industrialization and became a backward region, and thus grew naturally envious of the North and resentful, even though it was of their own doing. And by relying on slaves the South introduced the ever-present chance for revolt and dealings with foreign powers, such as Britain, who might have wished to use such openings to their advantage. Eventually, this difference in

the similar self-interest became so great that the Civil War resulted. If perchance the Founding Fathers had decided to firmly eradicate this cancer from the start, and truly put into practise the spirit with which they had found the country, then the Civil War might not have ever happened, and the South today would not be the backward and poor area it is, still rife with racial tension and economic underdevelopment.

Another example is the Athenians and the Sicilian expedition. For after having won many victories the Athenians, growing bold and thoughtless, decided to strike at far away bases of Spartan power, in order to isolate the Spartan mainland. Yet not really understanding the scale of their undertaking, or the risks and rewards it might bring, the Athenians still set out on this massive expedition. One sees here that despite a generally similar self-interest between its citizens (with the noticeable exception of the commander Nicias, who opposed the expedition), the desire to wage war in far off lands for no discernable good reason suggests only thoughtlessness of the Athenians. Indeed, this thoughtless self-interest was very far from the original self-interest of its foundation, and the similar self-interest of Delian League at *its* foundation. For if the Athenians really were committed to democracy and peace, they would not have gone about trying to conquer Sicily, a land far away and not really involved, (though nominally allied to Sparta). In fact, the Athenians, if they were true to their founding similar self-interest, would have never committed so many brash and un-democratic acts against their allies so as to cause the war to begin in the first place.

3.2.3 How A Similar Self-Interest May Change And Yet Still Remain The “Same”.

As I have said above, a similar self-interest must remain faithful to its original intent, yet it must also adapt in order to survive. How then, can a similar self-interest adapt and at the same time remain the same? Here, it is productive to think of an individual: just as a person grows older, they change physically and mentally. But assuredly, they are still the same person. The Meiji Restoration, although it caused great change in Japanese society, yet managed at the same time to maintain the Japanese values of cultural cohesiveness, social hierarchy, and love of the emperor.

At this point it is important to note that problems arise when the multiple lenses of the similar self-interest are forced to change quickly. Although an individual may be able to remove one bad habit over a year, it is much harder to remove many bad habits within only a month. So it is the same with a nation's similar self-interest. Generally speaking, large and quick changes often happen violently and by coercion, with much destruction and death. Whereas small changes over long periods of time are peaceful and sometimes even unnoticed. Thus, the Meiji Restoration was a magnificent rarity, in that it was both a quick and large change in Japanese society, accomplished with little bloodshed.

3.2.4 The Necessity Of Keeping A Positive Perception Of The Similar Self-Interest By The Public: The Necessity Of Public Support.

It is also necessary, to maintain a positive perception of the similar self-interest by the public. For even if the public has a unified conception of the similar self-interest, if it is unified in thinking that it is *bad*, then that is not good for the state either. One great example of this phenomenon can be seen near the end of Tsarist Russia. For although the people were unified in loving their Tsar, they were also unified in thinking that his reign was inefficient, his advisors were bad, and that the system was not providing for their welfare. And indeed, it wasn't, for the second and third objectives were not being fulfilled! Not only was Russia being defeated by Germany, but also the civilians were starving back at home. Thus, it is of utmost necessity that the state maintain the support of the people for its similar self-interest, for without it, the state will collapse, leading into even more ruin. So in reality, as morally empty as this may sound, in fact it may be better for the people to support a state that is inefficient, than try to overthrow it, since any revolution is bound to be worse than the current situation.

3.3 By Civil War A State May Realign Its Similar Self-Interest With That At The Time Of Its Founding.

Just like how car tires must be realigned every few months, lest they tilt their passenger into dangerous accidents and off the paved road, so too the similar self-interest of any state must be realigned from time to time with its founding. There are a few ways to realign the similar self-interest. The first is by civil war. This is obviously the most dangerous and costly method, since it involves open war by one part of the people against the other part. However, if the party which is closer to the founding similar self-interest succeeds, then it can be considered, if said party administers the defeated rebels well, that the founding similar self-interest has been restored. One example of a successful civil war would thus be the Sonderbund War in 1847 in Switzerland. Despite the deep seated animosity between the Protestant Swiss and the Catholic Swiss, the swift victory (with less than one hundred deaths on both sides) of the Protestant Swiss and their subsequent leniency to the Catholics ensured a calm and surprisingly peaceful return to the Swiss similar self-interest. However, there is always the risk, that neither party is truly fighting in line with the founding similar self-interest, and that the victor may impose his own new similar self-interest. This imposition is what happened with Augustus, when he supposedly “restored” the Republic, but in actuality created a new power structure with only the appearance of a Republic. However, since this method is not to be preferred unless in the most dire of straits, when no other options hold sway, I will discourse now of other methods to realign the similar self-interest.

3.3.1 Other Ways By Which A State May Realign Its Similar Self-Interest With That At The Time Of Its Founding.

Another way of realigning the similar self-interest is to employ the use of a great man. A most famous example would be Solon the Athenian, who in the sixth century BCE, noticing the evil of the existing debt laws and the power of the few great growing greater and greater, he, as archon, instituted numerous reforms in order to assuage the condition of the masses. Although he was not completely successful, in that he did not manage to create a true democracy in the government, his reforms managed to bring the state back closer to what it once was. First, he lowered the wealth requirements for different classes in the state for people to be able to participate in government. Second, he removed Draconian laws which had excessive punishments. Third, he encouraged trade and tradesmen within Athens, thus reducing the stranglehold of the established elite. Fourth, he forbade the use of the physical body of debtors themselves as security for mortgage or loans. And finally, by leaving Athens for ten years after instituting his reforms, he performed a great piece of political theatre, by which he showed that he did not wish to profit from his own work, but that he did it solely for the people, thus providing for them a concrete example of outstanding uprightness to follow.

A third way of realignment is to employ a council of highly educated men who have none or little political power but who are respected and must be listened to. An example of this is the Supreme Court in the United States. Because at any time the men in the council are few in number and educated in mind, there will neither be an excess nor thoughtlessness of opinion. Furthermore, because they are a group, they may bounce ideas off each other and examine the merits and detractions of each. And because they do not hold legal power they (hopefully) will not be biased in their judgement. By this method, the people will come to appreciate the intelligence, impartial nature, and status of the council, and take heed to their decisions.

A fourth way is to employ strong social customs, whether it be religion or tradition (and also culture and custom. Essentially, this method is to use the similar self-interest to realign itself). For example, the old Orthodox Christian religion remains a constant presence among the masses of Russia to this day. The constant veneration of their icons and their saints gives Russia a unique perspective of self that differed it from the western european nations. It can be argued that it was because of this holy love of the motherland that the Russian people rose up en masse not once, but twice against foreign invaders, the first time against Imperial France and the second time against Nazi Germany, sacrificing everything in defense of their similar self-interest. The other side of religion is culture. For an example, I turn to the Swiss again, who, though split by four languages and two religions, are able to maintain a remarkable faithfulness to their original self-interest. For by means of the legend of the Rutlischwur of 1291, the concept of citizen rule, a common Christianity, the saga of William Tell, the love of the Alps, the concept of neutrality, the love of privacy, and their humility (can you name one famous Swiss person? And if you said William Tell, you would be wrong. In fact, he's actually German), the Swiss are able to create a national image with which they can strongly identify. That the Swiss to this day can initiate or deny federal legislation from the citizen level is testament to their strong and continuing tradition and culture.

3.3.2 In Comparing The Various Methods of Realignment.

In comparing civil war, a great man, a council, and religion and tradition as means of realigning the similar self-interest, we may conclude thus. Civil wars are to be avoided at all costs, since in most cases they produce great amounts of death and waste, but if they become necessary, they are to be preferred over revolutions. (For revolutions usually destroy everything).

The advantage of the great man is that he is able to make reforms quickly, efficiently, and without argument. He is also able to arouse great respect and reverence from the people by public and private acts of theatre, thus lending his work credence, and giving the people an example to emulate. But the life of any one person is limited, and there is no guarantee that when called upon, the next great man, whoever he may be, will be as virtuous as his predecessor. There was no guarantee that Solon's successor would have been as upright and virtuous as he was, and indeed, the next great man, Peisistratos, became tyrant of Athens three times. Thus it

should be obvious that immense power given to an individual, for whatever amount of time, for whatever reason, is inherently dangerous.

The advantage of a council is that no single man can seize power, since they are bound to work together. This is especially so if they are legally prevented from taking power, and legally mandated to deliberate and not govern, as is the case in the United States' Supreme Court. Thus, one does not have to worry about dangerous individuals. Furthermore, unlike the inherent issue of succession with an individual great man, a council can perpetuate itself when it loses a member by simply electing a new member. This aspect of a council has the further advantage that new members can be introduced to the common ideas and thoughts of the council, thus perpetuating the similar self-interest more stably than a succession of great men can. A council also has the benefit of having multiple members to bounce ideas off of, with each member being able to examine the merits and detractions of any given proposal. However, a council is not as able to perform public theatrics for the masses, since a council is usually deliberating or researching. And even if they were able to perform theatrics, it would be more difficult for the masses to follow them, since whereas one great man is easily noticeable and memorable, a council is numerous and forgettable. Furthermore, a council's deliberations are difficult to be understood by the masses, for a council is generally composed of men who are highly educated and erudite. Another danger of the council is slow and unseen corruption. For if its members slowly either become corrupt, or are chosen badly, a council will lose its educated and impartial nature, but not seem that way, whereas the corruption of a single individual is usually quick and easy to spot.

The advantage of religion and tradition is that they are even more long lasting than a council, and are accessible to the masses. Since religion and tradition are accessible to all people in a rudimentary form, it would require that everyone citizen of a state die for the similar self-interest to cease (for example the reestablishment of the Polish nation and the establishment of the Jewish state after hundreds of years of non-existence). Furthermore, it would ensure against a forgetting or a quick perversion of the original similar self-interest, since there are so many people who have a part of it in their breasts. One disadvantage of religion and tradition is that they are not easily adaptable to changes in commerce, technology, politics, and new ideas. For example, the Japanese, sticking to their centuries old tradition of isolation and disdain for foreigners, nearly ended up like other victims of western colonialism when they were visited by Commodore Perry's Black Ships. It was only by quick action of a council of statesmen, soldiers, and thinkers, that Japan was saved. The Meiji Restoration and its subsequent industrialization and modernization thus not only propelled Japan into the modern world on equal footing with the western states but also managed to preserve Japan's unique similar self-interest. A second disadvantage of religion and tradition is that the people, may, over a very long period of time, become corrupt, and often this is not noticeable at all, even compared to councils, since the body of a people is very large and hard to behold at once to see clearly, and no man lives long enough to be able to compare the people now to what they were before.

3.3.3 On Why I Have Not Included A Constitution As A Method Of Realigning The Similar Self-Interest.

At this point you may ask why I have not included a constitution as a method of realigning the similar self interest. I say that a constitution does not live, and is merely words written on paper. For a constitution can not tell us what is the meaning of what is written, and since those who can interpret as when it was written are usually dead, we cannot know. And even if they could tell us what they meant, most likely they would not agree with each other. Thus, we see the big issue with using a constitution as a method of realigning the similar self-interest: no one in the present age can agree in its interpretation. For some think that the Second Amendment allows all American citizens to own any arms, and some think that the Second Amendment only allows civilian-grade arms, and some think that the Second Amendment only allows those who pass multiple tests and checks to own arms, and others think that the Second Amendment limits arms to militias, and still others might think that the Second Amendment should be removed.

This brings us to the next point: that a constitution, since it is written and not changing, may become a gathering point for die-hard conservatives, and it may entice people to cling on a false sense of similar self-interest. For despite the modern nature of weapons and armies, certain Americans still feel the need to “resist” the government by owning assault rifles, as if assault rifles could stand up against the world’s most advanced military and intelligence network. This unchanging nature of the American Constitution has caused its modern citizens much trouble over the years. For no country is static, and the ideas that men have centuries ago may not always be totally fit for today.

Instead of blindly following a constitution, I say that it is the *spirit* of the founding similar self-interest that the modern citizens of any nation should try to find and adhere to. For although slavery was legally permitted and women legally could not vote, these old aspects of American society were in no way in line with the founding self-interest that all men are created equal. For if a nation says that all men are equal, it should act that way, or that if it does not say that, it does not have to act that way. In contrast, the United Kingdom has never had a written constitution, and instead has adapted slowly over the years to new events in human affairs. As we can see, not only has the UK managed to implement mass suffrage, but it has also maintained its noble class, and its Queen, and achieved a very high standard of living. And this mutability and adaptability is the important point. A constitution cannot change: it is written. But traditions and religions may slowly adapt and evolve. Thus, the common point of the great man, the council, and religion and tradition is the fact that they may all change, since they are living.

Thus, whereas the British may turn to their Monarchy and Parliament, the Swiss to their Sonderfall and Tradition, the Russians to their Orthodoxy and Geography, the Americans have no idea to turn to in which all may strongly agree and identify, for no one can agree to the

meaning of what is written on that 245 year old piece of paper (though, ironically, there are many things that Americans can choose to agree on).

3.3.3.1 On How The Americans Should Use Their Constitution.

Although it is clear above that there are many reasons why a constitution should not be used as a method of realigning the similar self interest, still, the United States uses as its primary way of aligning and realigning its similar self-interest. Thus, I shall recommend how the Constitution of the United States may be better employed than it currently is.

It is necessary that the people and politicians of America not cling to the old document as if it were something God-given. For as I have said before, no man can reach the shining star of Truth, though he may reach close, and the Founding Fathers are no exception. Therefore, why should it be the case that the Constitution is treated as if it were some untouchable object? The fact is that it *has* been touched, indeed, by the hands of the Founding Fathers when they wrote it! Thus, the Constitution must constantly be revisited, reflected upon, and revised, since as the times change so too should the laws that govern them. And this is not a bad thing. For just as when men reach a point in their lives in which they question their goals and achievements, so too must Americans question themselves and their constitution. For even if certain goals become less important and others more important, and certain achievements more meaningful and others less meaningful, the spirit of an individual comes out more aware, more pure, and more full of understanding of what he must do in life and where he must go when he evaluates these things. Americans thus, must do on a national scale with their Constitution, as what they do individually with their own lives (though it would be a valid argument that indeed not many people these days reflect upon their own lives).

3.3.4 No Method Of Realignment Is Better Than The Other, Each Has Its Own Time And Place, And All Are Equally Useless Of The People Involved Do Not Have Virtue, And Are Corrupt.

Ultimately none of these modes of realignment are worth anything unless its participants are virtuous. For if its participants are corrupt, then the result of realignment will be corrupt. This much is obvious, and has been discoursed upon numerous times by ancient writers. However, since someone will most likely ask me what method of realignment I favor, I will say that religion and tradition should be most favored as a method of realignment, since they are accessible to the masses, they are stable, and they are long lasting. Only if religion and tradition should fail, should one recourse a council. And if a council should fail, only then should one recourse to a great man. For with each step of decreasing participation in realignment, though the ability to realign becomes greater, so too does the risk of total derailment and tyranny. Therefore, using religion and tradition as a method of realignment is slow, it comes with the least risk of ruin. And while a great man can quickly point the nation back on its proper path, he can also completely derail the nation as well.

The State Must Regulate Its Consumption And Be Aware That Its Similar Self-Interest Does Not Surpass Its Available Resources.

Section 4 The Second Objective: The Sustenance Of The Similar Self-Interest.

4.1 The Body Of The State Is The Amalgamation Of The Bodies Of Its Citizens, Which Also Requires Sustenance.

The state can be thought of as a composite being, made up of the bodies of each of its citizens. A great representation of this idea is the 1651 Leviathan cover. For it is unsustainable that all of the citizens of a state can be leaders, or that there exist no leaders at all. And it is equally unsustainable if the army exceeds the carrying capacity of the nation's resources and production (on the topic of army size and function in peace time I will discourse of later). And I say furthermore that it is also unsustainable if all the citizens were knowledgeable only in one subject. For just like the human body, the national body is composed of a brain (government), different organs (resource management, military, social work, infrastructure, land management, police, businesses, researchers, learning institutions, etc), and blood (humans, its citizens). And just as a human body is not one indistinguishable blob, but a unified whole of highly complex parts working together to maintain the individual consciousness, so too is the national body a highly complex organization of various moving parts.

Thus, just like the physical needs of each individual citizen, the national body also requires sustenance. And many of these substances are the same. Food, water, energy resources, material resources, shelter, public works, security, entertainment, and so forth. And if we were to consider the state as an “individual,” we would see that the state’s “individual” self-interest is also that of the preservation of its own life (or in other words, the continued existence of the state). (On this topic, on the self-preservation instinct of all states, even if it is to the detriment to the people, I will discuss later: such a state’s similar self-interest has lost its alignment with the people).

4.2 As Cells May Die To Defend The Body Of The Individual, So Too Individuals May Die To Defend The Body Of The State: Manpower Is Also A Resource.

It is important to remember that at times the human body must defend itself by means of deploying white blood cells against pathogens or destroying old or diseased cells. The national body too, may require its individual citizens to fight and die for it during times of crises. Thus, just like red and white blood cells, men are the life-force of the national body, for without them

there would be no nation to begin with. And just like with blood, losing too many men becomes detrimental to the national body. Manpower is a resource as well, and must be organized, managed, and deployed carefully. For there is one major difference between the human body's blood and the national body's blood. Whereas cells are not individuals in the sense that they do not have consciousness, *individuals are indeed individuals who have consciousness*. Thus, whereas the human body might order its white blood cells to rush en masse to defeat a virus, and sacrifice its infected red blood cells, all without thought or question, the national body cannot easily expect such blind obedience from its individual citizens. (On the question of obedience and organization I will discourse later).

4.3 The Driving Force Behind Individuals And Behind States, Which Compels Individuals And States To Continue Forward And Not Stagnate Into Apathy.

A person must constantly have some sort of *driving* life principle, desire, or moral to *compel* him to continue on in life, whether it be love of family, love of wealth, love of glory, love of power, love of stability, love of God, love of man, love of happiness, love of knowledge, or sheer arrogance, and so on. This is because without some sort of driving factor, an individual will eventually stagnate into apathy. Most evident are those older people who, after having retired, don't know what to do with their free time, and slowly lose their mental functions, as opposed to other elderly who either work until their death (either because they have to or because they want to), or are able to enjoy whatever pursuits in retirement with the free time that they now have. For it is necessary for humans to continually *do* something, since very few are able to endure doing nothing. This latter reason is because by doing nothing one's mind and spirit inevitably (out of boredom) turn to one's own death, which leads one to become miserable and suicidal.

Thus, a state's people's similar self-interest must not only constantly be realigned by various methods, but it also must be constantly sustained by a driving spiritual principle. And these driving principles may come from one or more of the seven lenses. But what is the difference between realignment, sustainment by a life principle, and the similar self-interest? Realignment is what helps to bring the citizens back towards a unified conception of the similar self-interest, when there is too much fractioning in the people. Sustainment by a driving force is what drives the similar self-interest, and what keeps citizens away from apathy. And the similar self-interest are the lenses that define a certain people.

At this juncture, it is important to note that the methods of realignment, the various lenses of a similar state-interest, and a specific driving force, may all interlap with one another. For Russian Orthodoxy is at the same time a cultural lens, which constantly realigns the people, and a slow driving force for the people to constantly achieve the goals of their religion. But in general, it takes a unique and singular driving force to truly implement massive change. And this singular driving force may be so strong that it may even coagulate those citizens who are forced into action by it (think of the bond that soldiers form, which exists only in combat). Thus, for

states that have no good method of realignment, then a very strong driving force is perhaps the *only* force that may be able to maintain also the unity of the similar self-interest of that state.

For example, states like Nazi Germany have not much content: they lack any real similar self-interest in their various lens. Culturally, the Nazi state is devoid of any cultural and intellectual development. Economically, its balance of payments is unsustainable and has no real growth. Industrially, its supply chain is ridiculously convoluted. Even militarily, which is the lens that it uses as its driving principle, it relies on sheer force of will and tactics to the complete ignorance of the modern material-based warfare. Furthermore, because of Hitler's autocratic rule, there is no reliable method of realignment, since the entire ability of realignment rests on Hitler, and as we have spoken before, one man is always fallible, especially the longer he is in power and the more power he is given.

Thus, in order to unify the Nazi state, Hitler's world vision of an "ayran master race" (which is in itself such a vague concept) requires some sort of other driving force which gives it legitimacy, namely, the persecution, expulsion, and eventual annihilation of the other (namely, Jews, Slavs, the mentally ill, Bolsheviks, etc). As Hitler himself states, the extent of Nazi Germany would have only been complete once it had annihilated the peoples of the east and colonized its lands: the disappearance of this driving force would have fatally weakened the Nazi state. Indeed, Hitler, throughout the prelude to war, made no secret as to the fact that his rearmament was for offensive purposes. In fact, in his world vision, Germany's balance of payments was not unsustainable, since the deficit would be made up by Germany's conquest of the vast living spaces and resources of the east. Thus there was no question from the very start that the continued existence of the Nazi state was based on the destruction of the Slavs and Jews, and the colonization of the East, since it was only by the supposed threat of these "race enemies" that the Nazi state would be able to compel its citizens to act. Yet ironically, this very driving principle, indeed, led to their ultimate annihilation by the Soviets and the Allies. Thus, even though a driving principle is important for the growth of a state, it can also lead a state to its ruin.

On the other hand, the driving force behind more peaceful states is most often innovation and productivity, or more negatively, greed. For example, modern China's modus operandi is essentially production and GDP growth over all other considerations, its driving principle is the lens of economy. Billionaire internet giant Jack Ma put it best when he stated that "the quintessential quality of the Chinese people is money". Thus, when looking at the driving force behind Chinese individuals, one sees that they value displays of wealth and the security of their assets above all else. Even though Chinese billionaires may not know anything of the fancy cars, the expensive watches, the private jets, the bottles of wine, and the seaside mansions they are buying, to be able to own these things, to own them *securely*, and to show them off to other people, is their driving force. And indeed, it is the driving force of the modern Chinese nation, for if any observer were to look at the structure of Chinese society and government, without strong economic growth, the very foundation of modern China and the CCP would quickly collapse. The fragility of the CCP's rule over modern China and its reliance on economic growth

as its driving force and its method of realignment is best exposed by the 2020 Coronavirus outbreak. (The logic is that if the economy is doing well, it must be by the leadership of the CCP, thus, the citizens will align themselves with the CCP). The outbreak, in just two months, has managed to reveal the numerous cracks and structural faults in the current Chinese government. For without the profit (or distraction, in a more negative view) of the factories and businesses, which have been shut down due to the quarantine of entire provinces, the citizens have nothing to do except worry about their own future financial and physical security, the party ministers devolve into pointing fingers at one another, and the top-tier wealthy CEOs are all attempting to flee to western democracies with their families. Thus, wealth is not only the quintessential quality of the Chinese people, but rather it is the quintessential quality of the entire Chinese state. For it is into this singular lens that the Chinese state has put all their effort.

4.4.1 The Sustenance Of A State's Similar Self-Interest Is Tenable When There Is No Large Deficit During Peacetime.

Since in today's modern era no state can possibly be 100% self sufficient, it is thus natural that all states (who do not pursue autarky as part of their similar self-interest) today seek to trade with other states in order to obtain products or resources otherwise unobtainable from their own lands or unobtainable in sufficient quantities from their own lands. Thus, trade during peacetime is a good thing, since it satisfies the needs of a state's similar self-interest, and helps facilitate different nations to maintain peace (on the matter of an interstate similar self-interest I will discourse of later). However, trade becomes harmful when a nation's similar self-interest creates a large deficit through trade because of its insatiable appetite. By "large deficit" I mean a deficit that is too big for one generation to lower without substantially lowering their standard of living, and impacting their future prosperity or their security.

For even if during peacetime a nation's similar self-interest cannot satisfy its appetite, then there will be even less reason to assume that a nation in war can successfully satisfy its appetite, since the various nations of the world will be hoarding their resources in order to survive the coming hardship. And furthermore, even if all nations were perpetually at peace, said insatiable state would still eventually collapse. Such an outcome would be due to two main reasons: first, that other nations will eventually tire of supplying the greedy nation and be no longer willing to sell them products and resources on credit. Second, even if we were to assume that there was only one nation on Earth, said singular insatiable nation would physically run out of resources to consume. And because of that, it will collapse from within due to societal unrest. Thus, having a large deficit is never a good thing for the maintenance of a state's similar self-interest, during peacetime, and even more so during wartime.

4.4.2 Sometimes The Physical Maintenance Of The Similar Self-Interest Is Simply Untenable Or Self Contradictory, Due To The Nature Of Their Similar Self-Interest: A

Discourse About The Currently Unsustainable Similar Self-Interest Of The United States, And How It Contributes To The Lack Of A Driving Force.

Although it is important to keep a state's similar self-interest well fed, sometimes, it becomes difficult, impossible, or even harmful to do so. Indeed, I say that although it is a good thing to feed a growing child well, to feed an obviously overweight and unhealthy man who is not exercising a lot of food not only will not satisfy him, but will also make him even more prone to obesity-related illness and death. The perfect example of this phenomenon is the United States. The United States has one of the most developed infrastructures in the world, with an abundance of food and natural resources. Yet despite this fact, the American people still consume more than they are able to sustainably produce or trade for. And despite the fact that their living standard (on average) is one of the highest in the world, they still do not seem to be happy, and they still constantly seek more material things to make them happy.

But why is there this disconnect between the abundance of resources and the insatiable appetite in America? One might say, that it is because of the sheer abundance of resources and products in America that causes America's insatiable appetite, and certainly this theory holds some ground when one examines the 1%: the more money the 1% have, the more money they want, even though they have more than enough to live a comfortable and luxurious life. But the greed of the 1% is an established global phenomenon. Why, in America, does the average person also have an insatiable appetite? America's insatiable consumerism may perhaps be better understood through its love for individual freedom (better known as "mah rights"), and its unshakeable and self-righteous (and arrogant) belief in the moral supremacy of democracy. By taking into account these reasons we are able to see the cause of America's insatiable appetite. In other words, the United States' similar self-interest is untenable not because of corporate capitalism or crass consumerism, no, these, in fact, are only side effects (although it may be argued that here we have a positive feedback loop, in which love of freedom feeds consumerism and consumerism feeds love of freedom and so on). America's similar self-interest is untenable because its love of freedom and democracy with no compromise means that anything that inhibits the freedom of the individual is frowned upon. (I must first point out that I am making general statements. Secondly, again, I must point out here that I am not making any value judgements on whether America's fervent love of freedom is good or bad, only that it is what it is.)

In order to maintain their individual freedom and their democracy, which is the number one lens in their similar self-interest, the average American will resist any attempt to limit their consumption and action, for to limit what one can or cannot do is to limit the fundamental lens of the American similar self-interest, that of freedom. Thus, even though it is inefficient to drive cars, Americans still prefer cars over trains simply because cars are emblematic of freedom. And even though flight travel is extremely wasteful, and people don't really learn about the "exotic" places they travel to across the sea, Americans (and the people of other wealthy nations too) still love to fly everywhere. And even though climate change is a scientific fact, and Americans are

per capita disproportionately contributing to it, Americans still love to waste tons of plastic and buy new things often (and Americans disproportionately, among developed nations, deny its validity). And even though eating to obesity may cause disease and decrease quality of life, and causes a large strain on the health system, America is one of the fattest nations in the world.

And Americans still do these things because they can. For this is the *modus operandi* of America: Americans would rather do something that harms themselves and then later ask for help and try to resolve the issue, than be told not to do it in the first place or to try and prevent it from ever happening; they would rather take momentary pleasure in the ease of buying material things, than put in effort to achieve a truly satisfying and rewarding goal; they would rather apologize than ask permission. (Thus, the preponderance of rehab clinics, AA groups, "lose weight fast" gyms, strip malls, and online shopping across the United States). Consequently, although different groups of Americans may judge you for what you do with your freedom, they will never question your freedom to do those things, for it is the freedom to do whatever you want itself that is what is seen as the good in America: and although this freedom has given rise to a nation of idiots and fatties, it has also given rise to the only nation in the world in which freedom of all speech and the pursuit of all knowledge is allowed.

But ultimately the freedom to do whatever one wants is meaningless if one chooses to do nothing or harm oneself (sadly, it seems that doing nothing and pursuing unhealthy lifestyles are the predominant choices among American citizens.) Currently, this widespread apathy in the United States is a major factor contributing to the stagnation of its culture, religion, society, economy, and technology (in relation to itself, not in relation to other nations, since obviously, it is still way ahead of most nations in most measurements). Although freedom and democracy allow for a great amount of latitude in choosing one's own path, it also presents no compulsion to do anything. Because of this reason, we see that the greatest moments in American political history have been in situations in which the country felt that it was cornered or forced into action. (For example, British domination and the Revolutionary War, Confederate secession, German Aggression in both world wars, Soviet expansion in Cuba, and so on). Indeed, the greatest reforms in the US were undertaken during or after major wars. For example, after WWII and WWI, women and African Americans gained much more standing in society than before. At the same time, the overwhelming power of the robber barons was steadily whittled down to a more acceptable level.

Thus, Yamamoto's quote that the United States is a sleeping giant, even when taken out of a military context, still makes sense. For unless there is some very strong compulsion, some very strong driving force (and unfortunately, usually this compulsion is war), to wake the United States out of its apathetic slumber, the people of the United States will feel no compulsion to do anything, they will have no guidelines to being happy. For at the very least the peoples of, say, Italy, have a strong culture to adhere to and guide their daily activities, as it is also with the people of Japan, since in Japan often every week there are local festivals and traditions, and the sense of community and honor is extremely strong. Whereas the people of the United States (and

also to an extent Canada) uniquely have no culture to guide them, but only an idea. Thus, at most, we might say that America's contemporary driving force is an odd mixture of calvinist work ethic, the pursuit of happiness, and material consumption. None of which are strong compelling factors for growth, and none of which offer strong guidelines to daily living.

To the astute reader, it will appear *very* ironic that the United States has a massive problem of overconsumption in the material realm, but has almost no sustenance in the realm of driving principles. Indeed, one would be hard pressed to find any sort of driving life principle anywhere in American society. Thus, the overwhelming attachment Americans have to individual freedom and democracy gives rise to the total lack of any long-lasting driving principle, be it a culture (which it can't have, because it is a mix of many unique peoples), or a form of social code (which it can't have, because individual freedom is prioritised over community), or even military conquest (I am not saying that military conquest is good, only that it can function as a driving force). However, at the very least, despite its apathetic state, modern America at least has not actively imposed ruin on other nations and its own people by means of an aggressive driving force. For it is true that apathy generally does not lead to genocide, but imperialism does. Thus, ironically, in a sense, by being apathetic, America has ended up being better than Nazi Germany, China, and other modern states, since most importantly: it allows its citizens to live.

In these examples, Nazi Germany, modern CCP China, and the United States, we are able to see various configurations of similar self-interest and driving force. In Nazi Germany, unbridled aggression made up for its near-total lack of similar self-interest. In China, love of money makes up for its fragile similar self-interest. And in the United States, apathy comes as a result of its incredibly strong similar self-interest. What kind of similar self-interest and driving force are best for a nation? There is never a correct answer, and every nation must be considered in its own context.

4.5 The Necessary Regulation Of The Similar Self-Interest To Match Sustainable Consumption.

Eventually, however, each state must find a balance between its similar self-interest, its driving life principle, and the amount of obtainable resources for consumption. For unless Americans are willing to move away from their similar self-interest, which entails gross overconsumption, they will eventually lose the faith of their trading partners and even their military and ideological allies, since nobody likes a gluttonous and accusatory friend. For to not have a similar self-interest often leads to internal collapse or the formation of an aggressive spirit, and to have a similar self-interest that is contradictory to the practical situation at hand is also unsustainable. For we must always remember that despite the lofty ideas of individual freedom and democracy, states exist alongside other states, and there is only a finite amount of resources with which we may all satisfy our needs. And despite the grand dreams of a state of some grand empire, if you cannot not achieve it to the utmost, you will fail and collapse. For

despite Americans' love for freedom and democracy, the very existence of the United States itself presupposes that some individual freedoms must be curtailed, and that democracy can never be truly all inclusive, since by definition a country is a similar self-interest in which different individuals with different conceptions of what is necessary and enough join together and modify their own individual self-interests with a similar self-interest that is common enough for all.

Section Five: The Third Objective. The Defence Of The Similar Self-Interest.

5.1.1 Why An Individual May Strongly Defend Himself Against Threats To His Livelihood; And Why Anyone Who Does So Even So As To Lose His Life Has Forgotten His Individual Self-Interest.

Since humans are one of the few animals that require advanced material goods to live and be happy, it is natural that they also seek to protect their goods. Yet although the defence of their property and livelihood is important, in that those things improve the living standards of a person, one generally sees that an individual will not defend his property to the last unless the damage or theft of his property is so great that he believes he can no longer survive afterwards without them. Thus, we see that in ancient times peripheral farmers would often run away from their fields and into the city fortress when the enemy raiders were too great for them, rather than fight to the death, since the farmers knew that the city would protect them and help them rebuild. But when the threat to one's property is sufficiently great, you will find that men often will fight to the last, since to them their property and their life are synonymous.

But this equation between property and life is false, since even if one were to lose all of one's property, one would at least *still be alive*. As Mao says, "keep men, lose land: land can be retaken. Keep land, lose men: land and men are both lost". Thus, although the idea of personal property and freedom may be great ideals with which to motivate the people to the defence of country, ultimately, *for the individual*, it is better to survive than to die fighting for property, since in death one loses everything, whereas even in poverty, one is still alive. In other words: Survival *is* victory.

This logic, however, does not apply to those who are fighting for rights or freedom, since those are aggressive actions (despite the fact that slavery or segregation is morally evil). This logic also does not apply to those who are specifically defending against enemies who come with the intent to kill you.

5.1.2 Why An Individual Will Defend Himself To The Last Against Threats To His Life.

Since all living organisms generally do not wish to die, they will seek shelter and food for themselves. But most especially they will take immediate action when they sense that an enemy

is attacking them for the express purpose of ending their life. For in this situation there is no bargaining with or running away from the enemy, as their objective is not one's property, but one's life. Thus, an individual under such an attack will fight to the last: for in fighting to the last there may still be the chance that one may emerge victorious, whereas in not fighting at all one will most likely die.

And men will do this because unlike old age, which is the only truly unpreventable way of death, dying from enemies is a preventable way of death, and no one wishes to die by the hand of another than by his own (this fact explains why people are so much more vengeful against doctors who commit malpractice than against their own unhealthy habits). Furthermore, in almost all societies, taking life is seen as a moral and legal wrong, so much so that the defender of his life is often not only motivated by primal instinct to fight back, but also by moral and legal justifications. (The ramifications of defensive vs offensive battle will be further explored later). Thus defence of life is often the greatest driving force that can compel an individual, since its cause is immediate and its consequences brutally clear.

Thus the above is the reason why generals of ancient times would often appeal to the sense of self preservation of his soldiers, when they were surrounded, outnumbered, or in a bad position. For to appeal to the soldiers' sense of self preservation in a dire moment would be appealing to each of their individual self-interest. And we see that often, a cornered rat will bite back with great bravery and ferocity, just as Caesar and his men did at Phillipi.

5.2 The Cause Of War Between Individuals, And Between States.

It should be fairly obvious that the cause of war between individuals, as I have said near the beginning of my work, is that of scarcity of resources (or the perceived scarcity of resources). Put in other words, it is the combat between one individual's individual self-interest and another individual's individual self-interest.

When nations go to war over "defense of rights" or "imperial conquest" or "liberation of an oppressed people," it might seem that these reasons are very distinct and different, and the reasons for war complicated and diverse. Although such an argument is no doubt true, given the fact that there are seven lenses by which we may examine a nation and its similar self-interest, in reality, all of it can be boiled down to the fact that nations go to war because they cannot reconcile their similar self-interests to an adequate degree required for peace.

When A Nation's Similar Self-Interest Does Not Lead To Its Survival Due To Certain Factors: (idiot autocrat all power, misled people, fight to the death mentality,

although these things may seem completely different, and often very complicated, they are in fact simply different lenses of a state's similar self-interest.

//

NEW SECTION?? Defense and war NEW SECTION.?? All states must defend themselves. This section leads into the discourse over war.

Talk about the interstate similar self interest. And how wars are essentially the fact that different states don't have sufficient agreement on the various lenses between their similar self interests. So for example, even though two states may not agree on ALL the lenses, they may still ally because they have ENOUGH agreement on the rest of their lenses. For example, even though in 1914 France was a Democracy and Russia A tsardom, they still allied because they both had goals of economic growth and containing the rising German threat.

?? All Wars Are Wars Over Differing Self-Interests. This is the ultimate rationale behind all wars.

Although often it has been said that men also fight wars for political, moral, and cultural reasons, underlying these reasons is ultimately the self-interested question of limited resources, and who is allowed to share in them. For example, for the Confederacy it was clear that the North was trampling on their cultural heritage and economic rights. For the right to keep slaves, to maintain greater state sovereignty, and to live in their "Southern way of life", the Confederacy was formed. Despite the fact bogus moral arguemtsn were made about the positivity of slavery, and that it was also a long-established cultural practise in the south, the real rationale for the South's defense of slavery was its economic benefits for the wealthy landowning elite, and its illusion for the poorer small farmer. Despite the fact that in reality, slavery benefited only a very small segment of southern white society, the fearful illusion that the wealth and culture of the South was to be trod upon by the North was enough to rouse even the small farmer into action.

WHY IS MY WAR SECTION SO LONG? Because even though it is easy to realign the self interest of a state, not many people do it. And although war is difficult and dangerous, many people wish to do it. Why is there is discrepancy? Because war is glorious, and can bring riches and rank, and appeals naturally to the primal instinct in man, and arouses his excitement, whereas maintaing the similar self interest is neither appealing or glorious, and often involves backhanded methods, and is not exciting.

However, self-interest will inevitably lead to conflict. Conflict, which leads to war and death, is bad. (Since most living things want to live, one must assume life to be good. And since death is the opposite of life, we must assume here that death is bad. By assuming thus we can dispense with the philosophical ponderings over the goodness or badness of life and death).

?.? On The Tension Between The Defence Of the Similar Self-Interest And The Sacrifice Of the Individual Self-Interest.

Another question that arises from the defense of the similar self-interest is whether the defense of the similar self-interest may at times be contradictory to each individual's self interest. For surely if Operation Tannenbaum did happen, many Swiss would have probably died in vain to defend their mountains, due to the overwhelming strength of the Nazi war machine in comparison with the Swiss militia forces. Obviously states that cannot compel their citizens to its defence cannot survive. Therefore the state must demonstrate either that its similar self-interest can *better fulfill* the individual self-interest, or that its similar self-interest is the only *just*, and *good* similar self-interest among those of all nations. Obviously, the latter point is an extension of the first, but in its practise it is fundamentally different from the first. For the former reason to fight is based on practicalities, whereas the second reason to fight is based on principles.

The state must demonstrate that its similar self-interest will allow for a better fulfillment of the individual self-interest than the enemy's similar self-interest. And second

have a convincing and strong enough similar self-interest to convince its people to fight and die for it.

First, if citizens are willing to fight and perhaps die for their country, this means that the citizens believe that their similar self-interest has a greater chance to preserve their individual lives than the similar self-interest of the enemy. For example, Americans believe that democracy is better than dictatorship, despite the fact that certain dictatorships in the world have raised their countries out of poverty in record time (but that latter fact is besides the point), because Americans believe that democracy is more likely to preserve their individual self-interests better than any other form of government. But if in defending their similar self-interest the citizens of said state perceive themselves likely to die, then they will not. An example of this capitulation of the similar self-interest can be seen in the February Revolution in Tsarist Russia. Because the people were starving and the armies were being decisively defeated,

In response to the contradiction between defense of homeland and individual death, I would say that if the people still believe that defending the common good has a higher chance of letting them survive, then they will defend, but that if their defense leads to their ultimate destruction, then they will not. Thus ultimately, principles are a more complex form of individual self-interest, but they are a form of individual self-interest nonetheless.

In the case of Nazi Germany, they were so paranoid against the Soviets, with good reason, that they HAD to defend to the very end. Furthermore, sometimes brainwashing can be so thorough that for the Nazis, defeat was equal to death. This mentality we also see in Sparta. But if the people decide that fighting and possibly dying for the common good won't lead to the fulfillment of their INDIVIDUAL self interests, then, just like in the Russian February revolution of 1917, the people will capitulate and rather COMPLETELY CHANGE THEIR SIMILAR SELF INTEREST (IE the Tsar Nicholas II) to an entirely different similar self interest (IE Central communist party direction)

2.7 THE DANGER IN STICKING TO PRINCIPLES OVER PRACTICALITIES.

Even though a conquerer may be able to feed and maintain his subjects, if his subjects were not used to his similar self-interest, the conquerer would not be able to hold them. Since eventually, men become deluded in the thinking that their similar self-interest is the only correct way, DESPITE THE FACT That all similar self-interests serve the ultimate end, that of the individual self-interest, and all individual self-interests are the same, BECAUSE the citizens of that former state, now conquered, STILL BELIEVE that their similar self-interest is more conducive to achieving their individual self-interests.,

When there are enough resources to go around all men, self-interest is a neutral quality of men. If we assume a controlled scenario in which men consume only what is necessary to survive, then there would be no conflict, since excess

that men will only consume what is necessary to survive

Although every individual may be either good or bad, every individual is indeed self-interested. (However, it must be noted that self-interested is not the same as selfish. Selfishness is self-interest taken to an extreme degree, but concerning that I will discuss later). Every action of every individual is self-interested, since it is natural that we wish to preserve our own life, the lives of our family, and our property.

If perchance someone were to say that men in social states like Germany or the Scandinavian countries or Switzerland today are not self-interested, I would say they are not examining clearly enough the situation at hand. For first, these countries are able to sustain their appearance of community and social cohesiveness through the import of necessary resources.

Why is it that billionaires often donate lots of money? This is because they wish to be seen as a good person. And despite our horror at the dystopian Chinese system of the “Social Credit Rating Score”, we Americans subconsciously rate people we know and meet,