The title of this presentation is: “Where are we now?”.
When attempting to promote The Movement, it is found that the majority of the critics tend to ignore the current of state affairs. Rather, in a detached manner, they simply criticize the abstracts of the proposed solution without ever reflecting on the train of thought that was employed to reach those solutions or how they relate to the problems.

So, in response to this, this presentation hopes to further express the dire need to get away from our current social practices, while also showing the core logic that arrive at the conclusions for a new economic model.

So, first, there will be an overview of the movement.
Then, Part one is going to elaborate even more so on the nature of our world monetary system and consequences;
While in Part 2, we will take a larger step back and consider the human condition, its cultivation and the effects of the social system at large.

However, before we begin, please note that this presentation is not a full treatment and it is suggested that everyone review the data at www.thezeitgeistmovement.com for more explanations regarding specifics.
The Zeitgeist Movement:

Working for change in the dominant intellectual, moral and cultural climate of the time

The term “Zeitgeist” is defined as the ‘The General intellectual, moral and cultural climate of an era.” The Term “Movement” very simply implies ‘motion” and change. Therefore The Zeitgeist Movement is thus an organization which urges change in the dominant intellectual, moral and cultural climate of the time, specifically to values and practices which would better serve the well being of the whole of humanity, regardless of race, religion, creed, or any other form of contrived social status.
The ultimate materialization of this view comes in the form of a new social design updated to modern day knowledge. A design that could be termed a “Resource Based Economic Model”, since the foundation of the approach comes from a technical, design application relating to physical law and resources - rather than one based on the movement of money or the like.

In the words of Buckminster Fuller:
"Ninety-Nine percent of humanity does not know that we have the option to “make it” economically on this planet and in the universe, We Do. It can only be accomplished, however, through a design science initiative and technological revolution” – Buckminster Fuller
The foundation of the Resource-Based Economic Model concept is the realization that through the intelligent management of the earth’s resources, along with the liberal application of modern technology and scientific knowledge, we have the ability to create an access abundance on this planet and thus escape the detrimental consequences generated by the real and artificial scarcity and waste which is dominant today. This reality can provably create a high quality of life for the entire world population.
All social systems, regardless of political philosophy, religious beliefs or social customs, ultimately depend upon natural resources as the initial first step towards social functionality. Survival and Efficiency are technical reality.
Likewise, it is important to recognize that society itself is a “culture machine”. In other words, it is a natural consequence of a culture for the supporting values integral to the functioning of that society to maintain dominance, regardless of the longterm benefit of those values. In other words, the society “reaps what it sows”, so to speak.

If your society’s foundation inherently supports self-interest, violence, elitism, greed and dishonesty, then no one should ever be surprised when certain members of society continuously fall into the extremity of murder, financial corruption or indifferent selfish gain. Society is not only a product of the sum of its member’s values. Consequently, it is also a generator of them for each new generation.
It should be no wonder then, for example, that government tend to perpetuates Nationalist and Patriotic values. If they didn’t, people might not support the state agenda or their wars. 
It should be no wonder that, say, the Catholic Church perpetuates the idea that humans and born into sin. Otherwise, people might not show up to be “saved”. 
And it should be no wonder that every major city on this planet is cloaked with corporate advertising, working to generate materialism and inadequacy. Why? Because otherwise some people just might be happy with what they have and not contribute to the profit and perpetuation of a corporation or economy.
Regardless, when it comes to cultural influence, nothing can hold a candle to the vast psychological implications that have developed due to the system of Monetary Finance. Money, contrary to the attitudes of most of the world’s population today, is not a natural resource, nor does it represent resources. In fact, by all standards of logic, money appears only functionally relevant in a society when natural resources and mechanisms of creation are scarce. So, a system has emerged where people are given a value for their skills, in exchange for servitude, which can thus be used as a medium of exchange for those apparently scarce resources.
Today, the culture is now fully indoctrinated into this frame of reference and, like the sun rising, most cannot even consider another possibility for social functionality.
In fact, some have even redefined the relevance of money itself by being conditioned to think that money represents “choice.” That money, somehow, has something to do with “democracy” and the greatest illusion: that the monetary structure is a tool of liberty.
Well, while money has, indeed, served some positive role overall in the course of our social evolution - adaptation, change and improvement is still unstoppable.

The fact is, most of the original problems which required the development of the economic system we see today are no longer pressing, due to the dramatic advancement of science and technology.

We now have the means to move into a new paradigm, one where the negative byproducts of our current social establishment - perpetual war/poverty/human exploitation & environmental destruction no longer require tolerance.

What is advocated here is merely the next step in our social evolution as dictated not by a person or group’s opinion, but by statistics, trends, basic inference and extrapolation, as deduced by the methods of science.
Unfortunately, regardless of how logical, clear and obvious any new idea might be, the still maintains, on average, a tremendous fear of any form of change. This is largely due to the propaganda and indoctrination which has been pushed upon them by various establishment powers which, of course, prefer to maintain their power. These institutions range from religious orders to government, to business.
In fact, it really isn’t the technical understandings and implementation of the attributes that comprise a technically efficient social system that is the problem. We know we can technically do it. Rather, it is the outdated cultural values and educational barriers of the conditioned masses which is the most difficult aspect to contend with.
And this is where The Zeitgeist Movement comes in. We are not here to tell people what to think or believe. We are here to spread statistical information and socially positive value identifications, in the hope of bringing people into an awareness of the incredibly positive possibilities the future can hold. Once these understandings are fully realized, most people will never be able to look at the world in the same way again and the problems we find as commonplace today will become simply unacceptable, motivating change.
Today, there are countless well-intentioned people and activist organizations yelling at the top of their lungs about the rampant problems and injustices in our world. Yet, as you tend to find, very few actually offer any real solutions. Those that do offer solutions, however, almost universally frame those ideas within the preset guidelines of the preexisting social establishment. Very little regard seems to be given to the root structure of our system.
The Zeitgeist Movement is different. Our fundamental focus is finding the foundational sources of our social problems and working from that lowest common denominator to create solutions, coupled with the broad reference of scientific causality and physical law.

And when it comes to social corruption, poverty, environmental disregard, human exploitation and most personal and social turmoil in the world today, an important realization is that most of these problems are not the sole result of a particular company, some nefarious elite group, or government legislation.

Those are merely more “symptoms” of the foundational problems.
The real contextual issue, in fact, is Human Behavior and human behavior, which will be discussed in this presentation moreso, is largely created and reinforced by the social patterns required for survival, as necessitated by the social system of that period in time. We are products of our society on this level and the fact of the matter is that the very foundation of our socioeconomic system and hence our environmental condition is what has created and reinforced the detrimental cultural climate you see around you.
Our current economic system is based almost exclusively upon human & resource exploitation along with consequential redundant waste and inefficiencies. It is simply what our system is.

And far as the as the infamous “They”, which often gets the “blame” in the world - it is simply another social distortion, culminated and reinforced by our environment. There is no singular “They” as a root problem. We are dealing with negative tendencies and those tendencies have a source, trigger or/and reinforcer.
The bottom line is that we can spend the rest of our existences stomping on the ants that mysteriously wander out from underneath the refrigerator - setting traps - or “laws” - or we can get rid of the spoiled food behind it which is causing the infestation to begin with.
MONETARY DYNAMICS AND ITS CONSEQUENCES

PART 1:

MONETARY DYNAMICS AND ITS CONSEQUENCES
Here is an email received from a PHD in economics soon after the release of Zeitgeist Addendum.

Dear Filmmakers,

My son presented me the first half of your film last weekend, asking my opinion of the opening section about the Fractional Reserve lending practices. I am an PHD certified economist of 12 years and teach Macro Economics. While I always was cognizant of the creation of money through the sale of government bonds, I had never stepped back far enough to see the larger issue your film presented. I find it tremendously disturbing that the creation of value through debt, is indeed, by all formal logical, an imposed condition of deficiency and instigator of public servitude. I’m not sure what shocked me more... the fact that this is true, or that the fact that after the many years of education I have had on the subject of economics, this reality never even dawned on me.
It seems counter intuitive to think that a person who should, by all social standards, be an expert in a given field due to their awards and credentials, can often create a powerful mental hindrance to new information. One can become cognitively blocked from new ideas and realizations which exist outside of the framework being taught. This is often a characteristic of institutional “academia”. A common example is the work of the Wright Brothers, who were told my many authorities of the time that plane travel was impossible.
Monetary Dynamics and its Consequences

What are the lowest common denominators required to perpetuate a Market Economy?

(1) Human labor must be sold as a commodity in the open market.

(2) Money must be continuously transferred.

So, with all that in mind, let’s step way back and pose a very simple question about the economic structure we all live in.

“What are the lowest common denominators required to perpetuate a Market Economy?

(1) Human labor must be sold as a commodity. Outside of investment and inheritance, nearly all money is obtained through income and income is derived from wages or profit through some form of employment. Therefore, there must always exist a demand for jobs for the economy to operate.

(2) Money must be continuously transferred from one party to party in order to sustain economic continuance and “growth”. This is done through constant or “cyclical” consumption by virtually everyone in a society. Jobs are entirely contingent upon demand for production in some form. If there was no demand for goods and services, there would be no demand for labor and financial circulation would stop.

Needless to say, these two aspects of the system which, of course are intimately connected, are absolutely paramount to its functionality. If either one of them were substantially hindered, the integrity of the economy would be seriously compromised or possibly be made entirely obsolete.
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Possible Problems?

(1) Human labor must be sold as a commodity in the open market.

So, given this reality, let’s now hypothetically consider some variables which could put these mechanisms in jeopardy.

Regarding the first point, “labor sold as a commodity in exchange for money”, what if the human labor market itself became largely unnecessary to the production of goods and services in a society? More specifically, what if, say, Automation Technology and Artificial Intelligence became advanced enough to allow for the replacement of perhaps 40%, 50% even 60% of the human labor force? At what point would such unemployment be considered too much and the system’s integrity be put in question?
As far as the second point, “the need for cyclical consumption”, what if conditions arose where the circulation of money was severely stifled? In other words, what if people simply didn’t need to continually buy things?

What if, hypothetically, it was discovered that through optimized techniques in resource management, design and production, the most commonly purchased goods and services could either be made obsolete by larger order renovations or could have such extreme product efficiency, longevity and near maintenance free durability, that most items could last a lifetime without replacement or major repair?

Of course, this exact idea couldn’t be applied to perishable items, such as food, but – following the same train of thought- what if the cultivation and production of food was in such ease and abundance that the supply and demand equation made the value of such items utterly negligible?
To put these points in a different way, let’s consider the classic economic “Theory of Value”. Everything we buy in society, theoretically, is given its value based on two basic considerations:

1) The scarcity (availability) of the materials used.
2) The amount of human labor/energy required to produce a good or generate a service.

So, if material scarcity, both in terms of resource availability and quality, was not an issue and human labor was not required to create a good or administer a service, then there would technically be no such “value”.
Well, as radical as it may seem, one of the greatest realizations for the whole of humanity at this point in time is that, in fact, neither of the scenarios presented are hypothetic.

Human beings are, indeed, slowly becoming obsolete in the labor force due to advancements in production technology.

Likewise, powerful new design advancements in product efficiency and resource management reveal the profound possibility of relative, global access abundance and peak product efficiency.

This can be proven through basic statistical analysis of efficiency possibilities and the inferential extrapolation of historical trends.
When it comes to Production Automation capabilities today, the first thing to be considered is a phenomenon called "Technological Unemployment". Technological Unemployment, which is unemployment caused by the use of machines as vehicles of labor, has continually and systemically forced relevant numbers of people out of every new emerging sector, since the dawn of the technological invention.

In the words of Nobel Laureate Economist Wassily Leontief:
"The role of humans as the most important factor of production is bound to diminish in the same way that the role of horses in agricultural production was first diminished and then eliminated by the introduction of tractors."
Our current employment market is basically broken into three major sectors:
1) Agriculture: (including Mining/Fishing)
2) Manufacturing: (Tangible goods)
3) Service: (Intangible Goods)

As a near universal social progression, all societies tend to follow the same developmental path, which takes them from a reliance on agriculture and extraction, toward the development of manufacturing (such as automobiles, textiles, shipbuilding, steel) and finally toward a more service-based structure.

Naturally, the only reason some countries are further behind in this process than others has to do with the affordability of the technology required to move to the next level, irrespective of its social system or political disposition.

It is a scientific progression.
So let’s now consider this phenomenon using the United States as a proxy. In 1860, 60% of Americans worked in the Agricultural sector. However today, due to the advancement of machinery and automation, it is less than 1%. By 1950, 33% of workers were employed in the factory-based Manufacturing sector. As of now, due to continual advancements in machine automation it is less than 8%.
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Technological Unemployment:

Today: ~9% of Americans work in Agriculture and Manufacturing

Today: 82% of Americans work in Service Industries

So, considering that only about 9% of Americans work in the agricultural and manufacturing sectors now - where did everyone else go?
The Service Sector.
The only thing that has saved the US labor market, after the technological renovation of the Agricultural and Manufacturing sectors, is flight to the Service Industry.

From 1950- 2002, US employment in the service sector went from 59% to 82%.
The service sector is the dominant employer of Americans today along with all other industrial countries. Of course, this begs the question, is this sector insusceptible to the wrath of Technological Unemployment? Of course not.

With the advent of increasingly versatile computer technologies we are seeing job displacement once again in virtually all service industries. The replacement of tellers and cashiers with kiosks; the use of automated voice systems for phone service; the Internet as retail storefront; full kiosk systems in physical market places; advance food prep by machines - to even research by automation being done from statistical modeling, to lab experiments - there is a new advancement around every corner.

As Economist Stephen Roach has warned: "The service sector has lost its role as America's unbridled engine of job creation."
As a unique example, in Germany, the first fully automated front-house restaurant is in operation. It uses kiosks for order and payment, and the food is served by a fully mechanized system.

There is no wait-staff. There is no reason this idea and much more could not be done with every single eating establishment in the world.

In fact, if one was to think creatively about the application of technology that currently exists but is not yet applied to the service sector, it is easy to see how, almost overnight, the majority of service jobs could be phased out tomorrow.
The only reason it hasn’t been done is because the focus of society is backwards when it comes to social progress and efficiency.

To illustrate this more so, let’s stop thinking about technology in terms of unemployment for a moment and consider it from the angle of productivity.

The most incredible relationship of all of this is that the more technological unemployment increases - the more productive things become!

In the G7 advanced industrialized countries, employment in manufacturing has been dropping but manufacturing output has been rising, as noted in this chart.
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“The truth is that U.S. manufacturing is doing quite well in every way except in the number of people it employs. Furthermore, few economists would judge the health or sickness of any industry based solely on employment. By that standard, agriculture has been the sickest industry of all for decades because employment has declined – although farm productivity rose dramatically in the past century. Industrial health is better measured by output, productivity, profitability and wages.”

“BRUCE BARTLETT / NCAP

Here is a revealing quote:
“The truth is that U.S. manufacturing is doing quite well in every way except in the number of people it employs. Furthermore, few economists would judge the health or sickness of any industry based solely on employment. By that standard, agriculture has been the sickest industry of all for decades because employment has declined – although farm productivity rose dramatically in the past century. Industrial health is better measured by output, productivity, profitability and wages.”
Unfortunately, this person is forgetting one universal thing: If human laborers are displaced, they cannot obtain purchasing power in this model of economics.

If they cannot obtain purchasing power, they cannot fuel the economy by consumption so, on that level, it doesn’t matter how productive we are - no one will be able to buy anything.
This phenomenon has been termed by some theorists as “The Contradiction of Capitalism” for not only is the obsolescence of human labor the obsolescence of the consumer, the high level of output generated by technological efficiency makes the corporate motivation to pursue such advanced means very strong - even though it is economically self-defeating over time.

This very fact alone, that productivity is inverse to employment is most all sectors should be enough to warrant a deliberate shift from the focus of human labor to a system where technology is given the highest priority. The system is literally denying peak production and in world where 1 billion are starving, that is extremely despotic.
And this brings us to one of the most profound points of this lecture: THE SOCIAL INTENT.

Should a focus of society be to create and preserve jobs?

Or should the focus of society be to maximize production and create abundance? It is either one direction or another. You can’t have both in the long-term efficiently. Sadly, what you are seeing in the world today is ‘The deliberate withholding of social efficiency, for the sake of preserving the status quo.’
The main reason, outside of employment pressures, that you do not see technology being liberally used for all purposes possible, including the generation of food, energy and material abundance, is because our financial system is based entirely on the perpetuation of scarcity and inefficiency. Why? Because it is the most self-preserving and profitable.

If a company makes a car that can last 70 yrs. without service and also runs without the need for perpetual refueling through battery power, the aftermarket value of that car is virtually zero and billions of dollars would be lost due to the now obsolete consumer oil and auto service market industries.

This could basically happen right now. Why doesn’t it? Because the economic system literally couldn’t work if it shifted its focus towards optimum efficiency.
Our entire society, in an economic sense, is based on constriction. Scarcity and inefficiency are the movers of money. The more there is of any resource, the less you can charge for it. The more problems there are, the more opportunities there are to make money. This reality is a social disease for people can actually gain off of the misery of others and the destruction of the environment. It could be called moral hazard, loosely speaking.

Efficiency, Abundance and Sustainability are enemies of our Economic structure for they are inverse to the mechanics required to perpetuate consumption.
This is profoundly critical to understand, for once you put it together, you begin see that the 1 billion people current starving on the planet, the endless slums of the poor and all the horrors in the culture due to poverty and depravity - are not natural phenomenon due to some natural human order or lack of earthly resources. Rather, they are products of the creation, preservation and perpetuation of artificial scarcity and inefficiency.
To add insult to injury, this scarcity is not only perpetuated in the markets of consumer goods and services but also manifests in a way which influences the behavior of the whole of society - through making sure that even “money” itself is perpetually limited in supply. The Central & Commercial Banks of the world create money out of debt, through loans. These loans are produced with interest attached - yet only the principle is created in the money supply, creating a perpetual deficit in supply. The debts generated by these loans in turn serve as virtual prison cells for the average citizen, keeping them willing to work off their debt, putting them in a perpetual state of obligation.

There is a word for that - it’s called slavery. Debt slavery. The money isn’t real. The interest isn’t real. The debt isn’t real. The whole thing is an illusion or, in many ways, a scam.
Consequently, the world today is now stuck in the illusion that there “isn’t enough money” to do this or that. Virtually all the countries in the world are in debt to other countries and banks.

As of 2009, it has been confirmed that the world is in a state of recession, which basically means massive monetary contraction. In other words, the whole world is somehow short on cash.
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Peak Efficiency:

- Highest form of technical efficiency known at a given point in time.

The question has never been: “Do we have the money?”

The question has always been:

“Do we have the resources?”

The stupidity is not only unbelievable, it is deadly. The market and financial system as we know it is diametrically opposed to the development of peak efficiency in order to perpetuate profit and the established order.

What is peak efficiency? - The highest form of technical efficiency possible at that time. Not the highest form of efficiency that is “affordable” - but the highest form of efficiency that is technologically possible.

The question has never been: “Do we have the money?”

The question has always been, “Do we have the resources and technical understandings to make it happen?” That is all that has ever mattered.
So, given all of this, it is easy to see how the public today finds it difficult to assume that technology can provide abundance and peak efficiency for there is little in their day to day life that suggests it.

Everything around them reinforces the idea that scarcity in the world today is a natural problem. Why? Because the pursuit of profit by industry always inherently limits the quality of design for the sake of monetary preservation.

If a company wants to be competitive in the marketplace, they must find a balance between quality and cost, invariably denying quality. It is impossible for a company to produce a product with peak efficiency for, by the nature of game, it would be too expensive for most to afford.
This is one of the reasons there is so much unhealthy food and trash goods in the system. When you consider that the majority of people in society today are the lower-middle class and below, you realize that the corporations must reduce their production cost to meet the terms of affordability of the dominant demographic of the culture.

If you go to East Brooklyn, NY, for example, you will find a endless sea of discount stores - like “99 cent stores”. These are stores which sell product from the cheapest possible materials and lowest possible efficiently that could ever be manufactured.

It’s junk- stuff that should never have been created to begin with. Why is it there? Because the people can’t afford anything else. Why can’t they afford anything else?

Because the market system also creates and perpetuates social stratification and the poor must exist in order for the rich to exist. Therefore, the level of product efficiency today is, artificially, directly proportional to purchasing power of a demographic. Therefore, generally speaking, ones perception of quality is often only as good as their socioeconomic status.

The quality of goods are stratified, just as the social classes are.

What is the result – staggering amounts of waste and sickness.
Monetary Dynamics and its Consequences

There is no ‘real’ reason to ever create a product that is deliberately low in efficiency.

In a world that claims to be growing more and more concerned about environmental issues, such as resource supplies, man made atmospheric changes and pollution, I find it fascinating that no one is talking about the most consistent destroyer of ecology and the most continuous waster use of natural resources there is: “The Motivation for Profit.”

Free-Market Capitalism is based on the free pursuit of profit by whatever means necessary. It is a gaming strategy and nothing more. The irresponsibility it enables by its central philosophy of self-interest is profound. And while there are many angles to this, let’s stay with the point at hand: the deliberate production of inferior products.

It is as environmentally illogical and irresponsible as can be.

There is no ‘real’ reason to ever create a product that is deliberately low in efficiency. This simply means faster breakdown, faster obsolesces, more duplicate production and many, many times more waste and pollution than would be required if the goal was to simply optimize products based on the most current technological awareness of the day.
And this leads us to the final topic of this section: MARKET MYTHOLOGY.

So far we have touched upon the structural mechanics of the market system, pointing out its inherent contradictions and problems. As of now, through the overpowering growth in science and technology, the monetary system can now be considered structurally obsolete, serving only as a paralyzing hindrance of social progress, not to mention a destroyer of human trust and our environment.

Unfortunately, the social indoctrination within this system has created a mentality which blindly supports the social dogma, regardless of what we have touched upon. The identity relationship is too strong. In many ways it is like a religion.

Taking away their belief in the market system is like taking away their belief in god. It challenges who they are. Not to mention that those which have successfully acquired a good deal of wealth will naturally be inclined to tell you that the system is great. That is the nature of behavioral reinforcement.
The three most dominant of these psychological indoctrinations are the notions of: Property, Incentive, and associations with “Freedom of Choice”. Let’s consider each of these, starting with Property. The market economy is founded on the very idea of exchanging property in markets. The world we all know is so bound up in the process of buying and selling that most can’t even imagine any other way of structuring human affairs. Property is often associated with so called rights. We use a legal system to protect our property and if anyone interferes with what is “mine” their freedom can be taken away. In fact, there is even an entire industry to tell you what the best property there is to own - advertising. Yet, with all of this obsession over property, very few ask the question: why do we have property to begin with? The answer is simple - scarcity. Property is an outgrowth of scarcity. The farther we go back in time, the more difficult and time consuming is was for people to create tools or extract a resource. They in turn protected it because it had immense value relative to the labor entailed along with the possible scarcity associated. People claim “ownership” because it is a legal form of protection. Property is not an “American” or “Capitalist” idea… it is a ancient perspective necessitated from generations of scarcity. If their isn’t scarcity, the rational for property changes.
So let’s move on to the idea of “Incentive”. As the theory goes, the need for profit provides a person/organization with the motivation to work on new ideas/products that would sell in the market place. In other words, the assumption is that if technology could replace humans in the workforce and abundance could be created, then people would have no motivation to do anything socially irrelevant. No monetary incentive, no progress. There are two glaring issues with this assumption. The first is that it is entirely based on values and values are almost entirely based on culture. Nikola Tesla, Louis Pasteur, Charles Darwin, the Wright Brothers, Albert Einstein and Isaac Newton did not make their massive contributions to society because of material self-interest.
1992 Gallop Poll:

50% of American adults volunteered time, with no pay, for social causes, at an average of 4.2 hours a week, for a total of 20.5 billion hours a year.

If the incentive motivation theory held true, then you would see no volunteerism anywhere in the world. In a 1992 US Gallop Poll, it was found that more than 50% of American adults volunteered time, with no pay, for social causes, at an average of 4.2 hours a week, for a total of 20.5 billion hours a year. This is pretty amazing. For even with the sickness of self-interest generated by the monetary system, humans still strive to help each other and give to society without material reward. What’s even more amazing is that the poor and middle are more likely to volunteer than the wealthy.
The second thing to consider is that while it is true that useful inventions and methods do come from the motivation for personal gain, the intent behind those creations have little to do with human or social concerns directly. Rather, the incentive goal is not to improve humanity- but to make money.

There is a massive disconnect here and as we have denoted thoroughly, the very means by which money is obtained in our system is counter to social progress fundamentally for it based on the deliberate withhold of efficiency.

Never mind the traditional “corruption” that we see occurring on a daily basis as this “incentive” for income spreads like a malignant cancer of indifferent self-interest...from product dishonestly/murder/theft/fraud /slave labor/outourcing/price fixing/monopolistic collusion/redundant waste and environmental exploitation to illegal taxation/institutional theft/societal indifference /imposed psychological distortions (advertising) and, of course, the sickest monetary incentive ever created - War.

That is the reality of the Monetary Incentive.
And the final myth for now - so called “Freedom of Choice”. The free market system is very persuasive for most people because it appears that the possibilities are endless and that they, the individual, have limitless choices.

People witness the vast stratification of goods and services portrayed by the media and advertising and think that since those seemingly vast options exist, it has some form of relevance to the freedoms of the individual.

They can walk into a store and choose between 25 kinds of detergent and 75 kind of sugar coated cereal, yet they turn a blind eye to the fact that their lives are managed by likely only 2 political parties. They pay no attention to the reality that 40% of world’s wealth is owned by 1% of the population and thus 99% of world’s people will never obtain the luxuries afforded by the 1%.

More specifically, everyone seems oblivious to the realization that nearly everyday of your life you are forced, by the obligation of mere survival, into a private dictatorship, where most of your decisions are controlled by those in the next larger hierarchical degree.
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Market Mythology

You are only as free as your purchasing power will allow you to be

So I ask you: what freedom are we talking about?
You are only as free as your purchasing power will allow you to be and the statistics have proven that the socioeconomic rank you are born into tends to persist for the rest of your life.
If you are born poor, you will likely remain poor - why? Because all the odds are against you. If you are rich, you will likely remain rich - why? Because all the odds are in favor of it. It is the nature of the system.
Monetary Dynamics and its Consequences

Market Mythology

Upper Class:

1$ Million + 5% C.D. = $50k

Lower Class:

Loans to survive —— Paying Interest

For example, if you have 1 million dollars and put it into a CD at 5% interest, you are going to generate $50,000 a year simply for that deposit. You are making money off of money itself - nothing more - no invention - no contribution to society – no nothing.

That being denoted, if you are a lower to middle class person who is limited in funds and must get interest barring loans to buy your home or use credit cards, then you are paying interest to the bank which the bank is then using, in theory, to pay the person’s return with the 5% CD.

Not only is this equation outrageously offensive due to the use of usury (interest) to ‘steal from the poor and give to the rich’, but it also perpetuates class stratification by its very design, keeping the lower classes poor, under the constant burden of debt, while keeping the upper classes rich, with the means to turn excess money into more money, with no labor.
Likewise, it should be no surprise that the world is run by cartels and governmental collusion, for competition is based on nothing more than a gaming strategy. In other words - competition breeds monopoly. Monopoly is the final stage of success in a competition environment. It is incredible to me how people do not realize this. Many out there will tell you that we used to have a balanced free-market, but those rogue cartels emerged out of now where and took control. Wrong. And it doesn’t matter how much legislation you have to combat sector and industry dominance, it will keep occurring. Even more powerfully, government coercion by big business is also unstoppable. It is a natural progression of market strategy, to get government on your side. In fact, the true propensity of our world economic system continually, year by year, approaches one thing: Fascism*. Or more specifically, inverted fascism. This is the condition where corporations covertly control governmental policy. This is a natural gravitation of the market mentality.
PART 2:

Culture and The Bio-Social Imperative

In order for us to consider routes of social change, we must also have a clear understanding of conditioning, our biology and our relationship to the environment.

As denoted before, when it comes to the pursuits of social change, the most profound hurdle is overcoming the traditional ideology, identifications and dogmas which have been set in stone as “final” by the established culture.

Of these ideas, a consistent one that comes up has to do with the conclusion that the human being is of a rigid, fixed nature, whereas certain behaviors are simply unstoppable. Therefore, as the logic goes, social structures are locked into a set pattern which cannot be overcome due to the very “nature” of the species.

In order to address this claim, we need to first consider the ramifications of culture.
CULTURE:
A SET OF SHARED ATTITUDES, VALUES, GOALS, AND PRACTICES THAT CHARACTERIZES AN INSTITUTION, ORGANIZATION OR GROUP.

The word “Culture” in this sense is defined as a general set of shared attitudes, values, goals, and practices that characterizes an institution, organization or group.

The most obvious yet often overlooked examples of the mechanics of cultural is the fact that we are provably shaped by the sort of society we live in. The language you use, the gaming-strategies you execute for survival, the perception of beauty you lust for, the familial patterns and traditions you perpetuate and the deeply held theology, myths and urban legends that define your broadest worldview - are all examples of the qualities you might absorb, almost arbitrarily, from the culture you have been born into.

In fact, if you did deeper, you find that there is really nothing that we cognitively think and believe which isn’t first presented to us in some environmental form.
An insulted man who pulls out a gun and shoots somebody had to learn what a “gun” was, how to pull the trigger, along with what he was to find ‘insulting’ to begin with.

Every word I am saying has been learned one way or another. Every concept relayed is a collective accumulation of experience.

A Chinese baby taken at birth and raised in a British family in England will develop the language, dialect, mannerisms, traditions and accent of the British Culture.

Needless to say, it is obvious the profound effect the Environment has on our behavior.
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It doesn’t matter how much time I try to condition a cat to learn to speak English, it simply can’t, due to the limitations of its evolutionarily derived biological state. Those limitations are basically defined by “genes”.

Genes are a fairly recent discovery and there has been a great deal of speculation as to the spectrum of relevance genes hold. The most contentious, is the realm of Behavioral Biology. This is a field dedicated to understanding how genetics influence behavior.

The idea that genetics are the possible source of various behaviors become popular in the early 19th century. One of the first pursuits that emerged, was the idea that the aberrancy’s of human behavior, just as “criminality”, could be explained by a person’s genes.

Sickly enough, even Eugenics operations in the form of sterilization took place years ago in an attempt to ‘quote’ “rid society of criminals, idiots, imbeciles and rapists.”
The implication is that certain people are naturally quote “bad people” due to their genetics. You still see this rhetoric everywhere. Someone might say: he has “bad blood” or she is just an “evil person”.

As an aside, I find it interesting that this simplistic social fall back to explain a person’s behavior is in full accord with the primitive superstitious duality postulated by nearly all religions. Good and Evil. The gene, in this case, has replaced the satanic demon that once possessed a person and thus that person has no control over their “evil” actions.

Well, as research has progressed, it has been found that genes can do nothing of the sort.
“Genes are rarely about inevitability especially when it comes to humans, the brain or behavior. They’re about vulnerability, propensities and tendencies.”

-Dr. Robert Sapolsky

Genes are stretches of DNA that produce proteins which, of course, are vital to the operation of the brain, the nervous system, and the whole body. However, they are not autonomous initiators of commands. They do not “cause” behaviors in any sense of the idea.

In the words of professor of biology and neurology at Stanford university, Dr. Robert Sapolsky: “Genes are rarely about inevitability especially when it comes to humans, the brain or behavior. They’re about vulnerability, propensities and tendencies.”
As it turns out, the determining factor of genetic propensities, particularly in the realm of behavior, is the environment that the organism resides in.

For example, resent research has shown that a gene could exist for depression. However, just because you have that gene, does not mean you are going to become clinically depressed. It takes a some form of environmental stressor to trigger the genetic response - such as the sudden death of a loved one.

In other words, the environment triggers the existing genetic propensity. Even with a genetic predisposition to a particular illness, there is no guarantee you will get it. A chair with broken leg is not dangerous, if you never sit on.
As a variation of this, it is very interesting how the environment can even affect broad physiological attributes, a realm traditionally left to the genetic side of the nature and nurture debate.

A study was done a few years ago at the Miami School of Medicine with premature infants in neonatology wards. They decided to simply touch a section of infants in the ward, a few times a day, while the other section was not touched. All feeding patterns and like remaining equal. As it turned out, those touched infants grew 50% faster, were noticeable more active, and were released from the hospital a week earlier than the infants that were not touched. When compared again months later, the touched kids still showed better health and agility than those that were not.

This is a dramatic finding on many levels for it shows how the genetically prescribed growth hormone release can be profoundly influenced by a simple and subtle environmental experience.
Furthermore, the environment can not only trigger genetic predispositions, or influence their extent, it can also override them to a certain degree.

A couple years ago, a study was done at Princeton University where the scientists were able to genetically engineer mice, removing a key gene relevant to their neurotransmitter system, selectively targeting learning and memory. As a result, the cultivated mice were poor at various memory and learning exercises. They had trouble recognizing simple objects, their accuracy of smell was poor and they were unable to learn well in certain ways which would otherwise be natural to an average mouse.

Once their disability was firmly established, the scientists then put the cognitively dim mice, as adults, in an enriched, simulating environment. Over time, it was found that many of the genetically engineered learning deficiencies were actually overcome by the simply exposure to an intellectually nurturing environment. In other words, the environment was actually able to reestablish neurological pathways which seemed not to exist. Again, this is a powerful testament to the power of the environment when it comes to the brain and hence behavior.
Now, the reason this is being brought up is to illustrate the fact that our environment is provably the most important determinant of our functionality. “Nurture”, in many ways, actually dictates “Nature”, on many levels, ranging from behavior to physiology to health. Consequently, it is incorrect to think of the human being as a slave to his biology, especially when it comes to his or her actions. This is powerful myth which needs to be dispelled, for if we realize the importance of our environment, we will be more prone to changing it.
However, as one final example worth considering which likely summarizes the overwhelming power and relevance of the environmental culture we are exposed too - the implications of “Feral Children” is very interesting.

A feral child is a human child who has lived isolated from human contact from a very young age. Historical examples range from children who have been locked in rooms by their parents for years to children who have been abandoned in the wild and raised, so to speak, by animals.
This is Genie

She was discovered in 1970, having been locked in a single room, virtually alone for over 10 years. When they found her, at thirteen years old, she could barely understand language and she knew only a few words. She was 54 inches tall, her eyes could not focus beyond 12 feet, she walked in awkward, hunched manner and she could not chew solid food. Once rescued, psychologists and scientists immediately began working to rehabilitate Genie, creating a nurturing environment. She quickly began to grow and learn rapidly but apart from her serve emotional scars, there was one thing that stuck out - and that was her inability to learn language. While humans do have a genetic predisposition to language, it is cases like this that show how if the environment does not engage those propensities, they do not form. In fact, it appears that once a certain period of childhood has past, developing language becomes very difficult. It requires the environment to stimulate the response.
This young girl was rescued in Russia. She was kept locked in a room with dogs and cats for several years, causing her to behave like an animal. She could not speak, licks her food and drink with her tongue, and walks on all fours. She was 5 years old but was the physical size of an average 2 year old.

This is fascinating for, in this case and in many cases of feral children, they pick up and imitate animal behavior to a profound degree.
This is a girl named Oxana Malaya who was also an extremely neglected and ended up spending the majority of her childhood between the ages of 3 and 8 living with dogs in the back of the family home. She actually slept in the kennel with the dogs for 5 years. When rescued, she had adopted incredible canine mannerisms, including barking, a higher than average sense of smell, she ate raw meat, walked on all fours and knew little language.

Sociological examples like these should really make one question what the common denominator is for our supposed “human nature”. Please understand - there is no denial here that human beings are wired in certain ways - however, the fact is, we obviously, especially at a young age, have an incredible ability to adapt to our environment.
Humans, when it comes to behavior specifically, are exceptionally malleable and, as studies have shown, will adapt based on what is supported and reinforced by the social condition they inhabit. If the known propensities of human beings, such as walking upright, learning language or the like, are not trigged and supported by the environment of a child, it appears they might not manifest.

Therefore, again, the human being is very much a cultivated organism. The quality of a person’s health and behaviors really comes down to the quality of the environment, culture and hence social influences they are exposed to. Again, it is critical that society fully understand this and adjust accordingly.
And this is the point. We, as so called individuals, are actually running composites of our life experiences. We are walking expressions and cultivations of the environments we have pasted through up until this very moment. And, when it comes to survival, only those behavioral attributes that have served a function in your environment are reinforced and made dominant.

Once you understand this, the corrupt world you see around you suddenly makes perfect sense. Human beings are not, for example, “inherently” greedy or inherently competitive, or inherently “corrupt.” It is the social system; hence environment that enables, generates and reinforces such contextual behavior. Even if there was such a thing as a person being prone to being “greedy”, the environment is still responsible for setting up the conditions which allow that quality to come out.

So, the social imperative that emerges out of all of this in the long run, is that there is a great deal of care which needs to be taken in regard to our social environment. We must alter the system in such a way, so it does not create, support or reinforce those behaviors which are socially harmful.
It is also interesting to point out that competition and hierarchy have not been the dominant ethos of human society for the majority of time the species has been in action. Before the agricultural, or Neolithic revolution, which occurred about 10,000 years ago. Hunter and gatherer societies actually had non-hierarchical, egalitarian social structures. The social values were based essentially on equality, altruism, and sharing and often forbid upstart-ism, dominance, aggression and egoism. We know this because of the anthropological research done on remaining hunters - gatherer societies in the world over the past century.
“Hunter-gatherers have thousands of wild sources of food to subsist on. Agriculture changed all that, generating an overwhelming reliance on a few dozen food sources...Agriculture allowed for the stock piling of surplus resources and thus, inevitably, the unequal stockpiling of them- Stratification of society and the invention of classes. Thus it has allowed for the invention of poverty.”

-Dr. Robert Sapolsky
Part 2

Culture and The Bio-Social Imperative

Hierarchy

The core basis of social hierarchy, is real or perceived scarcity. It is a formalized system of inequality, which serves as a substitute for perpetual conflict over scarce resources.

In view of our western society which, as we have denoted, works to literally preserve scarcity, it is easy to see how our social classes are perpetuated, unnecessarily.

But, the problems don’t stop there. Another consequence exists in this chain of causality - one that effects everyone of us in ways which are almost hidden. And that has to do with our health.
Studies have shown that people of higher socioeconomic status live longer, enjoy better health and suffer less from disability while those of lower socioeconomic die younger and suffer a greater burden of disease and disability.

This most often comes in the form of a gradient, meaning that from the highest upper class, straight down to the lowest, bottom class, each successive step up or down the socioeconomic latter constitutes a respective quality change in a persons health, on average.
On the surface, most might find this relatively logical in the sense that the lower classes often have poor diets due to a lack of purchasing power; they are more prone to live in polluted neighborhoods; they are more likely to get sub par health care and, due to a lack of education, they might not take care of themselves very well in general.

Well, while these attributes are obviously relevant to health… new studies have shown that there is something else going on that is contributing to the increasingly poor health and disease propensities of people - the lower they go in the socioeconomic hierarchy.
One of the most documented analysis of this issue were called the Whitehall Studies, carried out via the University College of London. Using the British Civil Service system as the subject group, they found that the gradient of health quality in industrialized societies is not simply a matter of poor health for the disadvantaged and good health for everyone else. Something else was happening. Remember this is the UK and you have socialized health care.

They also found that there was a social distribution of disease - meaning that as you went from the top of the socioeconomic status to the bottom the types of diseases that people would get would change on average.

For example the lowest rungs of the hierarchy had a 4 fold increase of heart disease based mortality, compared to the highest rungs. And this pattern was, to a certain degree, irrespective of access to health care. Even in a country with universal health care, the worse a persons financial status, the worse their health is going to be on average.
Why is this? The answer, as it turns out, is Psychological Stress generated from Social Inequality. Not the byproducts of inequality, such as poor nutrition, health care resources or education for personal health- but inequality itself. Psychological Subordination.

Concurrent research done by Richard Wilkinson of the University of Nottingham found that the more income equality there is in a society, the worse the gradient of health and mortality rates. This is irrespective of absolute income values and, again, it has little to do with general health care, nutrition and the like.

Evidently, the more income inequality that exists in a society, or in other words, the more stratified a society is, the more health problems that occur in both the upper and lower classes. It isn't about money in and of itself - it is about the psychological stress, or “PSYCHOSOCIAL STRESS”, generated by the social hierarchy.
Not to mention, as an aside, it is well documented that the more income inequality that exists, the more crime, assault, robbery and murder are probable.

This is easy to exemplify for the United States, which has the largest income gap in the world, also has the largest crime rate in the world; the largest prison population in the world, and, amusingly, it is also the most armed and aggressive nation on the planet. Coincidence?
The bottom line is that when it comes to the comparison of Hierarchy to Egalitarianism or, in other words, Social Stratification to Social Equality, egalitarianism trumps stratification in regard to the health of the whole of society, from crime to disease rates, etc.

So, in conclusion of this section, not only are social classes modern inventions for human society, social classes are scientifically proven to be detrimental to the health of society as a whole.

I think that is compelling motivation to begin to seek alternatives.
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