

On Certain Aspects of American Economics Relevant to 2021

Jonathan W. Tooker

Occupy Failed Because it was Non-violent, Written at an Unknown Location

(Dated: April 8, 2021)

Abstract

We discuss contemporary socioeconomic issues in a frame of rhetoric beyond the Overton window. We analyze certain policies such as the minimum wage and federal tax structures. We describe a new set of wage and tax policies called normal policies and argue for their superiority over the comparable policy agenda framed by the Overton window. Coronavirus (COVID), racism, fascism, and nationalism are considered. While war followed by total reformation is certainly the best (only) solution to the present overarching societal malaise, for the purposes of scholarship we approach much of the material herein from a good faith vantage point assuming that the entrenched powers might ever permit any changes for the better to occur.




FIG. 1. This chart was originally subtitled, “The Fed’s balance sheet peaked at \$4.5 trillion after the financial crisis of 2008, and now it’s soared past \$7 trillion in the wake of the coronavirus pandemic.”

I. COVID

COVID was the best thing that ever happened to the USA stock market. In this section, we will contextualize USA monetary policy leading up to the appearance of COVID and then we will make the case that COVID was introduced to support that policy.

Long before the 2007 global financial crisis (GFC), the Congress of the USA had authorized \$5 trillion in quantitative easing (QE) capacity for the Federal Reserve Bank (the Fed), a private non-governmental agency. QE is a euphemism for printing money which in turn is a euphemism for the electronic creation of money. The Congress created the Fed (for the second time after President Jackson killed it) with a charter such that it has the responsibility to guide the economy according to the opinions held by the Fed’s executives as they relate (randomly) to the mandates of the charter. Figure 1 shows that before the GFC, the Fed had never resorted to the QE operation. Before the GFC, it was sufficient for the Fed’s funny money policies that Nixon had abolished the dollar’s gold standard in 1973. After the GFC, however, the bank needed more funny money and this is reflected in the first hiccup in the blue line in the gray recession bar (★) to the left of Figure 1.




FIG. 2. This chart shows a correlation between the post-GFC recovery of the USA stock market (A) and the simultaneous inflation of the Fed balance sheet (B). It is suggested that the stock market effect is caused by the money printing.

In the realm of conspiracy theories which are not far-fetched, it is often theorized that it was no coincidence that emergency bond clearance guidelines allowed the Fed to clear a slew of bonds without an ordinary standard of diligence in the weeks following 9/11. It is sometimes supposed that the culprits behind the 9/11 attacks, who are referred to in the present day as the deep state, orchestrated 9/11 with the clearance of these bonds in mind (among many other nefarious ploys and ends which were equally successful.) Now we will make the case that COVID was another Fed-related deep state conspiracy whose primary goal was to affect an increase in the Fed's QE authorization. While the post-9/11 bond clearances without ordinary diligence may or may not have been the primary goal of 9/11, certainly the QE limit increase was the primary goal of the COVID pandemic (or COVID hoax.) First, we will study the period 2008–2015 wherein the Fed's balance sheet quintupled from about \$1 trillion to a little less than \$5 trillion, as in Figure 2.

The red line in Figure 2 (A) shows the behavior of the S&P 500 stock index. The S&P 500 can be taken as a proxy for a much smaller index of only 30 companies called the DJIA, or the Dow, which dropped 777 points on September 29, 2008: a curious number.

Pictured in Figure 2 is the similar though numerologically less significant drop in the S&P 500 index (*). On September 29, that same day, the USA Congress had rejected the Bush administration's bank bailout plan. By the end of trading at 4:00pm, markets were sharply down on news of the failure of the Emergency Economic Stabilization Act. About two-thirds of Democrats in the Congress had supported Deep Red Bush's bailout plan and about one-third of Congressional Republicans. However, the forces that caused the DJIA to drop about 7%, losing 777 points and some hundredths of a point, were somehow able to change the collective mind of the Congress. It is as if the Congress was frightened into submission by the number 777. On reconsideration, the bailout subsequently sailed through both houses of the Congress and became law on October 3, 2008, less than one week later. Included in the first bailout was the \$700 billion TARP (Troubled Asset Relief Program) which catapulted Elizabeth Warren into the limelight. TARP allowed the USA Treasury to buy stocks to inflate the stock market by entering as a cautionless buyer. On April 15, 2009, Warren would appear on The Daily Show¹ squawking, "Shucks! I'm in charge of accounting for that money and we just don't know where them gosh darn dollars went but I'm a blonde woman smiling and laughing about it on TV so it's ok, and actually I'm an Indian though."

Erin Burnett once stupidly defended the TARP declaring that if the Treasury would exit its stock position at the same price point that it had entered, then there would be no net loss for taxpayers. This is stupid because buying in one year and selling for the same price in a later year is a net loss due to inflation, at least. At best, TARP was an interest-free business loan at the cost of about 20%² of the principle charged to taxpayers. Twenty percent of \$700 billion is quite a bit of free money for the banks and Burnett's assumption of fungibility between dollars in different years was absurdly stupid. Her failure to suppose the further existence of related notional losses was also stupid. Beyond the above cited ~20% hole in Burnett's cretinous analysis, much more was likely gifted to the banks through the shoddy accounting practices cited and laughed about by the program's overseer Warren on The Daily Show.

TARP funds, being a USA Treasury program, did not contribute directly to the Fed

¹ During this interview, Warren showed prescient despair and was nearly horrified to mention the P.P.P. acronym of the Public/Private investment Program. [<https://www.cc.com/video/ecpfjd/the-daily-show-with-jon-stewart-elizabeth-warren-pt-1>]

² This 20% figure is an aggregate estimate of losses due to inflation and notional losses due to lost return on investment of 3% per year had the money not been diverted to earn interest and leveraged profits for the banks during the five years that TARP was active.

asset balance. However, Figure 2 shows that inflating the Fed balance sheet (B) was also correlated with the inflating stock market (A). The overall process by which the Fed's balance sheet pumps the stock market began with a more convoluted mechanism than the TARP direct buying program. The overall gist is that the Fed prints money and since only mega-businesses receive that money, and because mega-business exists only to enrich stockholders, it all ends up pumping the prices of stocks. The total analysis of how the Fed's bond buying programs, including the primary open market operation for manipulating USA Treasury bonds on a daily basis, would make for a longish paper on its own and we will not present that material here. The reader is asked to take it for granted that the most spectacular USA bull market of all time, 2009–present, was sparked by the Congress' decision to reverse their rejection of the Bush bailout... which was punctuated by an immediate 777.68 point DJIA rout ($777.7\text{pt} \approx 7\%$) on the day of the initial rejection. Once the Congress changed its mind overnight, curiously, about whether or not the bailout was “good” for the constituents whose interests the Congress does not represent, the Fed balance sheet increased without going back down even while the USA Treasury did eventually exit its TARP position in 2014. The government reported a profit on the program but this must not be confused with a profit for the people who funded the program. Firstly, the reported TARP profit was likely accounting fraud and is not to be trusted. Secondly and mainly, the inflation of the TARP assets in the stock market was caused by the non-Treasury money printing at the Fed: money the citizens are still on the hook for meaning that one credit card got paid off with another. If TARP made a profit, it was because the Treasury's TARP program got bought out by the Fed's QE program. Paying off one credit card with another is not profitable. Everything the government says is a lie and twice so for the Fed.

Consider Figure 3. The Fed has several hundred billion in assets aside from QE meaning that until 2020, the Fed's maximum balance would have been around \$5.5 trillion³ across the span of Figure 3. The black line (A) spikes earlier than the blue line (B) so if one is a cause and the other is an effect, the Fed balance is the cause and the skyrocketing stock market is the effect. The Fed balance started to increase in late 2008 though this writer is not aware of the exact program. It is said that the Fed began increasing its bond holdings (holding more bonds has the effect of putting more assets on the balance sheet) in December

³ We compute the Fed's maximum account balance as the sum of $\sim \$0.5$ trillion in non-QE assets and \$5 trillion in QE authorization.




FIG. 3. This figure shows the same data as Figure 2 with a wider time window and different vertical offset. During the period in which the Fed balance had plateaued (2015–2018) the European Central Bank and the Bank of Japan ramped up their own QE programs. This added source of QE in global markets likely prevented a stock market calamity in response to the abatement of free central bank money. It does not matter for stocks whether money printing happens in the USA or in Europe and Japan.

2008 but Figures 2 and 3 seem to suggest that the Fed balance began to increase earlier than December 2008. Indeed, since the Fed's QE capacity was authorized many years before the onset of the GFC, the sudden change in Fed assets need not be tied to any specific act of the Congress.⁴ In any case, the initial hard spike in the Fed balance seems to align with the Congress' approval of the TARP bill which may or may not have had some language in it related to the concurrent Fed asset binge preceding the bond buying program brought to bear in December 2008.

The stock market bottomed in February 2009 on the day that the Congress passed the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act. The powers that be crashed the market hard

⁴ The Congress authorizes the Fed to print money so that the Fed can give the money to the government through the purchase of Treasury bonds. It may be that the Treasury was able to fund the TARP program through some Fed issuance aside from the separate December issuance.

when the Congress rejected the TARP bailout in 2008 and those powers allowed the market to start going up again on the day after the Obama Congress passed the super-bailout: the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009. Figure 3 shows that the Fed balance and the stock market rose in lockstep between February 2009 and late 2014 when the Fed stopped increasing its balance. At that time, the maximum authorized balance of the Fed would have been about \$5.5 trillion, just higher than the top of Figure 3's window. Throughout 2015 and early 2016, while the balance was no longer rising, the stock market flatlined and had two large hiccups to the downside (*). In mid-2016, stocks started to rise again, for some reason.⁵ In early 2018, the Fed began to reduce its balance sheet. The market flatlined again and the ensuing downside hiccups (*) were very large compared to the similar behaviors 2015–2016 (*). Ultimately in 2019, the Fed had to reverse course on its balance cutting policy. At that time, however, the Fed was already near its QE cap so it was limited with regards to how much money it would be able to conjure under its preexisting Congressional QE authorization.

The Fed's decision to reduce its balance sheet was met with shrieking horror in the USA stock market, as in the 2017–2019 period of Figure 3 (*). Now we are ready to discuss the relationship between the Fed balance and COVID, as in Figure 4. In mid-2019, the Fed was forced to start increasing its balance again but it was already close to the limit around \$5.5 trillion. It would have little maneuvering room in which to pump the market with more QE moving forward from its 2018 balance reduction plan reversal. At that time in late 2019, reports of COVID in China began to circulate. The virus spread around the world and by March 2020, the pandemic panic was in full swing and the stock market had crashed, as in the lower chart of Figure 4 (*).

Figure 5 shows that in the early days of the pandemic, the number of deaths reported per case of COVID was very high compared to what are now called the second and third pandemic waves. We suggest that these numbers were inflated to manufacture the panic of March 2020 which led to the Coronavirus Aid, Relief, and Economic Security Act (CARES Act) sailing through the Congress with no scrutiny or debate. The CARES Act became law with Trump's signature on March 27, 2020. All were happy to receive the \$1200 checks but it was little mentioned that the CARES Act had increased the Fed's QE capacity from

⁵ This writer has an excellent theory supporting the 2016 resumption of uptrend but it is far too speculative for the present context.





FIG. 4. (ABOVE) This figure highlights the GFC recession in gray (left) and the COVID recession in tan (right.) Whereas the Fed balance spike response to the GFC recession came after the market had endured more than a year of bear market conditions (Figure 3), the much larger COVID Fed balance spike aimed to inflate a new bubble at the peak of the old bubble without first allowing a normal inter-bubble decline in asset prices. (BELOW) The straight green lines in the upper right corner of this figure show the continuation into February 2021 with the S&P 500 around 3900 and the Fed balance around \$7.5 trillion.




FIG. 5. This figure shows USA COVID statistics.

\$5 trillion to about \$9.5 trillion just as the Fed was being forced into the corner of its own QE limit.⁶ Did China release the virus that was the best thing ever to happen to the USA Fed? Or did the USA support its own Fed by releasing the virus and then exaggerating the danger only long enough to the create the panic that led to everyone cheering for \$1200 without being made aware of \$4.5 trillion for the Fed?⁷ Computing the ratio of COVID cases to confirmed recoveries in early 2020 showed that the mortality was as high as 50%. This induced a panic which allowed the new QE authorization to float through the Congress without a word in the news and without even a mention in the blogosphere of conspiracies. As of the time of this writing in February 2021, the unwarranted hysteria of the initial statistics remains though the subsequent statistics show little danger. Figure 5 shows that the mortality immediately attenuated following the late March passage of the CARES act and then converged toward the $\sim 0.3\%$ mortality that the current data suggests.

⁶ The 10:9 ratio of \$5 to \$4.5 trillion indicates a mechanism by which the new QE was conjured. The USA banking system uses a 10:9 fractional reserve lending rule such that if a bank issues a loan for \$10 and the loan check is deposited at a second bank, the second bank can use that deposit to conjure a \$9 loan on which it can charge interest. When that \$9 is deposited at a third bank, it can conjure \$8.10 and charge interest by loaning it, and on and on. An initial \$10 loan allows banks to collect interest on about \$100 worth of loans by the time the fraction peters out. For this reason, credit growth is cited as very important for the USA economy. In the case of the \$4.5 trillion for the Fed, the 10:9 ratio suggests that the Congress authorized the Fed to write a check to itself for the entire old limit of \$5 trillion but then also gave the Fed a waiver on having to clear its check with itself. The Fed balance shows most of the \$5 trillion had been spent already so this check would have bounced. With a new deposit of \$5 trillion, however, the 10:9 fractional reserve lending rule allowed the Fed to conjure a new loan for \$4.5 trillion. See for example: "Money as Debt" [<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=2nBPN-MKefA>]

⁷ The $\sim \$280$ billion total of all the \$1200 checks is about 6.2% as much as the Fed's \$4.5 trillion.




FIG. 6. This figure separates the Fed's four main QE operations and plots the expected course of the current QE4 operation. As of February 2021, the Fed balance stands around \$7.5 trillion: about \$2 trillion above the pre-COVID limit.

The USA government could never release an actual dangerous virus. If they did, then The Terrorists™ would have it forever. Indeed, while the entire study of virology shows that pandemic disease increases in an exponential fashion, the John Hopkins data in Figure 5 shows linear communication of the disease almost everywhere in the pandemic other than the three waves' turning points. A linear growth trend is consistent with a non-communicable disease ($R_0 = 0$) spread by agents with aerosol weapons. If the same agents spray the same number of people every day, and people can't catch the $R_0 = 0$ virus from each other, then that would yield a linear growth trend. However, even the outlandish conspiracy theory of aerosol agents grants that COVID is a real virus though this writer has not seen any evidence to that effect; hearing something on TV is not sufficient. If there was a dangerous plague, then there would have been dead bodies in the streets. The lack of bodies is strong evidence against the existence of a dangerous pandemic emergency.

During the first rounds of QE, 2008–2014 (Figure 6), it was claimed by anti-QE analysts that the money printing would have an inflationary effect. Inflation lessens the value of people's savings. If a couple has \$1 million saved for retirement based on the cost of living calculated by their financial advisor in 1995 but then inflation sends the cost of a loaf of

bread to \$10 million, the couple has been harmed by inflation. They will no longer be able to support their retirement with one slice of bread's worth of savings. When the Fed conjures money through QE, it is expected that an increase in the total number of liquid dollars will decrease the average value of any particular dollars. While the GFC doomsayers claimed that the Fed's first few rounds of QE would impose this inflationary burden, the inflation never materialized. We suggest that the Congress' longstanding authorization for QE up to \$5 trillion was already priced into the value of the dollar at the time of the initial act of the Congress. In this way, the inflationary burden of QE4 is likely to differ from that imposed by the previous rounds of QE. QE4 is probably not already priced into the dollar. Presently, when all of the new money is soaked into the stock market, the number of dollars outside of the stock market is not greatly impacted and we do not feel unusual inflationary effects. This may change when the stock market inevitably goes down again and \$4.5 trillion new QE dollars are forced to find a home. The current QE thrust beyond the old limit has been such that $\sim 40\%$ of all cash dollars in existence were printed in 2020. When the rest of QE4 gets printed in 2021, as suggested by Figure 6, that number will go much higher. If the Congress is able to authorize more QE without the whole thing falling apart, then the inflationary forces will be magnified further still.

The mortality of the COVID virus was overstated during the first wave. The mortality computed from the number of infected versus the number of recovered was initially as high as $\sim 50\%$. After the blind panic of early 2020 was used to push through an increase in the Fed's QE authorization, the alleged mortality decreased to much less than 1%. This suggests that the virus itself and the massive over-reporting of its early mortality were the result of a plan to befuddle and strong-arm the Congress into authorizing more QE on top of the existing \$5 trillion. Realistically, the whole USA dollar system is going to fall apart. If the Congress' present actions have the effect of forestalling that collapse, that may be the preference of many Americans but it was not their preference that the Congress set them on the path to total financial Armageddon to begin with. However, this is what the Congress has done.

At the end of 2020, the total market capitalization of all public USA companies was about \$51 trillion. This number is the sum of the value of every share in every public USA

company.⁸ At the end of 2019 when the reports of “Chinese plague” began to circulate, the capitalization was \$37.7 trillion. Is it reasonable to think that any force outside of the USA could cause the USA market capitalization to increase by \sim \$15 trillion in one year? In the opinion of this writer, Occam’s razor eliminates the possibility of COVID’s foreign origin. Furthermore, when stocks are collateralized and leveraged, the \$15 trillion increased market cap of the USA corporations reflects much more notional value in derivatives, various securities, and capital gains driven by corporate buy backs. The net positive monetary effect of this COVID-related wealth splurge is compounded by the avoidance of the massive losses which would have been incurred, even in the absence of a so-called pandemic, if the Fed had not been able to stimulate the market far in excess of its preexisting QE authorization, as in Figure 6 (★). If the Fed had bumped into its QE limit while the market wanted it to keep printing, the market would have crashed far more than it did in early 2020 and it would not have gone back up. Particularly, the lower chart in Figure 4 suggests that the early 2020 market crash (★) was only a continuation of the annual crash pattern established by the preceding 2018 and 2019 crashes. In the opinion of this writer, COVID was introduced to lessen the inevitable 2020 crash as Wall Street is forced to turn the crank on its accounting gimmicks related to federally regulated annual reporting protocols. Will the pattern continue with a fourth plunge in early 2021? The anticipated scale of QE4 shown in Figure 6 (★) suggests that that remaining QE authorization is expected to be expended in 2021. Will it be enough? What happens when 2022 gets here? Eventually, the market is going to want more free money and there isn’t going to be any left. This event will be correlated in time with the outbreak of World War 3.

II. THE MINIMUM WAGE

This writer maintains an agnostic position regarding the \$15 per hour minimum wage. On one hand, it is good to put more money into the pockets of the workers on the lowest rung of the wage slave class. They will spend every dollar they get and that will be good for the businesses that collect those dollars. Churn on inventory or service is productive for the business community even while the churn is paid for by those business’ labor costs.⁹ On the

⁸ “Total Market Value of U.S. Stock Market” [<https://siblisresearch.com/data/us-stock-market-value/>]

⁹ The true productivity of churn is criticized by the broken window fallacy wherein it is questioned whether breaking a window on purpose generates real productivity. In the microeconomic view, the chain of

other hand, not raising the wage is accelerationist and hastens the collapse which this writer finds desirable. In this section, we will analyze the merits of the popular \$15 minimum wage plan without considering accelerationism. Then we will suggest an alternative revision to the minimum wage. We argue that the \$15 minimum wage touted as a neo-socialist coup of the left is nothing but a flat tax on business and, as such, it is tantamount to a far-right policy. Is the minimum wage hike truly a far-right policy? Kind of, yes.

The United States of America does not impose a flat tax on income. It is considered inequitable to tax very low income at the same rate as very high income. As it is, the USA taxes low income at a lower rate. The overall taxpayer body subsidizes the profits of businesses paying minimum wages by providing food stamps and other welfare to low earners whose low wages convert to operating profits for their respective exploiters. Why do the taxpayers subsidize this profit? Would it not be better to set the minimum wage at the minimum income which we as a society have decided that one may subsist without welfare? Why does the 10% tax bracket for income under \$14,000 exist when almost all workers in this bracket are refunded through welfare more than their income tax burden? Many workers in the 12% tax bracket on income up to \$40,000 are also subsidized. Not only is the direct welfare subsidy paid, but offices are rented for disbursing subsidy, other offices are rented for subsidy accounting and overseeing, employees are salaried to staff the offices, etc. These bills are paid in part by the tax burden of the very people whose money is so limited that we award them special welfare supplements. Would it be better not to tax them to begin with so as to avoid such expansive welfare infrastructure? If the tax burden on low earners is such that it causes their poverty to be so great that society feels the need to supplement them with welfare such as food stamps, then that tax burden is too high. However, even without the income tax eating about 10% of minimum wage workers' pay, and not to mention FICA taxes taking another bite, the standard of poverty in the USA

transactions related to replacing the window has some final step in a closed economic system. A zero sum game is defined and breaking the window is not productive. In the macroeconomic view of an open system with no final transaction, breaking the window is productive. In the open system, the window is replaced, a new window is ordered to replenish the stock at the spare window warehouse, a new window is manufactured to fill that order, sand is collected to supply the glass factory, sand harvesters buy lunch, etc. The chain of transaction goes on forever and one concludes that breaking the window did generate real productivity. The zero sum argument of the micro view relies on a final transaction such as the sand harvesters' wages without considering their lunch expenditures and the lunch vendor's subsequent ingredients acquisitions, etc. Since there is no final step in the real economy, the zero sum argument cannot be completed. The broken window "fallacy" should be called the broken window fact.

is such that most minimum wage workers would still be deemed deserving of welfare in the absence of any income tax burden. The minimum wage is that low. Even untaxed, it is not enough.

It is redundant, unproductive, and inefficient to impose the same tax on low earners and high earners whose after-tax earnings are not supplemented with welfare tax spending. Many whose income is not supplemented in this way are only marginally above the welfare threshold and the tax burden likewise should not fall on them. Neither should it be borne heavily by the middle classes. The burden should fall on those who profit most from the welfare given to low earners. These profiteers are the ones that pay the minimum wages and boost their profits with low labor costs. Profiteers pass the real cost of labor to taxpayers who pay for the profiteers' workers' food stamps and Medicaid, and also the rent on the food stamp and Medicaid offices, and the salaries of everyone who works in those offices, etc. The profiteers should subsidize their own workers with better wages.

Taxes and wages are two sides of a coin. Higher wages or lower taxes both look the same on a pay stub. As it relates to the minimum wage, however, consider the USA economic minority which supports the flat income tax. If these people call themselves Libertarians or Republicans, the flat tax is as far from being a leftist socialist policy as possible. The point about the redundancy of renting office space in which to pay the salaries of welfare workers to distribute welfare does not work well on flat tax adherents because many of them would prefer total worker exploitation as the solution for not funding welfare departments. They often say, "Deregulate labor markets and if laborers don't like where they work, then they can quit and get a better job and if they won't work harder, then let them starve." It is lost on these people that the entirety of the USA's existence is predicated on Thomas Jefferson's words, "[A]ll experience hath shewn, that mankind are more disposed to suffer, while evils are sufferable, than to right themselves by abolishing the forms to which they are accustomed." Those in flat-tax let-them-starve crowd are not real Americans. Real Americans know that people will put up with just about anything if doing otherwise implies a broken routine. As a society, and for the reason stated by Jefferson in the Declaration of Independence, we do give lip service to a shared belief that it is the duty of a business not to exploit its workers more so than it is the duty of workers to refuse to work for employers that will exploit them. We know it is not acceptable for businesses to exploit workers as they see fit because workers will not right themselves. However, the flat-tax no-welfare deregulation

crowd does usually suggest that workers would right themselves if businesses were given free reign of total unregulated worker exploitation.

The rent that non-homeowners pay is often described as the rent tax. If one does not own a home and yet one has a home, rent is paid. As certain as death and taxes, that money leaves the pocket every month. Similarly for businesses: taxes are paid, rent is paid, and labor costs are paid as well. In the way that rent can be considered a tax, labor costs are an effective business tax. It is not considered equitable in the USA to tax low income at the same rate as high income, and yet the proponents of the flat minimum wage hike cheer to levy the same labor tax against small family businesses as they do against Amazon and Walmart. This is a classical divide and conquer strategy on the part of the most wealthy business interests. It separates the poorest minimum wage workers from the small business owners whose interests are aligned with workers more than they are with Amazon and Walmart. The profiteers get the minimum wage workers to cheer for a flat labor tax even while the idea of comparable flat tax on income would be despised and hated by those who cheer for it to be imposed as a flat tax on business. Anything bad for small business is good for mega-business and anything good for mega-business only serves to reward the ethos of exploitation under which those businesses will always seek to pay unlivable wages if the remainder can be passed off to taxpayers. The entire exercise of the flat labor tax is self-defeating and seeks to exploit a short-sighted view of more money in pockets with no consideration for second order effects.

Small businesses usually operate on slim margins. If they are forced to increase wages, they will be forced to increase prices as a matter of maintaining solvency because their margins are not so large that they can easily absorb higher wages with decreased profits. To the contrary, larger businesses usually operate on larger margins which afford them the opportunity to absorb increased labor costs through a combination of increased prices and decreased margins. An across the board doubling of the minimum wage is likely to cause small businesses to raise their prices more than larger businesses because small businesses, in general, do not have much freedom to decrease profits. When increased prices manifest disproportionately among smaller businesses, their already low competitiveness will be lowered. It is reasonable to suppose that this will drive many smaller businesses into insolvency and that after they are gone larger businesses will raise prices to restore margins when they have fewer competing small businesses to undercut. They will earn record profits on their




FIG. 7. This figure illustrates a categorization scheme by which it is possible to implement a minimum wage increase as something other than a flat tax on business' labor costs. The horizontal scale denotes standard deviation from the mean.

previous market share and also the revenue share appropriated from the small businesses which could not endure. In time, increased prices will erode the value of the increased wage and the workers' plight be restored to how it was before the wage increase.¹⁰ The profiteer class will always employ scientists to calculate what prices are high enough to bleed the poor dry but no higher. Furthermore, all of the insolvent former business owners and their workers will be forced into the pool of common labor. The climate for transitioning out of common labor into small business entrepreneurship will be weakened by the iniquitous labor cost flat tax.

The health of the economy, from the perspective Main Street, is described by the small business climate. If small businesses are doing better, the economy is doing better even if Wall Street doesn't see it that way. Tens of millions of hundred-thousandaires would signify a far healthier economy than do a few hundred billionaires. We have argued that any change in wage structure should come at the expense of the largest business interests and we have also shown that the \$15 labor cost flat tax is a gift to the billionaire class. Now we will suggest an alternative to the labor cost flat tax.

¹⁰ Walmart provides low cost money orders as a service to the poor. In 2020, Walmart money orders cost \$0.88 but in 2021 they cost a dollar. This 15% price increase reflects the creep of inflation. If the minimum wage goes to \$15, the price of money orders at Walmart is likely to reach \$2 soon after.

An equitable way to increase wages is to tie a business' minimum allowed wage to its gross revenue. Consider Figure 7 which shows a Gaussian distribution which is also called a normal curve. We suggest that the minimum wage which a business is obligated to pay should be tied to the standard deviation bin of that business' gross revenue.¹¹ For instance, one might leave the minimum wage unchanged for businesses whose gross revenue is within a half of a standard deviation of the mean. About 40% of businesses fall in this central group between the ± 0.5 bars.¹² As the standard deviation increases or decreases, one would increase or decrease the minimum wage that a given business is obligated to pay. On the low end, smaller businesses would be obligated to pay a certain lower minimum wage and we expect that labor availability might drive smaller business to pay more than their minimum obligation. For instance, the minimum wage required by a business whose gross revenue is three standard deviations below the mean might be \$1 per hour but they would be unlikely to find employees willing to accept that wage when other business' minimum wage is higher (or much higher.) Smaller businesses benefit by letting market forces dictate their wages as opposed to being afflicted with some categorical flat tax. On the high end, however, the largest companies, the Amazons and the Walmarts, are forced to pay a higher minimum wage because their gross revenues are many standard deviations above the mean. Here, the market forces are less likely to dictate the wage. The labor cost tax is levied directly on the largest businesses that pay the absolute minimum required by law as much as possible. The Gaussian wage scheme, which is rightly called the normal wage scheme, has the desired effect of the \$15 labor cost flat tax. It forces megagglomerates to pay their workers more but it does not levy an undue burden on small and ordinary businesses. The businesses with the most gross revenue have the most employees and these employees' wages benefit the most under the normal wage scheme. This scheme has the added benefit of decreasing the competitiveness of the largest businesses whose competitive edge over smaller businesses is exaggerated by many decades of economic policy disfavorable to small business. By taking the edge away from the largest businesses, the normal wage scheme promotes the independent business climate and increases opportunities for workers to transition into the

¹¹ Gross revenue reflects total sales volume without subtracting expenses. Tying wages to gross rather than net revenue will preclude a large class of accounting gimmicks.

¹² The reader is encouraged to understand that while 38.2% of businesses' gross revenues lie within a half of a standard deviation from the average gross revenue, much less than 38.2% of workers are employed by these 38.2% of businesses.

entrepreneur class. As the top 0.1% of businesses are always penalized with the highest labor tax, competition is increased as it will be more difficult to maintain the top position.

III. TAX ON INCOME

Purely as an example, we proposed in Section II to leave the minimum wage unchanged in the center of the normal distribution. While most minimum wage workers are employed by the largest businesses whose wages would increase under the normal wage scheme, we must also consider other workers. Whatever the wage scheme is, it should be such that no wage is a poverty subsistence subsidized with welfare.

In the 2016 edition of this report,¹³ we suggested an exponential income tax structure. The structure is quite similar in quality to the normal wage scheme: those low on the distribution pay little and those on the high end pay more. The key feature is that those at the very top pay much more than those who are merely towards the high end. This is the main idea which separates the present policies from those framed by the Overton window. That window allows one to speak of special welfare considerations separating the impoverished from the poor but speaking of taxes to separate the ultra-wealthy from the wealthy is not allowed. Before reviewing the exponential tax and then presenting a normal tax, we will review the present USA bracket tax on income. We will describe how the bracket structure provides a human tax shield for the usurious avarice of the ultra-wealthy. Then we will contrast the bracket tax with the remedial exponential and normal taxes.

In 2020, the lowest USA tax bracket was 10% on income up to \$14,000. The highest was 37% on income above \$520,000. The main criticisms against this system are as follows. A low earner paying a hypothetical 10% on a \$10,000 income is overburdened by his tax bill. Why pay \$1,000 in taxes only to receive \$2,000 in food stamps? The burden to subsidize poverty is shifted onto middling earners but not onto the profiteer caste which profits by paying poverty wages. Consider Figure 8. The bracket tax (A) is indistinguishable from a flat tax. The bracket structure spans such a small portion of the income spectrum that it is not possible to discern the non-flat character of the increasing tax brackets. Income twenty times above the \$520,000 maximum threshold is still taxed at 37% while five tax brackets separate the \$26,000 income which is one twentieth of \$520,000. If income twenty times

¹³ “On Certain Aspects of American Economics Relevant to 2016” [<https://vixra.org/abs/1605.0166>]




FIG. 8. In this figure, the current USA income bracket tax (A) appears flat because the lowest 0.00035% of the income spectrum spanned by the seven brackets is too small to be seen. The first exponential tax in this figure (B) is set with $y \propto e^x$ but this only a random choice for contrast with the bracket tax. Likely an S-curve of some sort (C) would be the ideal implementation of the exponential tax. This S-curve is given with $y \propto x^3$ but the given 10% rate on \$3 billion is probably not realistic. The normal tax (not pictured) is proposed to take the guesswork out of the exponential tax.

higher than \$26,000 is taxed at a much higher rate, why is income twenty times higher than \$520,000 taxed at the same rate? Why is income 10,000 times higher than \$520,000 still taxed at the same rate? While the income bracket tax is presented as representing USA people's understanding that flat taxes are iniquitous, we see that the bracket tax is nothing but a flat tax with a tax break for the lowest portion of the income spectrum.

Now we will distinguish between real income and taxable income, and then we will intermingle the separate concepts to discuss income generally. For this reason, this section is titled "Tax on Income" but not "Income Tax." Taxable income is defined as "income subject to the income tax" but there are other types of income. We will use real income to mean "annual change in net worth." In the 2016 treatment of tax policy, we were careful

to separate taxable income from real income because the USA income tax is not a tax on real income. In 2020, many CEO's, celebrities, and athletes made tens of millions of dollars. Some made a hundred million dollars or more. For the most part, all of this represents dollar-denominated taxable income. However, the highest earners' income is not paid only in dollars and, therefore, is not subject to the specific USA tax called the income tax as usually understood. Elon Musk made about \$150 billion in 2020.¹⁴ Jeff Bezos made about \$75 billion and many other billionaires took home billions in real income. While the specific "income tax" does not hit stock-denominated income until the stock options are exercised, we will treat option income as ordinary income to demonstrate the mechanism by which the current USA tax scheme on the accumulation of wealth is iniquitous. In the 2016 report, we identified the highest income around \$150 million but this reflects dollar-denominated income only. Considering real income, we see that the high end of the real income spectrum is about 1,000 times higher than the greatest taxable income around \$150 million, as in Figure 8.¹⁵

When Musk exercises his stock options, he will pay income taxes on it at about the same rate that one pays income taxes on \$520,000.¹⁶ However, once Musk exercises his option to buy stock, his future real income on that stock will be taxed as low as 0% and not higher than 20% due to the capital gains tax. To illustrate how the capital gains tax is a tax break on real income, we will assume Musk exercised all of his options immediately (highly unlikely) and is in possession of \$150 billion worth of Tesla stock. If Tesla doubles in value in 2021 (hopefully it will not), then the \$150 billion in real income that Musk makes on his previous \$150 billion will be taxed at 0% unless he sells some stock. If he sells half his shares in 2021 and takes a check for \$150 billion, Musk will pay 20% on that: about half of the 37% one pays on \$520,000 of ordinary income. While his CEO contract probably forbids selling in 2021, selling will be allowed after a few years and the tax rate will be 20% on however many billions he profits by selling. If he does not sell, however, and his net worth increases by billions and billions in his stock portfolio instead of his bank account, he will pay 0% on

¹⁴ Billionaire CEO pay is complicated and Musk did not receive a check for \$150 billion in 2020. See for example: "Elon Musk won't pay income tax in his new home state of Texas, but he's not off the hook in California" [<https://www.businessinsider.com/how-much-does-elon-musk-pay-taxes-california-texas-2020-12>]

¹⁵ The reader is invited to recognize the scale of billions of dollars. The earnings of 900 people making \$150 million per year are much less than the earnings of one person making \$150 billion per year.

¹⁶ Stock option income tax requires computations related to option strike prices and other things which we do not consider here.

that income. For this reason, Bezos will likely pay about 0% on his \$75 billion 2020 income because it reflects the appreciation of stock he already owned rather than the receipt of new stock options as was the case for Musk's \$150 billion.

While many people do not have assets that can appreciate in value, if one is fortunate enough to own something that can appreciate, it is probably a home. If the value of one's home increases, then one's property tax will increase even if the home is not sold. This reflects a tax other than the income tax which is levied against the real income of home value appreciation. However, if the value of one's stock portfolio goes up, the real income connected to that change in net worth is not taxed at all unless the stock is converted to cash. If millions or billions worth of stock is converted, it is taxed at about 20% even though working people pay more than that on modest wages. For instance, if the reader's home increases in value by \$75 billion, the reader's property tax would go up quite a bit but this is not how it works for a stock portfolio. Investment in property in which to raise a family comes with a significant tax burden but no such burden is attached to investing in the corporations whose profits are padded by the unlivable wages paid at the bottom of the logistics chain. Stockholders paying 0% on their real income, and others, point their fingers at low income families whose standard income tax deduction is such that their bracket income tax burden is completely offset. Those are the ones vilified for not carrying their share of the tax burden: the notorious 47% that "pay no taxes." In fact, these people pay every other tax that most people pay, FICA taxes for example, while Bezos will pay no income tax and no FICA on his \$75 billion.

The ratio of the lowest \$14,000 tax bracket to the highest at \$520,000 is about 1:37 but the ratio of \$520,000 to the income of the highest earner making \$150 billion is about 1:300,000. Restricting to the highest 2020 cash earners, this ratio is about 1:400. For this reason, we say that the income bracket tax is an effective flat tax with special tax breaks for those whose earnings are in the lowest 0.00035% of the real income spectrum: those making less than \$520,000 per year. In the general sense presently considered, this flat tax scheme gives the profiteer caste the following benefit. Whenever tax hikes on the wealthiest citizens are considered, earners whose incomes are in the bottom 0.0005% but not in the bottom 0.0001% will argue, "No! Don't raise my taxes! I work for a living!" The profiteer caste gets the caste of the 0.0005%-ish earners to argue their case for them when, in reality, their interests are more aligned with minimum wage earners' than they are with the top

~99% of the income spectrum. The top ~99% of the income spectrum may only have a few hundred people in it but the Overton window is such that tax law must never target their hoard.¹⁷ The Overton window requires that these few hundred or few thousand people occupying almost all of the income spectrum are lumped in with doctors and attorneys that make hundred of thousands of dollars per year and yet are still well within the lowest fractional percentile of the total income spectrum. This lowest fraction contains the 99% of people whose interests were the predicate of Occupy (The 99%) before that was supplanted by BLM's focus on the interests of the 12% of USA black people.

In the 2016 version of this report, we proposed an exponential tax to remedy the bracket tax under which the profiteer caste is able to camouflage its economic interests among the interests of the affluent section of The 99%. Due to the constraints of the Overton window, the exponential tax may not be discussed in polite company. However, one is allowed to discuss the foot-shooting variant of universal basic income (UBI) pictured in Figure 9. The Overton idea for UBI is to leave the peak of the income distribution far to the right near the highest incomes while scraping off a few pennies for the bottom half of incomes. Under the Overton policy, one would levy a new tax to pay for UBI checks. Then UBI would be distributed to create Figure 9's new income distribution. The obvious problem is that a healthy income distribution would put the peak in the central yellow bin. A healthy distribution is a normal distribution, as in Figure 7. Any income policy that produces an abnormal peak in the red bin (top quintile) is self-defeating. The version of UBI presented in the Overton window preys upon low earners' small picture view of the lack of coin in their pockets when the overarching problem is the abnormality of the income distribution. Furthermore, it exploits middle earners' complacency by showing them a version of UBI which does not transfer many dots into the middle.

The purpose of the exponential income tax is to hammer the upper crust of the top quintile of the current income distribution. Through sufficiently exponentially increasing taxes on income, the peak of the income distribution would be forced into the central yellow bin. In Figure 8, we approximated the form of the exponential tax with arbitrary examples (B) and (C). In a real world implementation, the exact form of the tax curve would be

¹⁷ The distribution of gross revenue in Figure 7 was such that much less than 40% of employees work for the ~40% of businesses in the two central bins. Similarly, the reader is invited to understand that the bottom 1% of the income spectrum contains far more than 1% of earners. It contains more than 99% of earners.




FIG. 9. This figure demonstrates a variant of UBI which is admissible in the Overton window. The axes of this figure's template are not labeled so it is not certain exactly what the bins and dots signify. For the present purposes of discussing the general character of USA income stratification, we take each bin to represent one quintile of income and the number of dots in each bin to represent the share of total income paid in the lowest 20% of incomes, the next 20%, the next, the next, and the highest 20%. Since many people have equal incomes in the sense that a lot of people earn \$50,000 per year, the population is not evenly distributed along the horizontal axes as would be the case if each bin represented one quintile of earners, which may have been the original intent. In this income *distribution*, incomes are evenly distributed along the horizontal axis but the income *spectrum* shown in Figure 8 is such that almost all incomes are squeezed into the first horizontal pixel.

computed to generate a desirable outcome: one in which The 99% don't have their incomes squeezed into the bottom 0.00035% of the income spectrum. Since the outcome of the exponential tax is the relevant policy object while the exact mathematical form of the tax curve is not of interest, now we will propose a tax defined by its outcome rather than the quality of its increase.

The normal tax uses real-time payroll reporting to dynamically adjust tax rates so that the after-tax income distribution is a normal curve. Rather than a new UBI tax levied to pay for UBI checks, the existing income tax is altered. Low earners would receive money in the form of a negative income tax rate. While the income distribution is abnormal, many in the middle would also receive money through a negative tax rate. The normal tax is like grading on a curve in a classroom. Under the normal tax, the desired outcome is guaranteed but the similar exponential tax is only a guess about what the curve will be. It is better to implement the grading curve as needed than to guess what curve will be

needed to produce the desired distribution of grades. For this reason, the normal tax is superior to the exponential tax. The income distribution is normalized by the tax and the complementary normal wage policy would set the minimum wage to prevent any gaming of the system. Without a minimum wage, employers might pay \$0 per hour because the normal tax would generate income from the negative tax rate which replaces UBI checks. In the current bracket tax scheme, most workers earn far less than the average wage.¹⁸ In statistical language, one says that the current median wage is below the current mean wage. The normal tax remedies this inequity by forcing the most common income toward the center of the income distribution. When we consider real income, the current most common (median) wage is near the bottom of the lowest 0.00035% of the income spectrum. This is abnormal.

One benefit of UBI not presently considered is that “universal” basic income goes to everyone, not just workers. As we will discuss in Section IV, income should be universal and payments to non-workers in some form should be implemented. Even among workers, however, a normal income distribution is such that earners many standard deviations below the mean would earn very little. Therefore, some form of UBI check to prevent poverty is needed but the scale of such a program is necessarily small compared to the program that moves the peak of the income distribution from the fifth quintile into the third quintile, as not pictured in Figure 9. We will not theorize a complementary UBI program here. By some mechanism, a modest pittance should be scraped of from the haves and given to the have-nots more or less in proportion to the scheme illustrated by Figure 9.

The normal tax is not communist by any means. The normal tax cannot re-order who makes more than whom. The highest earners and the lowest earners remain the highest and lowest earners, and the ordering of everyone between remains the same as well. No one’s tax penalty will ever be such that their income would have been better if they had made less money. The normal tax is not a program of wealth redistribution. We have not proposed to redistribute wealth to enforce a normal distribution of who has how much more money than whom. The tax only seeks to redistribute new income. All of the profit incentive for working hard is preserved under the normal tax: the richest, most successful people will still have and make more money than anyone else. The normal tax only corrects the worst

¹⁸ In terms of taxable income the median wage is slightly below the mean wage but in terms of real income it is far below.

market forces which say that one man's work is worth literally one million times as much as another man's. That is not reasonable and the million-to-one ratio reflects the exploitative low wages of low earners at least as much it reflects the high pay of the high earners that pay those wages. The normal tax corrects the exploitation of the poor and, *most importantly for most people*, it greatly increases the wages of the middle class. In Figure 9, the central bin is barely changed by UBI and the fourth bin is changed not at all. The reader is invited to imagine the number of dots placed in the center if the abnormal character of the distribution was corrected with a normal tax on income.

Consider Mark Zuckerberg whose societal contribution has been to sell banner ads on the internet and to sell his users' data. Capitalism determines that his 2020 real income of \$15 billion should be 300,000 times higher than someone earning \$50,000. The socialist normal tax scheme might determine that Zuckerberg makes less than 100 times as much. Whatever the exact figure would be, 300,000 is not a reasonable multiple. In the opinion of this writer, Zuckerberg's contribution hardly rises above a McDonald's employee whose productive work provides lunch to several hundred people per day. It is true that Zuckerberg employs people but the productivity of those people is only to sell banner ads on the internet and sell user data that users would prefer not to have sold. The change implemented by the normal tax is that the highest earners might make dozens or hundreds of times as much money as an average worker as opposed to the current system which awards them thousands or millions of times as much.

We conclude this section belaboring the object of anti-capitalism. Usually people earning 1.5 times as much as an average worker react with horror thinking that anti-capitalism will plunge them to the economic status of someone making merely 1.3 times what an average worker makes. In reality, the thrust of anti-capitalism is to correct the abnormal misvaluing of income when market forces are given free reign to run amok determining that Zuckerberg's contribution is valued 300,000 times higher than an average contribution. Was Musk's work in 2020 correctly valued at the worth of three million average annual wages? In the opinion of this writer, these exaggerated income ratios suggest that anti-capitalist policies should be implemented by the government to oppose the unrestricted capitalism of the business environment which finds it to be in good order that one man's income is millions of times higher than another's.

Anti-capitalism is not anti-business. It does not seek to abolish the right of citizens to do

business in the market. It does not seek to prevent profits from success in business. Anti-capitalism calls for the government to oppose inequitable market forces rather than to pour gasoline on them by, for instance, taxing income a million times above the minimum wage at the same rate as income twenty times that wage (or less than half as much if the income is realized as capital gains.) Left unchecked or exacerbated by capitalist government policy, the distributions which measure our economic circumstances become twisted and grotesque. When the government enacts capitalist economic policies (which are divorced from citizens' capitalist initiative to do business in the market), it finds that abnormal distributions are in good order and that they reflect the desire of the market. What's more: this is true! This is the desire of the market! Governments ideally oppose negative market forces by being the advocate of the people in the market but degeneration in economic thinking has given rise to the supposition that the market knows what is best for market participants and has their best interests in mind. Anti-capitalism calls for the government to implement socialist policies that act in opposition to the greed-based capitalist ideology of the business environment in which it is expected that participants' love of capital will drive them toward good decisions. On the other hand, it is said that the love of capital is the root of all evil and one should expect the government to oppose rather than accelerate such forces.

IV. THE ROLE OF THE POOR

The previous section contained the claim, "Whatever the wage scheme is, it should be such that no wage is a poverty subsistence subsidized with welfare." There will be some body of the public whose opinion on this claim will be that no wages should be subsidized, ever, and that if people aren't making enough money to pay the rent on their lives, then they should wither away in poverty. To the extent that people of any political opinion are rarely amenable to any form of persuasion, now we will briefly make the case for not letting the low earners wither away. We will frame this as an issue of the hidden economic productivity of low earners rather than the matter of compassion as which this issue is often framed.

Usually, business owners claim that their own hard work built their businesses. In fact, their customers were equal parties in their success. No business can succeed if people don't spend money on its goods or services. For this reason, we assign equal weight in the success of a business to a businessman and to his customers. The relationship between an owner

and his customers is one-to-many so the owner is entitled to the rewards of his own business far more than is any particular customer. The customer's reward should be a modest welfare drawn from spenders' small contribution to the success of many businesses. Since the service provided by people who spend money is absolutely vital to the functioning of the marketplace, such as poor people who spend literally every cent that comes to them, reward is due for their invaluable contribution without which the marketplace would fail. While it is somewhat outlandish to demand that all businesses engage in direct cooperative-style profit sharing with their customers, we argue that some minimal standard of UBI is a proper economic compensation for the service provided by those who will spend 100% of that UBI in the market. Usually one speaks of giving money to the poor from the standpoint of charity but here we argue that the economic productivity of a business' customers is equal to the economic productivity of a business' principals and that, therefore, compensation in the form of UBI is due.

V. FOOT-SHOOTING

Racism is not a big problem. If someone is a racist, so what? How does that affect others? If a policeman murders a citizen, the problem is that the man is a murderer and this is not mitigated at all by the man's condition of racism or non-racism. Is it proper for police to murder as long they aren't racist while they do it? Some racist police go through their entire careers and never fail to perform their duties properly. Some non-racist police kill and abuse people from behind the armor of the badge, through negligence or malice, and sometimes those people are black. The current foothold of racism at the pinnacle of citizens' popular grievances serves the purposes of the elites which orchestrate the inequitable and unjust society whose disease is not properly diagnosed as racism. In fictional analogy, the Wizard of Oz famously ordered, "Pay no attention to the man behind the curtain." In 2021 the wizard says, "Pay no attention to the economic system." The wizard likes nothing more than to see the ire of the downtrodden focused on a boogie man of racism at the expense of any focus on the man behind the curtain and his capitalist neck irons.

The police kill far more whites in any given year than they do blacks, as in Figure 10. The disproportionate representation of blacks in the per capita murder and brutality statistics represents, in the opinion of this writer, blacks' disproportionate per capita representation in




FIG. 10. This figure shows that about eight whites are killed by police per five blacks. It also shows that blacks are killed at rate in excess of their representation in the population while whites are killed at rate lower than their representation in the population.

the USA economic underclass. This is an economic problem, not a racist problem. If someone is racist, what harm is done? While racism itself does little to no harm, capitalism does great harm. It is reasonable to look at Figure 10 and suppose that the over-representation of black people in the “killed” statistic is driven not only by their over-representation among the poor, but is also due to the racism of the police. For example, a police officer might be a murderer that only kills black people and this could be assigned as a problem with racism. However, in the way that some serial killers only kill women, it is never alleged that a serial killer’s problem is misogyny. The serial killer’s problem is that he is a murderer.

To further separate the problem of racism from the disease often said to be caused by it, now we will argue against racism as a strong contributing factor in the racial skew of police violence. There exists a classical reasoning fallacy called *cum hoc ergo propter hoc* which means “with this, therefore because of this.” Also stated as “correlation implies causation,” the fallacy is the assumption that if two things appear together, then one must be the cause of the other. We argue that the identification of racism as the cause of the racial skew in Figure 10 is an example of the *cum hoc ergo propter hoc* fallacy. We will place almost all of the problem’s blame on the over-representation of blacks among the poor and, thereby, we will identify capitalism rather than racism as the main cause of certain grievances.

Consider a toggle switch such that all racism ceases when it is toggled. Murderers remain

murderers and brutish ruffians remain as they are but all racism ceases. When racism is toggled off, murderer and brutalizer cops will still interact disproportionately with the USA black population because that population is over-represented among the poor. The poor are more likely to commit crimes and poverty forces the poor into public spaces where police interaction is most common. The murderers and brutalizers will still interact with the black population on a disproportionate per capita basis so it is reasonable to conclude that, even in the absence of racial bias, the murderers' and brutalizers' victims will remain disproportionately black. When racism is toggled off, meaning that there is no racial bias among police, the racial police murder statistics will exactly reflect the racial distribution of police interactions. However, this is the problem that BLM attributes to racism. For this reason, we have titled this section "Foot-shooting."

By the scientific method, the thought experiment of the toggle switch treats racism as an independent variable. Police victimization is the dependent variable. Since racists who are not unethical ruffians or murderers did not contribute to the problem while racism was toggled on, and since the murderers and assorted scoundrels among the police are still interacting with blacks on a higher per capita basis than any other group while the racism is toggled off, the scientific method suggests that we should not identify a strong correlation between racism and police violence. The lack of racial bias ensures that police will murder each race in proportion to their interactions with that race. We do not have data giving the interaction rate so we cannot compare it to the 23.4% given in Figure 10 to determine how it would change in the absence of racism. We have extrapolated that the over-representation will remain but we have not shown that the toggle will fail to lessen the disproportion. For example, the racial skew contribution of murderers who are more likely to murder blacks due to racism will be lessened when racism is toggled off. However, granting that police interact with poor people far more than any other group, and granting that black people are over-represented among the poor on a per capita basis, we have demonstrated conclusively that the anti-black skew in the racial statistics will persist in the absence of racism. To the contrary, if we treated the existence of an economic underclass as an independent variable which could be toggled on or off, we would find that the existence of the economic underclass is a strong causal factor with respect to racial skew in police violence. The economic underclass' existence is a precept of capitalism. It is historical circumstance more so than present day racism which leads to the black population having

a higher representation in the economic underclass.

The issue of black on black violence raises some vexing quandary about BLM's focus on police violence but we will not treat that issue presently. It suffices to say that BLM ignores this problem and the hypocrisy is noted. As a way to frame the historical origin of the black population in the capitalist underclass, a class that exists in all countries and is not a class invented to oppress USA black people, we will examine the issue of slavery in the context of black lives mattering as a further indictment of BLM. When 18th century European merchants sailed to Africa's slave coast, they were met by African merchants selling slaves. The Europeans did not enslave many of these people. Rather, they bought slaves that the Africans had already enslaved. Slavery flourished as an institution in the USA for a long time. Eventually, Abraham Lincoln told the southern states that they could keep slavery if they agreed not to leave the Union. As it was, the USA white European settlers eventually altered USA slave law with the 13th Amendment.¹⁹ Black lives mattered enough to the white people running the government in the 19th century that the lucrative Atlantic slave trade was terminated. Had it been up to the African slave merchants who were enslaving their fellow Africans, that trade would have continued. BLM does not adequately consider the fact that the Atlantic slave trade ended when white people stopped buying slaves, not when black people stopped selling them. Furthermore, the present day USA white community is less racist than the white community that abolished slavery. BLM drives people of all races away from economic solidarity with their vacuous chants of, "Why don't you care about us, Whitey?"

Capitalism does more harm than racism and so does feminism. From Eve to Deborah to Jezebel to Delilah, no society tolerating feminism can rightfully call its ethical system Judeo-Christian. USA public opinion is anti-racist enough that it is now essentially illegal to employ a uniformly white office staff. When the capitalists embrace anti-racism by hiring diversely, far too often the salaried and benefit-laden corporate jobs go to black women. The disproportionate representation of black men in the police statistics is mentioned one

¹⁹ The 13th Amendment does not abolish slavery in the USA. Rather, it restricts the circumstances under which slavery is allowed. Specifically, "Neither slavery nor involuntary servitude, except as a punishment for crime whereof the party shall have been duly convicted, shall exist within the United States, or any place subject to their jurisdiction." Under USA law, everyone in jail is a slave. Many languish in slavery for years awaiting trial as they cannot afford the price of emancipation set at their bond hearing but such people have not been duly convicted of any crime. This is the institution of slavery alive and well in the USA: the most incarcerated country on Earth.



FIG. 11. The speech bubble in this comic originally read, “Put it all in pepper spray.” The identity politics of BLM and the associated cancer of the transgenda were introduced to undermine and short circuit any broadly unifying anti-capitalist populism.

thousand times per day but the disproportionate representation of black women in the corporate class is not mentioned. By way of feminism, the economic benefits of the broadly held anti-racist beliefs in the USA circumvent the black man who in turn succumbs to frequent police interactions. By way of feminism, anti-racism is used to turn the black man into an economic eunuch. His economic situation is not improved and he is emasculated by the promotion of women whose desire for a man to support them is lessened. It can only be racism that places black men below black women in the corporate hierarchy while white men are mostly above their female counterparts. It is the feminism, however, not the racism, that provides an avenue for racist corporatists to implement a racist agenda that diversity hiring is meant to mitigate. As with capitalism, this structural issue is rarely given due consideration.

To frame the issue of self-sabotage that is the subject of this section, we will consider an example unrelated to racism. About ten years ago, a TSPLOST²⁰ initiative was placed on

²⁰ This acronym stands for Transit-related Special Purpose Local Option Sales Tax.

the ballot in Georgia. It would have levied some small new tax for public transportation initiatives and it would have formed a council of the ten Atlanta metro counties to collectively decide how spend the TSPLOST money. Each county would get one vote. After many years of dissatisfaction with Atlanta metro public transit, many were happy to see something finally being done to increase transit spending. Luckily, the initiative failed.²¹

For many years, demographic trends in Georgia showed that the balance of power in the state legislature was bound to tip in favor of the Atlanta metro area as its population surpassed the rest of the state's rural and less-urban populations. In 2021, this tipping point has passed but it had not yet passed when TSPLOST was on the ballot.²² The problem with TSPLOST was that each county would get one vote in how the money was spent. The voting power of more than a million people in Fulton County would be set equal to the voting power of 250,000 people in Cherokee County though Cherokee County residents are at least an order of magnitude less likely to use public transit. TSPLOST was a bone thrown by the long dominant parties which could see the ebb of the tide of their power. They said, "Here, we'll give you a few dollars for transit if you agree to let five Fulton county residents' voice be equal to one Cherokee County resident's voice regarding TSPLOST tax spending." The gimmick is always the same. The party which is likely to lose in the long run makes an offer laced with poison and the winning party which has been on the losing end for too long gladly accepts in triumph. As it was with TSPLOST, so it is with the minimum wage. The tide of worker's rights is changing in tandem with the destruction of the middle class. Now the capitalists throw a \$15 minimum wage to low earners and their sympathizers hoping that they will strangle small business with it and hurt themselves unknowingly by their lack of foresight. Economic protests started with Occupy and the capitalists quickly said, "No, complain about racism instead." Suddenly UBI is proposed but the proposal does almost nothing to alter the abnormal character of the income distribution, as in Figure 9. The profiteers say, "You don't like it that the income distribution peaks so far to the rich side of things? Here, beg us to move the peak over about one inch so we can grant your request. Then when you complain that UBI isn't working because the distribution is still abnormal, we'll say that moving the income peak doesn't work and we already tried it."

²¹ TSPLOST was expected to succeed. It may have failed in part due to a critical report produced by this writer shortly before the election.

²² This shift is shown in the 2020 electoral victories for the freshman Democrat US Senators from Georgia.

As the common sense of right and wrong is so well aligned against the profiteer caste, that caste relies on the self-sabotage of the working class without whose willing complicity the sabotage would not succeed. The direction of the attention of the black community toward racism rather than capitalism is one such example.

VI. IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALISM

The USA is one of the least racist countries in the world. If there is another country less racist than the USA, then it must be Canada or one of the western European countries. Certainly the home countries of most immigrants are far more racist than the USA, Mexico and India for example. For the most part, Mexicans do not want Central American illegal immigrants in Mexico. This widely held Mexican sentiment is not vilified but when many USA people prefer an absence of illegals in the USA, then the issue is framed in the context of an alleged wicked hatred in the hearts of USA people. USA whites are faulted for black lynchings that happened 100 years ago while the hundred Muslims lynched annually by roving Indian hate mobs somehow do not reflect negatively on Indian immigrants. The previous section regarding racism was titled “Foot-shooting” and we might call this section “Hypocrisy” if it was not also about nationalism.

The great replacement is a conspiracy theory claiming that whites’ social dominance in their traditional enclaves is eroded by immigration.²³ Wikipedia notes, “Scholars have generally dismissed the claims of a ‘great replacement’ as being rooted in an exaggerated reading of immigration statistics and unscientific, racist views.”²⁴ Following in that vein, we will examine the facts. Noting that people emigrate from all countries but eight of the top ten destination countries are white,²⁵ we may now conclude the examination. The replacement is real. If it was not real, people would emigrate from all countries and immigrate to all sorts of countries as well. Though the scholars cited by Wikipedia find that reality is unscientific and racist, one’s desire not to live among foreigners is not inherently racist. While many immigrants are refugees, many others do not want to live among their own people and no

²³ Often times the whites which are the object of this conspiracy are referred to as Europeans in the sense that a white crayon does not render the complexion of whites.

²⁴ “Great Replacement” [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Great_Replacement]

²⁵ “List of sovereign states and dependent territories by immigrant population” [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_sovereign_states_and_dependent_territories_by_immigrant_population]

fault should be found when host country residents do not want to live with them either. As it is, the man who does want not immigrants in his home is faulted for hate while the source of immigrants' desire to leave their homes is little considered. Some people emigrate because the culture in white countries is, in their opinion, better than the culture in their home countries. In this case, any large number of immigrants from that country will contain some immigrants seeking to assimilate and also others who will not assimilate. The latter will seek to establish an expatriate colony of the inferior culture within the host country. While many Americans are glad to take the good with the bad in this regard, those who prefer not to raise their children under the influence of another nation's expatriate colony should not be faulted. Immigrants seeking economic opportunities in western countries will likewise seek only to assimilate in part. Called the Land of Opportunity, the USA is the ancestral homeland of American Indians only and it is a cultural norm in the USA to accept immigrants seeking to make money here. This economic migration does have the effect of establishing expatriate cultural centers and it is not inherently hateful to desire a community of common culture away from such centers. However, the federal government forces all cities and states to receive immigrants without respecting that some communities welcome immigrants and others prefer not to have them. One would think it proper for some communities to choose not to host immigrants but federal law makes this effectively impossible.

Aside from cultural and economic immigrants, refugees merit special considerations. Usually refugees flee from war and/or political conditions which are the direct doing of one western country or another, usually the USA. For this reason, the compassionate case for the accommodation of refugees is greater than for other types of migrants. Relative to economic and cultural migrants, however, refugees are most likely to establish themselves as expatriates and least likely to assimilate. Therefore, the compassionate case is increased and the nationalist case is increased as well, and the plight of refugees raises a difficult question. While we will not answer that question here, we note that the USA trend is always to identify the nationalist interest to live in homogeneous communities as villainous while the capitalist interest in making pointless war and fostering treacherous political climates abroad is little considered. Pointing the finger at the capitalists will not restore the fortunes of present refugees but it is proper to fault the creation of refugee crises as a larger concern than anti-immigrant sentiment among the working classes.

Not only is a preference to avoid the company of foreigners devoid of inherent hate, it may be framed in the context of love and nurturing as well. While the decision of any particular person to find a mate of their choosing is theirs to make in the USA, it is also the right of fathers to choose to raise their daughters in culturally homogeneous areas which will maximize the chance for a preferred outcome with respect to their grandchildren's cultural identity. If a dog breeder prefers not have a certain breed of dog in his kennel because he does not want his puppies to turn out a certain way, one would never say that the dog breeder is hateful of the excluded dog. One would assume that he simply prefers one dog over another. Here, we suggest that one's interest in the identity of their grandchildren far exceeds a dog breeder's interest in a litter of puppies. If ten men are going to try to date a man's daughter while she is in high school and the father wants all of them to share his own cultural identity, that is not inherently hateful. The attitude presented by the USA media, however, is that the expatriate colonies are entitled to fill five of every ten suitor positions. Particularly, white nationalists are faulted for their desire to raise daughters in areas which will ensure that all ten suitors are white even while a dog breeder would never be faulted for putting up a fence to deny a stray dog's chance at mounting his bitches. Since it is the white nations' culture that led to the better living conditions in the countries which are the choice destination of almost all immigrants,²⁶ meaning that the white culture is objectively the best culture, the white nationalist interest in cultural homogeneity is well motivated.

Any problem blamed on racism can be blamed on lack of segregation. Racism is never an important problem in homogeneous communities. The eminence of racism as a USA catch-all bad guy reflects people's natural preference for cultural homogeneity. Everyone prefers segregation and the only exception is the case of immigration or social mobility into a more affluent area. As is always the case, it is the economic affliction of capitalism which makes certain standards of living so low that one's inherent desire for segregation is overcome by one's desire for a higher standard of living. When a pervasive lack of segregation in society is found to be disharmonious, racism is blamed but not ever the capitalism which blights countries and neighborhoods with its inequity. Lack of segregation is never blamed because the idea that people like segregation is not allowed into the Overton window.

²⁶ The two non-white countries in the top ten immigrant destinations are Saudi Arabia and the UAE. Their high rankings likely reflect geographical nearness to regional refugee crises more so than immigrants' preference to live in Arab countries.

Black and white post-slavery segregation was implemented in the USA previously but the policy was not well loved. The problem was not only a stark economic disparity between communities but also the small scale of the segregation in which already small towns and cities were supposed to split into untenably small separate facilities. For instance, a black-only water fountain in a mud puddle next to a white-only water fountain on a fancy stone escarpment does not represent segregation in the sense of geographic separation. However, even while the policy of segregation was not well loved, and was hated for its uncompassionate *schadenfreude*, the modern day USA housing demographics make it plain that many black people prefer to live in homogeneous cultural enclaves, as do many white people and assorted immigrants. While the case for compassion increases from cultural to economic to refugee immigrants, the case is strongest for the descendants of slaves that never wanted to leave their homes. A fence to keep out immigrants is different than a fence to keep out blacks because most USA blacks have nowhere else to go and did not want to be inside the fence to begin with. As with the question of the plight of the refugees, the plight of the USA black nation raises some quandary which is not easily solved. Racists may call for the easy solution of killing them all but this writer and many others do not find that to be in the interest of justice. To the extent that many USA blacks harboring a sense of black nationalism see separate black and white nations in the USA, as do many white nationalists, a precept of international law called the right to self-determination suggests that the USA black nation should have its own land but all the land is taken. Likely this problem will find no solution until the resolution of the war which is soon to come.

In the sense that the USA claims global moral superiority through its Judeo-Christian morality, we will conclude this section considering the history of that tradition. After God afflicted Egypt with ten plagues leading to the execution of Egypt's firstborn children,²⁷ the Israelites wandered for 40 years and then inherited the promised land. At the time of the inheritance, God did not put all the Israelites together. God specified which land was for which people and he segregated them by their tribes, as was always God's way. In the history which followed, it is written that the Israelites could rarely go a generation without forsaking God and turning to foreign gods that their ancestors did not know. In return,

²⁷ In the Gospel of Jesus Christ, Jesus celebrated Passover but it is lost on many of the Paulite tradition that Jesus' holiest holiday commemorates God killing the Egyptians' children as way to force the Egyptian ruler into submission.

God smote the people and gave them to their enemies over and over and over, letting every manner of disaster befall them short of total extermination. Ages passed and then Adolf Hitler did to the so-called Jews exactly what God had been doing to the Israelites all along. Though it is viewed as good when God did these things, Hitler is framed in the USA as some horrible monster as though God's long tradition of smiting the Israelites for their wickedness had come to an end some time after they called on Pilate to crucify Jesus. Long story short, Hitler's idea of Germany for Germans²⁸ was perfectly consistent with the system of tribal segregation described in the Bible. God separates people according to their nations but now nationalism in the USA is called a wickedness.

VII. STRONG MAN GOVERNMENT

God appoints kings over nations. God does not ever implement democracy. One benefit of fascism over democracy is that a fascist country's average citizen understands who is running the government. Such citizens are able to correctly place the blame and credit for the outcomes of the government's decisions. To the contrary, the state of the democratic republic in 2021 is such that no one knows where decisions are made. No one knows who to blame and there is very little to give credit for. When the Congress passes a 5,000 page law, who were the authors of those pages? Certainly not the Congressmen themselves. The limited success of democracies in the past has been derived from citizens' desire to vote in their own self-interest. In 2021, a citizen of the USA can hardly be trusted to vote in his own self-interest because he does not know what is true and is not likely to understand the fundamental structural issues governing his interests. Only a fool trusts the television and one's guess about which of the policies in the Overton window are better is rarely a good one. The interests of common citizens are not admitted to that window.

Throughout history, the argument for fascism over bureaucracy has always been executive efficiency. It is possible to get things done with fascism. The bureaucratic alternative will always stagnate at best or it will become at worst a faceless tyranny aligned against the interests it is empowered to shepherd. For instance, Obamacare is a prime example of the self-sabotage protocols described in the previous sections. When the people's demand for healthcare reform peaked circa 2009, a policy called Obamacare appeared in the Overton

²⁸ The reader is encouraged to differentiate between invasive migrants and involuntary slave descendants.

window. It was designed not to fix any of the healthcare system's structural flaws while giving a superficial impression of structural reform sufficient to quash public demand for change. A dictator would have seen that the USA pays $\sim 18\%$ of GDP for healthcare while similar western economies pay about 10–12% because we do not have a Medicare For All program. Such a program was the obvious solution to the grievances Obamacare did not remedy. However, Medicare For All would terminate the multi-million dollar salary of every health insurance CEO, all the similar salaries of their C-suite officers, as well as the dividends of the shareholders of every health insurance insurer. For an obvious reason, the Congress was not able to entertain such a solution. In the de facto rule by unelected bureaucracy that has become of the USA's democratic republic, no one knows who writes the Congress' bills and those who write them will never prioritize the common interest over the capitalist interest. The USA Congress was unable to produce even a study of a Medicare For All draft law which might have been debated. Instead, the question of healthcare reform was never more than how much money people would be forced to give to the capitalists that run the 50 redundant bureaucracies of the large insurance companies which could be assimilated easily into the existing Medicare infrastructure. While Congress is too impotent to do so much as make the case for such an option to the people, the fascist beholden to capitalists' campaign contributions would have immediately identified the elimination of the 50 redundant for-profit insurance bureaucracies as the proper solution. The reason the USA pays $\sim 18\%$ of GDP for healthcare while all comparable nations pay much less is because it is very expensive to fund 50 redundant health insurance bureaucracies as the independent fiefdoms of their 50 respective millionaire CEO's. It is not reasonable to believe that this simple accounting might have been lost on an autocrat in the way that it was never communicated to the people demanding reform.

One of the most representative examples of the failure of the democratic republic is the Congressional approval rating. Following 9/11, the approval briefly went above 80% as Bush and the Congress launched the war on terror upon a failure to identify 9/11 as a deep state operation. Other than that, the Congress' approval rating is usually very low. It has been under 20% for most of the last ten years. During that time, however, incumbent Congressmen have been reelected more than 90% of the time. In every Congressional district in the country, voters understand that the Congress is not functioning properly but the nationally unanimous opinion is that the other districts' Congressmen are to blame. Fifty

years of voting the two parties into power in alternating succession has done nothing to affect the long term monotonic downtrend in the USA standard of living and quality of life. Each party's members mostly believe that if they can their guys into office next time, then that will be the time things finally change. Voters in both parties are told that they aren't getting what they want because the other party got what it wanted instead and the horizon of very few is broad enough to see that neither party gets what it wants and both parties are told the same lie.

The 50 year downtrend among the middle and lower classes has so much momentum by now that the Congress is effectively powerless to stop it even if the people stopped reelecting their do-nothing incumbents. Not so many years ago, amputating the penis was considered very unhealthy but now the people's alleged representative government's CIA's media apparatus guarantees the soap box of those who will tell citizen's sons that slicing off the penis and testicles can be a good idea. Is it representative of the people that employers are enabled and encouraged to terminate employees over nationalist internet posts but termination for posts that encourage penile amputation is a federal crime? People's opinions on drugs are generally opposed to the policies of the people's so-called representative government. During her failed attempt to attain the Presidency, Hillary Clinton told her would-be voters that the war on drugs can't end because there is too much money in narcotraffic without any nod to the plain reality that marijuana and cocaine are more expensive than corn and sugar only because they are illegal. The people's interests are no longer represented by their alleged representatives which have become little more than very widely smiling disinformation agents. Did Obama close Guantanamo Bay? Did Trump build the wall? No campaign promise is ever delivered. The status quo of the reign of the hidden hand that the people do not know is always maintained. And yet, for some reason, people go to the polls year after year expecting a different result. As Jefferson wrote, "[M]ankind are more disposed to suffer, while evils are sufferable, than to right themselves by abolishing the forms to which they are accustomed."

Any proposed change of government in the USA is invariably met with an appeal to the mythical founding fathers. The foremost example in 2021 is the question, "Did the founding fathers have in mind an AR-15 when they wrote that the people's right to bear arms shall not be infringed?" While they could not have had an AR-15 mind, surely they were aware of a continuing technological progression which had already allowed them to

fight the British with muskets and cannons instead of swords and trebuchets. To the extent that the founding tax rebels' lack of awareness is so often cited, here we will support the abolition of the democratic republic citing that of which they were well aware. The second President, John Adams, wrote, "There is nothing I dread So much, as a Division of the Republick into two great Parties, each arranged under its Leader, and concerting Measures in opposition to each other. This, in my humble Apprehension is to be dreaded as the greatest political Evil, under our Constitution."²⁹ Adams cites the two party system of government that we have now as the greatest evil. Adams did not have the benefit of hindsight with which to know that democracies invariably degenerate into two parties. If he had been aware of this fact, his conviction of the superiority of democracy over monarchy might have been different. George Washington, the first President, said, "The alternate domination of one faction over another, sharpened by the spirit of revenge, natural to party dissension, which in different ages and countries has perpetrated the most horrid enormities, is itself a frightful despotism."³⁰ Washington as well describes the present USA system in which the Democrats and Republicans alternately oust each other every few years. The USA status quo never changes because the alternating ousting is itself the status quo. So, while it is so often asked whether or not the present system of USA gun rights reflects the founding tax rebels' vision, it is never acknowledged that the entire government is what they described as the worst possible outcome for the Constitution. Thomas Jefferson thought that the whole government should be abolished and recreated in every generation writing, "Every constitution, then, and every law, naturally expires at the end of 19 years."³¹ Indeed, the right of the people to abolish the government was written into the supreme law of the USA by Jefferson himself in 1776. While the founders had the wisdom to see the present two-party do-nothing system as a poisonous nightmare, our current political leadership appeals to itself as the pure embodiment of the founders' hopes and dreams. Today, the ancient wisdom that no government is so poor as two-party rule is ignored by fools that delight in their foolishness. For the reason that these fools are the fools running the government, the time to abolish the government is now.

²⁹ "From John Adams to Jonathan Jackson" [<https://founders.archives.gov/documents/Adams/06-10-02-0113>]

³⁰ "Washington's Farewell Address" [https://avalon.law.yale.edu/18th_century/washing.asp]

³¹ "Thomas Jefferson to James Madison" [<https://jeffersonpapers.princeton.edu/selected-documents/thomas-jefferson-james-madison>]

If the people can't be trusted to choose their Congressmen, how can they choose a dictator? To the extent that fascism is autocratic monarchy with a dictator instead of a king, the reader should know that this writer is God's chosen king. As David's male heir, this writer's kingdom is guaranteed by God's covenant with David as written in 2 Samuel 7. The prophecy of God's Messiah in Genesis 49 states that he will command the obedience of the nations and this writer is the correct person to complete that task. Aside from God's favorite person David, this writer is also descended from Elizabeth Windsor, Anastasia Romanova, and Adolf Hitler, and many other kings and emperors, and this writer is well qualified to command to obedience of the nations. It is this writer's God given right to be king over the whole world and this writer's non-membership in any political class testifies to a superior quality of leadership over any dictator that might be chosen from such ranks. Due to the influence of the Norman invasion of Great Britain, a political entity currently exists called the United Kingdom which has a female monarch that can never inherit the divine right of a king as in God's covenant with David. While the United Kingdom has a throne, however, this writer is the rightful of King of Great Britain whose throne was spurned by the Jeffersonian Declaration of Independence. When crowned, this writer will burn the Magna Carta³² to assume full king powers and the Treaty of Paris³³ will be burned as well. It is suggested that the course for abolishing the failed USA government should be to make America British again, at that time.

³² With this 1215 charter, King John of England abdicated the sovereign authority of the English crown.

³³ The 1783 Treaty of Paris ended the Revolutionary War between the USA and Great Britain.