

Add \$50 Trillion and Shake

Extracts

www.h3operations.com

Book
Extracts

Table of Contents

Glossary

(Recommended reading first)

Introduction

(No desire is felt for a thing unknown)

1. **The Prince Principle**
(I give so that you may give)
2. **Superheroes**
(Superhuman from possibility to reality)
3. **Extrahyoidic Oratorious Jactitation**
(Wonderful to relate)
4. **Technology Intro**
(It is easy to add to things already invented)
5. **The Technology Curve**
(Let there be light, forever)
6. **Technology Directions**
(Such go the fates of men)
7. **The Technology Phantasy**
(All things change with many a groan)
8. **The Technology Reality**
(It is so)
9. **Choose One**
(Honesty is praised and is left to starve)
10. **A Novel Idea**
(Voice of the people for the people)
11. **The New Renaissance**
(A favourable but unexpected solution)
12. **We Are Our Own Masters**
(More obscurity out of obscurity)
13. **The Fantasy of War**
(I am what you will be, I was what you are)
14. **The Real World**
(Greater afflictions await us)
15. **The Future of War**
(That which justifies war)
16. **The Future of Capitalism**
(For whose benefit?)
17. **Intellectual Vs Militaristic**
(Let arms yield to the gown)
18. **“Feminism” as a Solution**
(The most important thing to be corrected)
19. **Pop Culture**
(An omen of a better age to come)

20. **Who Could've Known**
(Into the midst of things)
21. **Add \$50 Trillion and Shake**
(Plan for living together)
22. **Early Warning Signals**
(A word is enough to the wise)
23. **The Toxic Saturation Effect**
(A difficulty worthy of powerful intervention)
24. **A New Kyoto Protocol**
(Here lies the first Kyoto Protocol)
25. **The New Kiretsu**
(With united powers fortune herself will yield)
26. **SOTU on a Bubblegum Wrapper**
(Wonderful to see as much as you wish to see)
27. **Zarathustra's Wake**
(Burning the midnight oil)
28. **A Light Green Fairytale**
(What a world to live in)
29. **A Dark Green Fairytale**
(Just a story)
30. **Bits and Pieces**
(Let it pass for what it's worth)
31. **The Bridge**
(Prepared for all things)

Appendix I – The H₃ Operation
(We must yield to the times without delay)

Appendix II – H₃ Founding Principles
(To be rather than to seem)

Appendix III – The H₃ Vision
(The same road by different steps)

Appendix IV – “Bloopers”
(Perhaps a small spark may lie hid)

Appendix V – Numbers
(Elegant in simplicity, trust not to appearances)

Appendix VI – The 500 Year Bond
(My care is for the future)

CORRIGENDA –

UN Charter and US Constitution
(Where the law is uncertain, there is no law)

Epilogue (Not for self but for all)

Add \$50 Trillion and Shake is a non-fiction publication of 173,000 words. It is an introduction to a new approach to world affairs that will actually solve some of our biggest problems. In the very first chapter it gives us the knowledge of how we can solve every single problem in the world. The rest of the book deals with how we can apply this knowledge in the real world; how we can solve our problems by running with and taking account of human nature rather than fighting against it as we always do. The most materially significant part of the new approach is social, political and economic reforms that will increase the size of the global economy by tens of trillions of dollars. It is utterly impossible for so much new commerce to be ignored; the reforms will be implemented. Add \$50 Trillion and Shake is a handbook for the H3 operation that is not written as a handbook.

From the Introduction:

You cannot be hip deep in the system with all of its tentalisations and really want to change it. You can be in up to your toes and still want to change it, but not up to the hips. The individual who focuses all of their mental capacity on trying to get ahead in the system of commerce, of capitalism, begins to enjoy what they are doing.

If we don't enjoy a thing, then we're not going to be good at a thing, and if we're not good at a thing then we're not going to be able to move ahead in a thing, which of course is the original intention; you can't change anything unless you are in a position of authority is about the only thing such people get right in their desire to change the system from within. This is how it catches you: When you enjoy a thing so much, then you are not going to want to do something that will stop a thing.

Unless we are ever prescient of the principles of justification and incremental commitment in our quest to be good at commerce and climb the ladder, so that we can then "change the system from inside", our unconscious mind will develop a degree of the basest form of Utilitarianism, which is the hallmark of the pure capitalist (if it feels good do it, regardless of the consequences to others). And no-one has the discipline to be ever prescient of these principles as they're wading through the tentalisations.

The human mind is a sponge. It will absorb what is around it, and if the only thing that is around it is ideas inherent in capitalism, then that is what it is going to absorb. And if it feels good then it is something you are going to want to keep doing.

From The Prince Principle:

So if the group with 1% of the power and resources is trying to convince the group with 99% of the power and resources to do something, is it going to work better to hammer the environmental arguments or the financial arguments?

Is it going to work better to say, "sure I know people are going to lose their jobs, and you won't make as much money as you do now, but look at all the furry animals you'll save, they have a vital ecological role blah blah, and aren't the trees pretty as well". Now whether we like it or not this is almost exactly the messages the logging industry and governments are hearing from greenies, no matter what the greenies are actually saying. It's the polarization that does it.

People, ALL people, are not interested in the nuance if you are trying to take away their livelihood. This is not a completely unreasonable position when it is seemingly impossible to take the heightened emotional volatility out of the issue. So would that approach work; has that approach worked?

Or is it more likely to work if you say “I have a plan to reorganise the industry that will guarantee its vibrant growth and increased profitability for the foreseeable future, and it will take us away from the reliance on natural forests; the plan will see the creation of massive fully funded commercial corporations that will establish over one hundred million hectares of new plantations, and they will also wean us off the reliance on government subsidies, which will infer more prestige on the industry; we will double employment in the Forest and associated industries so the industry will have more power for this reason, and all owners in the industry will be three times richer in the process due to ownership of the larger corporations; and did I mention that we’re NOT creating overlords here and everybody will have roughly the same level of autonomy they enjoy now, perhaps a little more”.

It’s ridiculous to ask which of these will work, and which will not; one of them is of the past and one of them is of the future.

This is not an exaggeration or a caricature. This is exactly the choice before the Forest Industries through H3, and something akin to this can be done for every major problem in the world as a result of applying The Prince Principle.

From A Novel Idea:

This is not offered as a reform, just a suggestion. Championing a reform that completely realigns the power structure of a society is a very low margin option that needs to be seeded by individuals in power with higher ideals. Mikhail Gorbachev is seemingly the most prominent modern example.....

There is no fancy or kitschy name for the new system I am about to propose. It is, quite simply, a natural evolutionary step for democracy to take if it is to continue to be *pro populi*.....

If one were to simply remove the party system and have the current Representatives and Senators all operate as independents, in some form of sick emulation of the New Democracy, then what we’d get is impotent cacophony. But we’re not talking about doing this. This is an important point to make because it will be a feature of one part of one of the arguments against the New Democracy; you absolutely cannot suggest that the current batch of politicians will be anything like the parliament or congress the New Democracy would produce. The candidate selection process will deliver candidates of a far higher calibre than what we get at the moment, and the structure of the system will encourage a far higher standard of behaviour; we’re not only talking about intelligence here. People will be stunned to see just how different a system can be with the addition of real humility and reverence from all those elected to govern; the real deal, not the pretend stuff. People selected to govern in a system like this and for one term only, will view their job as a sacred trust, and what we see today, would not be seen tomorrow inside such a system. Representatives and Senators who come into office through the New Democracy will have respect for each other’s credentials, and after all, we’re not talking about putting politicians in here. I ask it somewhere else in this

book and I'll reiterate the point here, and I am truly sorry if it is insulting: Is there anybody out there who truly believes that even two of the one hundred strongest intellects in their country are actually in parliament?

So we get all the best people in parliament, but then we need to add one more thing; I'm nothing if not thorough: Presidents, Prime Ministers, Ministers, Parli Secs; they all enter their jobs and they get a detailed job description and instruction on what they must do and how they must do it. They are so happy to have just won or just been appointed to their post that it doesn't even occur to them to question how the job is done, even though they are the ones in charge.....

I will be getting behind and pushing the reforms that I mention throughout this book with all the resources I ever have, but the New Democracy I'll leave to someone else.

From The Real World:

Now we add to this the fact that we were killing their children long before they were killing ours, and still so even in the first decade of the 21st Century (and of course the Iraqis have never killed ours). In the twenty years around the turn of the century we were killing their children, in order to save them, is how the propaganda goes. What is so valuable that anybody would be willing to make such a sacrifice? Screw freedom and a hundred other vulgar pejoratives (in this usage), if children must be sacrificed *en masse* to get it. People who make the call for freedom at any cost are prepared to sacrifice everybody's children except their own. So screw not only freedom (if this is how we must get it), but also those calling for it at any cost.

Put yourself and your children on the front line. If you do this then we will know you are standing up for hard held principles. If you do this we will then believe you worthy of our attention, but until then keep your shxt to yourself and shut the fxxk up; yes calling out instructions for people to die from well outside the line of fire is clearly something that I have a big problem with. Historians will study the two wars in Iraq and, well, let's just say that history is not going to be very kind to the Bush boys, especially Bush the Younger. Would he even get the reference I just made, let alone the specifics of why the term should apply and where the comparison ends? More than, "a sight to make all nations stand and stare: a kingdom trusted to a schoolboy's care". We should not spare to be cruel and ridicule, one who wishes to be King but is only a fool.

From "Feminism" as a Solution:

You cannot be the new Gloria by trying to be the new Gloria; the new voice emerges by aspiring after the ideal not the individual; aspire after the ideal as it is manifest in the current environment; that's how we get the new and original voice. Aristotle or Plato did not revere Socrates, they revered the enlightened ideals Socrates represented, Newton did not revere Galileo or da Vinci, James Clerk Maxwell or Faraday did not revere Newton, and Alice Paul did not revere Mary, Elizabeth or Carrie (although she may very well have revered the overt action that Susan represented, and there's an additional message in there I think).

Yes, the overwhelming message of the superficial and material lifestyle is primarily focused on women, and when you are bombarded with it from before you can even talk it is not an easy thing to shake loose but you must. Focus on such a lifestyle takes you out of evolution; indeed it takes you out of everything that really matters. Do something! Be something! Stop this focus on self and stop the whining. We can't get to the Fourth Wave with the whiners. But we don't get there by fighting either. This is the time to understand human nature, and figure out how to get there by counting on human nature, both male and female. It's time to take the inherent strengths of being a woman out of the little blue gift box, and to start pressing it into the pages of the massive psych and sociology books, the places from which there is endless scope, and yet the places from which nothing original ever seems to spring forth these days; we believe ourselves to be the paragons of this planet, but just saying it's so doesn't make it so.

For those who believe they are up to it, there's a job to do and there's a world to change, that's it.

From Who Could've Known:

The comment "that we cannot solve a problem by focusing directly on it" is an idea that is occasionally brought up, but nobody ever explains it. I've occasionally wondered about whether the people who do this actually know the answer, or whether this statement has become just another one of those throwaway lines (I love you, hugging everyone you meet, yes I know, I always liked him or knew he was bad news, I came up with that idea, and I'm an advisor to the Dalai Lama etc.). If you want to make a positive impact on this world then it will help you to do so if you understand this "why". And it wouldn't hurt you to understand at least half a dozen other key ideas that are put forward in this book, the basic idea underlying The Prince Principle being chief among them.

So, why can't a major problem be fixed by focusing directly on it?

When you focus directly on a problem you polarise the issue and create opposition to your action from people who cling to what is, from people who have misapprehension about goals on all sides, from people who see opportunities to make money, from people who fight against things because it is their nature, in the more extreme there are those that simply want to see the world burn, and everything in between. When you focus directly on the problem, the problem becomes one of the side issues to be dealt with amidst all of the flurry of superfluous human activity, that is given a higher priority than the problem itself.

People can be very intelligent, but they also want what they want, and for almost everybody the ID will dominate the intellect. This is why we can't solve a problem by focusing directly on it.

Whenever anybody suggests an indirect approach, people immediately think of doing things behind people's backs or manipulation, but what is being suggested here is not large scale Machiavellian manipulation, just an approach that runs with human nature rather than against it. If you can get to the endgame before people have a chance to organise their Prejudices and Pre-Dispositions, they can see it in action, they can see the enormous benefits they'll get by letting it stand, and the PPD will drop away. And if it happens to be bad for them (in the case of H₃ reforms it never will be) then they can always knock it on the head before it is institutionalised.

Without a strong visual demonstration, anything out of the ordinary does not get past first base in this world, not anymore. Think of this approach as a long, drawn out and expensive way to provide a strong visual demonstration and you will not be that far afield.

From The Principal Chapter of the Book: (also called Add \$50 Trillion and Shake)

H3 is a significant ideological shift to what we've been doing for forty years. It is overdue, it is right for the times, but it is a long way outside normal experience, and so it remains for now, a thing to be demonstrated.

In the world we live in, our children are taught that money is the most important thing in society. We teach them this from before they can even talk. Even those people who use words to tell their children that money is not the most important thing, are telling their children through action that money is the most important thing. The way our society is structured it is almost impossible to do otherwise.

We add comments like "I work hard to get the money to give you opportunities that I didn't have" (or we make similar comments to others within earshot of our children), and we show open desire for material things and say a hundred different versions of "everything's so expensive", and "I want that car or boat".

When we are dealing with other human beings, and children especially, it doesn't matter what we say when our actions are saying something completely different. And "our actions" include the things we say without thinking and rhetorical such as those things in the above paragraph. Some adults retain this ability to prioritize action over words when defining who a person is, but all children learn by example, by actions, and only a little by words; and they're all out there learning from each other as well.

So we have a society of adults that have all been thoroughly indoctrinated into the view that money is the most important thing in the world. In the world we live in, places like America especially with "no" social safety net, it is almost impossible to develop a view contrary to this as we get older. So we end up with a society, a view, and a people that will not do anything of significance unless there is money to be made out of it.

We focus none of our collective intellect on solving our biggest environmental, sociological or political problems; amazingly, to do so is considered to be the height of naïveté. Just try to apprehend how truly ludicrous and self-serving that idea is. We look at a problem as if it is fire, and water is all we use to try and put it out. We try to "solve" complex problems with ridiculously simple approaches, then we sit back scratching our heads and wonder why we didn't solve this or that problem. Simplistic solutions, the politically safe route, is all that government will consider, all that they can consider.

This is the environment we must acknowledge if we are to solve the world's problems. But there is so much more.