

War

18 May 2017

Generally understood as armed conflict between different nations, states or within one, I ask The Committee for future insight. History can be researched; coming trends, developments and destinations are what I want to explore.

Q: Esteemed Committee, who admits to liking war, when obviously it's considered bad?

C: This is a human view, to see war as bad. We do not see it as good or bad, we see it as human. Many people who derive benefit state their preference regularly.

Q: Military people?

C: Yes or also winners. This is not the majority however there always exist supporters of war.

Q: It strikes me that deterrence seems to be the biggest roadblock to its occurrence. How can humans remove the need for roadblocks and choose to avoid war?

C: Stop teaching it to one another.

Q: As y'all have often said about personal violence.

C: There is little difference.

Q: I'd say there's a HUGE difference; war requires a whole bunch of people to agree. Given the way humans disagree about everything, you'd think somewhere along the way somebody would put a stop to it.

C: To do that, your one "somebody" would hold the power of veto and thus would not be part of the decision process. To hold veto power means power to command, supplied by followers part of the collective agreement.

Q: I guess this means war isn't just about war but why groups decide.

C: And also how.

Q: What is the origin of human war? I explained in The Alien Handbook and also on this website, humanoid beings we humans are, were created through DNA splicing and growth. These first predecessors to ourselves, what we call CroMagnon man and Neandethals, did not start out having war. Did their alien ET masters teach them to organize into groups and attack one another?

C: The origins of war between humans are human, entirely.

Q: I read somewhere, the only animals besides homo sapiens which engage in organized war are ants. The teeth on fire ants seems to qualify as armed; I know from experience! Why?

C: The behavior of many animal groups has evolved just as understood, although this is not the case always. There are and have been a few interventions by alien extraterrestrial visitors, especially the ones involved with the seeding or planting of life on Earth in the earliest stages of this possibility upon the planet. This is the case with a very few species of ants.

This was done to promote balance and equilibrium among ant and other species with which the ants have regular interaction. The fire ants displace other ant populations but are themselves prey for flying insects. The interaction tends toward balance and equilibrium.

Q: We think humans messed this up, accidentally moving fire ants from one continent to another.

C: New equilibriums will be reached, although not as soon as humans prefer.

Q: Why do fire ants engage in war? I've even seen fire ants from one colony attack another when artificially mixed. [Don't try this at home, something else with which I have some experience].

C: To control territory and food, much the same reasons humans do.

Q: Are we reaching or even chasing human societal equilibrium by engaging in war?

C: Yes.

Q: How are we out of balance, as humans, as a group, to require or stand to benefit from war?

C: Many humans see life as what has been called a zero sum game. That the totality of what is available begins with zero and is added up. That wealth is not created but located. Human perceptions of what represents wealth and its origins, purposes and benefits are what feed war.

Q: How soon after the first humanoids were left to survive without alien ET creator involvement, did war begin?

C: Along the course of human development, in the way war is understood now, at about forty percent of the development level mankind has so far achieved.

Q: Why is intentional disarmament good or bad, from a human point-of-view?

C: Bad because you cannot control others, as we have often said. Good because it breaks the teaching learning cycle.

Q: How can personal preparation for self defense become armed conflict? The former good as humans see it, the latter bad.

C: Armed conflicts always begin when a group sees advantages or threats. The biggest initial step mankind can make is to identify threats, then develop plans to deter or protect oneself from them. The problem this involves is that placing attention on something creates it.

Q: That seems to contradict itself!

C: We shall go on; when the threat is identified, the identifier must broadcast its hopes and intentions to both the would-be or already known enemy and to all observers, also. This is possibly the greatest hurdle for humans, because such knowledge is considered a military secret; holding these types of information is considered power, an aphrodisiac many humans either do not resist or actively pursue.

Q: That would get us into a discussion of power, lust for it and control in general, a good subject for another day. In other words, reveal what has been discovered?

C: Yes!

Q: This means methods and people would be compromised and exposed to danger.

C: Remove them from danger before revealing what was gathered and how. Make certain it is understood that new methods and personnel, or spies as you might call them, can be re-introduced at any time to reinitiate gathering of intelligence.

Q: That's just a looming threat, and once the threat is removed...

C: Do not remove the threat; hold it open and above the heads of any would-be adversary. Over time, change will take place and the idea of armed conflict will fade.

Q: This seems so simple, why haven't we done this before?

C: Humans collectively have not considered it, because it has not been suggested in a big enough way. To the contrary, as you all know automatically, it is thought to be foolish to disarm. The threats which brought about arming in the first instance must be understood to have truly faded from the scene before voluntary disarmament gains popularity and is carried out.

Q: Did somebody way back when on, let's say Lemuria, steal a bag of apples, an event from which the apple loving friends decided to seize the orchard, giving birth to war?

C: Along these lines yes, however your fictitious example is just that.

Q: When do we stop coveting our neighbor's possessions?

C: When you realize there are no possessions.

Q: I can see hell freezing over first.

C: Humans can find new ways to reward effort, industry and accomplishment that do not involve money, itself the illusion of a possession no more than a wide agreement.

Q: The current trends seem to be elimination of borders and to modify social, cultural and legal institutions.

C: These are a possible and very good approach, with one large error made by humans in support of the concept; the burden for adjustment and amendment fall almost entirely on the host.

Q: I can certainly see the reasons porous borders are popular, and the appearance of sharing opportunity is very noble.

C: The border crossers themselves reinforce the dividing line even more than those who established it earlier. Elimination of national borders works against the interest of the crosser, who most certainly want the opportunity sought to remain available. The removal of a border leads towards removal of opportunity, as peoples and products flow freely. This means the conditions a crosser sought to escape can pursue the fleeing emigrant. Such new immigrant wants this not at all.

Q: I've never seen that point-of-view in any discussion; very good. So developing opportunity to replicate, not seek or pursue, is the better way to reduce coveting the things of others?

C: Yes, and involves a modification to habits. An amendment.

Q: The name of this website.

C: Yes, and mankind is carrying out the process of amending now.

Q: How can the downtrodden, the forgotten or the have-nots create opportunity without emigration?

C: This is easily achieved by following the formula already discovered and employed with success.

Q: Sounds so simple. As many a young person today might ask themselves, "Is there an app for that?"

C: It is that simple. It is a cultural barrier to discard habits or to adopt new ones, both approaches and attitudes humans employ well. To those humans resistive to change, a simple

self-examination of what is desired will clear up or reinforce the choice to resist. The cost of advancement is the loss of habit.

Q: It seems childish to then say, I want what country "B" offers but I insist on replicating my country "A" while I'm in "B" and I hope to get the established residents of "B" to provide it, with as little change to myself as possible.

C: We do not say if this is childlike or otherwise; it simply represents a choice. Do the hosts in "B" accept the arrival of entrants from "A"? If they do, they accept what follows.

Q: How does war fit into this, going forward?

C: It does not.

Q: There will be no war over immigration?

C: No.

Q: Are humans more warlike now than at any time in human history?

C: No, humans have been far more disposed to war through nearly all human presence on Earth. Human capability for waging war across a much larger surface area has increased.

Q: The cries for reduction in armed forces isn't new, but has enjoyed popularity recently.

C: It is a possible good item to include but is not the answer to organized conflict.

Q: Are the Armed Forces of the USA more capable compared to any other on Earth? Excluding nuclear weapons, which many nations have.

C: Yes, and by many multiples. Even when compared to N^o 2.

Q: N^o 2 is Russia?

C: Yes.

Q: Have wars been successful in the eyes of their participants, in the course of human history?

C: Yes, the short term gains were often very attractive, something even losers of the same conflict readily, if disappointedly, acknowledge. The risk of success is always carefully analyzed, in the current Earth environment. Where the cost is deemed appropriate, the risk of war rises.

Q: Japan's attack on the USA in 1941 showed a serious miscalculation.

C: It was not a miscalculation; it was more an ignorance of emotion. It was the oldest human habit of all; to measure what is observed in units of oneself.

Q: So said the one foot ruler to the meter stick!

C: The Japanese Emperor and his court did not consider the emotionality of their target, much as Hitler and his own jesters did not do this with Russia. The weapons do not operate themselves, nor do war strategies self draft.

Q: Anyone would admit, the potential gains were large.

C: Look what was gained, if lives have this measurement. In Heaven human life has no value because humans are temporary, souls permanent. Which makes the idea humans visit large scale death upon themselves far less traumatic. Often even part of a lesson.

Q: Is the war lesson from WWII this: Be careful, you could lose far more than is initially committed?

C: This conflict occurred for this precise mankind lesson. Both Nazi Germany and Imperial Japan would have avoided much of what they lost, if risk to their nations was thought possible, as happened.

Q: We Americans love the idea of peace through strength. I agree on an individual level [the image of a gentle grandmother in her front porch rocking chair with a shotgun close by, means she will have a tranquil day] but collectively? On a national level?

C: The one argument says removal of military power means inability to launch military attack. This is true; remove all military power worldwide, simultaneously. Will all Earth society member nations continue to abide, or will one cheat to specific advantage? This is a choice. How can national sovereignty be respected but policed also? This implies distrust, something humans adore. It offers power thus control thus wealth.

When wealth is redefined and reconsidered, then control thus power will both be altered and there will be no more war on Earth.

Q: Esteemed Committee, thank you for coming to the war room.

C: Our honor.

Q: PS, I have already offered your explanation of the French election misprediction [not a word, I know - but it works] so do y'all have anything to say to the readership, beyond and in addition to what you have said to me about it?

C: Yes, we tricked all of you readers. You are unhappy. Modify your ideas about money, wealth and gain for happiness to return. You voluntarily chose to value money and we know you will say you do not. The choice to gamble says yes, money is valued.

We are not saying happiness is the lack or loss of money. No, not in any way. Money is a toothbrush is a firearm; all three inert and ineffective until human use.

Your unhappiness now shows you a way to avoid disappointment, a way you did not have before or did not pursue. Act upon your beliefs, not solely information. If you believe you are uncertain, then certainty you already have. To say you are not sure means you are in deed and in fact very sure of one choice but wary of another option. Then choose the risk you prefer. If you lose money, you gain insight. If you gain money, you lose the opportunity its absence offered.

Be well one and all.