

Xxxx Xxxxx Xxxxx

16 July 2020

What's with this title? It's a "No Subject Post" where I allow rambling or rumbling thoughts and the questions arising from them, to direct the Q & A with The Committee.

Q: Esteemed Committee, hot air flowing from several sources in many directions at the moment, suggests 1990s era support for economic globalisation, the virtues of which were extolled at the time for the USA's middle class, have not been realised. Why was globalised trade suggested and why has it not produced gains once promised?(I'm intentionally using British misspellings, to show how "gloablised" I can be. [That was a British misspelling the Grammar Gods have already detected])

C: It was suggested to develop additional routes of control. It has not produced the desired gains because this was not the objective.

Q: What the heck was the objective?

C: Create more critical mass. Creating resistance to movement of that mass produces friction, the heat to be directed to the best benefit of whomever controls it.

Q: Booming trade between the USA and China, to China's great net benefit, benefits whom in China?

C: Business owners obviously, and the controllers and regulators of the business. China wants to sell more, America wants to pay less, the authority in the middle subtracts a share for itself.

Q: Isn't this just free market capitalism?

C: No. If free market capitalism were in effect, small and always temporary trade deficits would exist at the most. The existence of continuous and typically expanding trade deficits between nations are not natural. They occur because of restrictions, and benefit the authorities who impose the limitations.

Q: Who coordinates these restrictions?

C: Your good fellow humans the HCPs.

Q: What if no restrictions existed between nations? Any goods may be imported, their origin unimportant. What happens?

C: Your alien extraterrestrial friends would enjoy showing their histories of such developments, only if humans would consider halting economic regulation and restriction. No new policy would be adopted; none. Reductions and eliminations would be made, only.

The general benefit would be a great reduction in both poverty and poverty reduction measures. Many fewer poor humans would remain and almost no central authority intervention into the provision of economic assistance would, either.

Q: Why are cases of corona virus increasing, and serious symptom patients requiring hospitalization, also?

C: The virus was artificially stopped but only temporarily delayed, when measures were imposed initially. It is now running the course it would have to run.

Q: So....restrictions misnamed "quarantine, lockdown and social distancing" didn't work?

C: No, such measures only delay or postpone. The curve is not flatten-able.

Q: It would have been better NOT to clamp down on human interactions as was done in March and April of 2020, worldwide?

C: From an economic perspective, that is accurate. From a health perspective, restrictions were a postponement.

Q: If human activities had remained possible, would the virus have run its course by now?

C: Human societies would have entered a permanent reduction and decline of new virus infection, yes. The virus will seem to flare up again after it is considered finished, however this will not be a re-ignition of an epidemic or pandemic, despite alarm to the contrary.

Q: The world's economy has been hobbled and handicapped for what benefit?

C: This you can all decide as humans; from our perspective, the restrictions were done to allow people humans have placed in positions of authority, to exercise it.

It is common to hear the label "leader" applied to a person given authority by the population who has elected her or him. To where are you being led, why do you require such leadership either collectively or individually, and what awaits you at the destination? What is the destination?

Q: I never hear these questions asked. (I gotta get out more...) What about Hope & Change, or Make America Great Again?

C: Desire to modify what? Improved comparing now to when? Each of you may answer as you prefer. Collectively all of you go where you choose, not where you are led. To be taken where you resist going is not to lead you; you all must choose to follow. Why? Is it not possible to gather together and map your route with a view to the common goal, without choosing a leader with authority over you?

Q: Who wants all these damned questions, can y'all just tell us what to think?

C: Yes. Some listeners and readers would agree, some would disagree. This would produce what benefit for whom?

Q: There y'all go again with the damned questions!

C: A good job you are doing with your example of human desire to both grasp authority and benefit yet simultaneously shirk responsibility.

Q: Did the HCPs use the corona virus to assert authority, both to cause economic trouble and test limits of authority and population's compliance?

C: Yes.