

Peace through Conscious Scarcity

By Christopher Winn

2022

For Richard.

*“Get rid of the wise men!
Put out the professors!
Then people will profit
A hundredfold over.
Away with the kind ones;
Those righteous men too!
And let people return
To the graces of home.
Root out the artisans;
Banish the profiteers!
And bandits and robbers
Will not come to plunder.
But if these three prove not enough
To satisfy the mind and heart,
More relevant, then, let there be
A visible simplicity of life,
Embracing unpretentious ways,
And small self-interest
And poverty of coveting.”
-Lao Tzu, Tao Te Ching #19*

My friend Richard recently brought to my attention a photograph from the 2022 Conservative Political Action Conference (CPAC). It showed a banner above the main stage which read [“We Are All Domestic Terrorists.”](#) As the token American, and a Southern one at that, of our international friend group, he looked to me for context as to why CPAC would make this admission at all, much less proudly.

I guessed that it must be related to the reappropriating of the term “Deplorables” by American conservatives after supporters of Donald Trump [were labelled such by Hillary Clinton](#). A Google search revealed the likely source of this newest label—a leaked FBI guide on “Domestic Terrorism Symbols” that (amongst other things) cites support of the 2nd Amendment or usage of “historical imagery or quotes” from the Revolutionary War [as indicative of potential domestic terrorists](#).

This guide instantly made me feel uneasy, but it wasn’t immediately clear why. After all, I know that the guide is accurate, inasmuch as U.S. militia-types certainly use “2A” and “Molon Labe” and the Gadsden Flag. One could perhaps object that it is unfair to vilify these symbols since they are used by non-violent patriots with great frequency, but considering that many FBI agents likely own a Punisher Skull sticker or Betsy Ross Flag, that seems an over-literal critique. The document even states that “The

use...of these symbols should not independently be considered evidence of [militia] affiliation...”
Eventually I decided that the guide is primarily objectionable in two other ways.

Firstly, it is objectionable that anyone believed the “FBI Internal Use Only” header would prevent it from becoming a public relations nightmare the moment it drifted into view of a smartphone. The FBI and intelligence community writ large have not exactly been cultivating the good graces of the populist populace as of late (hence why Trump was able to get elected by verbally sticking it to the spooks of “The Deep State”). Thus, cultivating a list of symbols, some of which are among the most popular modern Americana imaginable, and then ascribing them to terrorists in need of neutralizing, was destined to go over only slightly better than if one were to do the same with the American flag and the old rugged cross, or perhaps just a Caucasian infant and a golden retriever. In this it joins similar documents from similar agencies in recent years that have especially pinned potential domestic terrorism on military veterans.

The second objectionable aspect is not for what it contains, but what it *does not* contain. Such is beyond the guide’s purview—but perhaps it ought not to be. I am thinking of *why* these symbols in particular feature so prominently, not only within extant militia groups, but almost certainly within any “spontaneous” domestic terrorism that may appear in the near future. In other words—why would symbols of such broad appeal to American “normies” translate just as well to American extremists?

I believe (without getting sidetracked by the academic nuances of symbolism) that the answer is quite plain. The reason the symbols translate well between the two groups is because it is no longer difficult to image the two groups becoming of one mind under certain circumstances. Whereas the line between being a “normal” Irishman and an IRA member requires a very specific ideological bent in the extreme Catholic and irredentist direction, the motive of being an American militia member seems only to require the rather amorphous proposition that “the government is doing such a bad job that we must oust them with force.” One may also note of this statement that it could intriguingly be said by either extreme political pole; as the recent campaigns of American Antifa have shown us, one may be anti-gun and anti-capitalist while wielding guns and being bankrolled by billionaires. To no one’s surprise, hypocrisy does not inhibit politics.

I articulated how this extremist game of Red Rover begins by pondering to Richard that it occurs whenever “1st world expectations meet third-world realities.” Or, to more concisely quote the great Alan Moore’s *Killing Joke*, “All it takes is one bad day...” To any cynical student of history who has ever been kept up at night by the past deeds of one’s fellow man, it eventually becomes apparent that these are haunting not only because they could occur at all, but because of how shockingly little there is in place to keep them from occurring again. It is difficult to conclude otherwise than that, for the average human being, a certain level of comfort *precedes* empathy. Sate a person’s constant struggle for survival, and they will begin to think upon the troubles of others. Otherwise, excepting the teensy Buddha/Christ

minority, the selfish solipsistic ape will generally do what it does best (chimpanzee barbarism meet bonobo hedonism), regardless of whatever particular blend of political bullshit it has been conditioned to spout.

Speaking of, I must admit that a certain frankness about this unpleasant reality of human nature is rather what I respect about our rightwing. To my mind, it is more honest to ask, “Why should I care about XYZ (illegal immigrants, for example) when *my family’s* quality of life is decreasing?” than it is to affect a limitless empathy that dries up at the first sign of trouble. This could even be the rough delineation between being merely *kind* and being truly *good*. Kindness is donating \$10 when one has \$100,000. Goodness is sharing the last loaf of bread, knowing full well that it is the last.

An infantilism about this inherent selfishness seems to be the root cause of our misunderstandings concerning what happened in Germany just before WW2. As it is taught to children today, we are to believe that everyday Germans mysteriously went from living in peace with and even intermarrying amongst their Jewish neighbors—and yes, even buying their newspapers and keeping accounts in their banks—to disliking them merely because a new chancellor said they should. This is completely disingenuous given that we know what actually happened. The economic ruination wrought by the post-WWI Treaty of Versailles led to reactionary overprinting and thus hyperinflation of the reichsmark currency under the Weimar Republic. Consequently the possibility of the last loaf of bread became a reality for many, even unto child prostitutes working street corners to subsist. The veterans of WW1, including a certain Austrian painter, witnessed this making of the proud Motherland into a whore and resolved to do whatever to rectify it. On the Night of the Long Knives, the Reichstag, home to Weimar’s parliament, was burned and many of its political denizens assassinated. After the previous political leadership was dealt with, a scapegoat was turned to—Germany’s upperclass, the Haves to the average German’s Have Nots, who happened, due to the immigration and industriousness of that people, to be predominantly Jewish. Political and class-based warfare has a funny way of becoming every other kind of warfare, including racial.

Economic ruination>political resentment>class (etc) warfare over the scraps. The tale is simple enough for any historian to follow, but we play coy to avoid even the slightest hint, not even of *sympathy*, but merely of *comprehension* concerning the Nazi. This may even be witnessed via the taboo topic that has become of Israel’s genocide against Palestine. That a secular nation-state was carved out of Palestine with the prevention of another Holocaust as its primary excuse, only for the pitied people group to then immediately adopt the role of aggressor, is a too-bitter education in humanness for most. Such will prove a classic case of refusing to learn from history and thus repeating it.

To briefly apply this Weimar rationale to My People—that is, the middle-working class American, usually white though not always, better at accumulating debt than wealth, enthused about the

military and televised sports in a Hero Worship sense, a fan but not a follower of whatever god they profess, who is proud to be an American *solely because* the U.S. is “the land of opportunity” and they and theirs have had a lot of opportunities—the Tea Party during the Obama era was but the first stirrings of their “1st world expectations” meeting “3rd world realities.” The next pang was MAGA and January 6th (history’s first unarmed “coup,” a modern miracle in a land with a rifle behind every blade of grass). My people are long suffering, but they are not all-suffering. And they are saying, repeatedly and louder each time, that they are suffering.

Thus, we must at the very least ask—ought we to care? Is a “first world problem” negated by the existence of third world problems? Are expectations so fictional that they ought not be considered in the realm of fact, even though they often influence the realm of fact? Is any problem of the privileged not a problem because they are privileged, even though the privileged logistically hold the fate of the unprivileged in their hands? Shall we ignore non-life-or-death problems until they employ Life and Death as their attention-getters?

My people are not *bad* people. They are *entitled* people, but they are not *bad* people. They simply dare to suppose that the American Dream they were sold—a slow but perpetual progress wherein their children’s lives are better than theirs were (even though theirs were already Pretty Damn Good) need not be woken up from. Is it not appropriate then that their ideological opposition are called The Woke?

Before one hastily and resentfully answers “no!” to the original question, we should understand what the consequence of answering Yes would be, and that they would better the playing field for absolutely everyone except the hyper-elite. I call it Conscious Scarcity.

- That future economic expectations and “American Dream”-esque propaganda ought to be intentionally lessened, not due to social justice equity which is a P.R. dead-end, but because [“we’re consuming ourselves not because the fixation on progress is inevitably self-destructive beyond a certain threshold, but because material progress has objectively stalled while we remain collectively in denial about this fact”](#). In other words, circa the ‘90s and early 2000s were the peak of First World middle-working-class comfort above and beyond any nostalgia, and therefore we ought to intentionally pivot from a Decadent to a Tightened Belt culture before it is resentfully forced upon us.
- That central and fractional reserve banking, fiat without standard/debt without limit, and corporate buybacks/derivatives (“usury” for conciseness) are the Satanic Trinity in economic terms and ought to be banished as such. In other words, it is better to mirror the objective reality of scarcity within one’s currency and monetary policy including markets than to indulge in the Keynesian-esque illusion of infinite arbitrary wealth (which has been tried many times before Keynes and always ends with imperial Decline and Fall). A truly free market wherein “neither a

borrower nor a lender be” reigns as the predominant philosophy is the strongest historical bulwark against class warfare due to equality of opportunity (class mobility) despite inequality of outcome (aka nature).

- That, due to clear-eyed recognition of the corruptions of human nature (which were excellently addressed *at the time* by our Founding Fathers’ constitutional “checks and balances”) we ought at every opportunity to pursue Decentralization, so that the morality or immorality of human leaders, be they elected or spontaneous, is irrelevant to the political health of nation-states. So long as the ability to vest the necessary power to a rightwing Hitler or leftwing Stalin is possible, tyrants will continue to emerge during times of crisis. Therefore their very potentiality ought to be eradicated outright with decentralized cryptographic checks and balances, such as smart contracts that could act as emergency killswitches to the future’s automated infrastructure during mass violence (mutually-assured destruction in one’s own backyard). Those who have no choice but to play nicely generally do. The idea is of course not to render violent revolution totally impossible, but to make its self-inflicted price equal to its other-inflicted cost so that supposedly civil societies cannot so conveniently decide to abandon the base civility of their own social contracts. NOTE: this is *not* the same as creating an A.I. god to make our decisions for us, as this is simply a tyrant without flesh and blood who thus could not be dealt with in *Sic Semper Tyrannus* fashion. Nor should anyone be compelled to partake in an implantable biometric system, as this also carries with it potential problems that could prove logistically permanent and thus unsolvable. Society must be voluntary and therefore escapable at every step; the involuntary and inescapable are the stuff of nightmares.

To recap, it ought to be no wonder that the middle and working classes of hitherto prosperous nations, who have something to lose yet cannot afford to lose it, resort to “domestic terrorism” when they perceive that their economy has been mismanaged to the point of failure. Nor is it any surprise that devilish tyrants use this precious period of chaos to possess the spirit of the nation. The easiest rhetorical method for such an upstart tyrant is to define a common enemy—a class group such as Russian kulaks or German Jews who are simultaneously blamed for mismanaging the economy and accused of intentionally prospering from its ruination.

Indeed, it is all too easy to roughly guess who-will-be-who in societal breakdowns—the ease of it is why we tend to indulge in such preemptive finger pointing rather than taking any steps to prevent it. The American Left have most recently lived this out by masterfully playing the part of The Boy Who Cried Wolf. Their “literally Hitler” “mean tweeting” “Orange Man” proved a merely annoying flash in the populace pan, because in our game of economic hot potato his first term happened not to coincide with the collapse of the U.S. dollar. Indeed, Trump would not have come to power to begin with, if not for the

populace voting for him because our infinitely annoying Leftish media told them they mustn't. Said media learned so little from their first foray that they are currently working hard at getting him elected again (my favorite example was them dragging Dick Cheney out of whatever coffin and cave he was sleeping in to run an anti-Trump ad on cable TV. "I was going to vote for Trump, but then Vlad the Impaler said not to...").

Should Trump lose again or pass a second term without economic collapse, then I will revert to my usual theory—the strongman to scan the horizon for is the one who can genuinely identify with the populace in Hitler/Stalin "I too have lost everything" fashion, and in some sense fights alongside his own troops in Alexander/Napoleon fashion. I also would not be surprised to see him advocate for the only version of Conscious Scarcity that is even worse than doing nothing, which is the aforementioned A.I. or implanted biometric tyranny. The hour is late; let us all hope we can find [our inner Witold Pilecki](#).