

The Prince Principle Extracts

Table of Contents

Introduction

1. The Prince Principle simplified
2. Secret of the universe
3. Goodness as a point of view
4. The political reality
5. To Do we need to know what Is, as it really is
6. Asking the right questions
7. What is a thing, and how did it get to be as it is?
8. What are people like?
9. There are no objective views
10. The value of a small footprint
11. Indirect action is more direct than direct action can ever be
12. The Founding Fathers Principle
13. SEER Theory
14. The original Ockham's Razor
15. Don't take the food off someone's plate
16. Wilful ignorance
17. Just for a change
18. The Black and the White
19. There are no sides
20. There is no such thing as winning
21. Emotions in decision making
22. Intellect and the money chase
23. Apprehending power
24. 99% of the power

25. All recalcitrants have their “price”
26. Stockholm syndrome but not only
27. The enemy???
28. No gun to the head needed
29. But there is more than one way to skin a cat
30. The issue of deserve
31. All politics is local politics
32. The art of peace
33. Learning to apply The Prince Principle
34. Expectations
35. Frustration
36. Pyrrho almost had it right
37. Planning and adaptability
38. “Kin Selection” and “The Selfish Gene”
39. Necessary frame of mind
40. Respect the process
41. Motivations
42. A long journey
43. Maintaining a pristine intellect
44. You need to know things but,
45. Reading is easy (thinking is hard),
46. And keep your eyes open too.
47. The angel is in the detail
48. Education and purpose
49. Overreach
50. Pure power players
51. Alliances
52. We CAN solve EVERYTHING
53. The Generational Effect

Glossary

Appendix I – The Intermediate Democracy

**Appendix II – The Prince Principle summary
points**

**Appendix III – The “Ten Commandments” of TPP
negotiating**

Appendix IV – Current suite of TPP solutions

Appendix V – ANSR resource addendum

Not a windmill in sight

Epilogue

From

Secret of the universe

This is not THE secret of the universe, such a thing does not exist, but it is certainly one of them; and to ramp up the accuracy to a slightly higher pitch, it is not a cosmological secret of the universe but one of the secrets of the human universe; one of the principal understandings of human existence that is going to get us all the way to the best realistic outcome we can possibly imagine at our current stage of development:

**We must solve a problem
inside what it is.**

I mention this in two other books but in those other books challenge the reader to ponder what this might mean rather than lay it out. Allow me to elaborate this time.

What IS Overpopulation?

What IS Overfishing?

What IS Deforestation?

What IS Climate Change?

What IS the Middle East problem?

In trying to define the meaning of this “secret of the universe” the obvious corollary questions must be: How does society view these problems and under what premises do we try to address them?

Now when I say “What IS” this, this and this, I mean what actually is it AND what are the causes of it;

what makes it as it is?

In any of our biggest problems, how society views them is sometimes a shadow of what it actually is, and sometimes how society views a major problem is completely different to how it is in reality. There are no major problems we view as they really are. For edification, “the issue” is the general idea of what a thing is, and a major problem is the general idea of what a thing is, PLUS the causes of what make it as it is; so a deeper understanding of what an issue is.

Breaking down the causes of a thing is a little more than a little more complicated than almost everybody ever imagines. For example, if there is a cause of a major problem that all believe to be intractable, unsolvable, and for all intent and purpose it is, that cause will have a number of constituent parts, and most of those constituent parts will not be intractable. Things are at first more complicated than we imagine them to be, and then if we are able to delve into those depths, things then become less complicated, but in a very different way to how we originally imagined and not really less complicated; it just seems so after you go through the process of breaking a thing down into constituent parts.

From

The political reality

This one is going to be kept a little shorter than I had originally planned because to go into the specifics will seem far too verbally punitive on the general population. Nobody likes to hear that the failings of politicians are because we choose people for elected office who are the most like us, or even worse because they are the most charming option. We can't choose people who are like us or who have charmed us so much that we didn't even see who they really are, and then expect them to solve the things that we don't understand, or to react differently to policy and crisis than we would. With very few exceptions, politicians are NOT the cream rising to the top, they are simply part of the group who are the most shameless (and noisiest) in our society (and the most shameless are never, Never, NEVER, the smartest); there are degrees of shamelessness, and those on the Left are far less so than those on the Right, but they all belong to this group. These people we choose, who are very definitely not the cream, are then conditioned to be perennially posing for the next beauty pageant; that is the principal cause of impotence in politics; "what do I need to do in order to get elected next time" and "if I do this I'm going to alienate too many voters"; quite often making this judgement on something that they promised to do in the previous election in order to get elected. And in

regard to politicians that serve under conservative parties, re-election aside, they think of money first and second, and every decision they make in government or in opposition is informed by this focus.

From

Asking the right questions

In Sun Tzu's Art of War he talks about hobbling an army and this is the source of the idea for asking the right questions inside The Prince Principle. Inside Sun Tzu if you give orders to an army for it to retreat without realizing that it is impractical or impossible for it to comply, or if you give orders for it to advance without realizing that this action is also impractical or impossible to comply with, then you are hobbling the army.

If you're not asking the right questions when formulating, whatever it is that you're formulating, then you are doing to your intellect the equivalent of what Sun Tzu described in his passage on hobbling an army. It will try to obey "your orders", but it'll go round and round in circles and never make any headway.

For Climate Change you don't ask the question "can we fix it" or "what exactly is Climate Change" as the first point of discussion in public interaction. When you do this, as we did, you get mired down in the details of what it is and nothing can get done; even simple science is complicated for some people. But if

you ask the question “why do so many people object to fixing it”, taking it away from the non-human elements and into the human elements of the problem, this is where you can start to make some headway.

For one of the key elements of solving Climate Change, deforestation, you don’t ask the question about whether logging is good or bad for the environment, and all of the questions that spring forth from that avenue of inquiry. Your questions need to relate to the fact that all of those with power in and around the industry, including governments, view deforestation as a commercial enterprise, purely as a commercial enterprise. If you’re not asking questions about jobs and new markets, corporate profits and wages, then to take from the first paragraph above, you have “hobbled your army”.

Now given the scope of the H3 agenda and those elements of it that are already out in the open as at 2024, it would seem to be counter-intuitive to avoid the questions I’m saying we need to avoid, but you need to go through a long process on the human elements before you move into the realm of “can we fix it” in the public discourse. Until you’ve got the human elements right

EVERY OTHER QUESTION IS IRRELEVANT.

NOT LESS IMPORTANT. IRRELEVANT!

If you are trying to solve a problem and you’re ignoring the impacts it will have on the human participants in that issue, from wage earners all the way up to those

with 99% of the power in the issue, well, I just said it all with the 99% comment did I not?

The questions you ask need to be in their language, or to quote Corinthians “you will be speaking into the air”.

All of

Wilful ignorance

When you're out on the frontline trying to solve a major problem and you turn a blind eye to all of the negative human impacts that would result from adopting your “solution”, this is wilful ignorance. This one is no more complicated than that. When defining a solution inside The Prince Principle you must avoid the partisan views that lead you to this wilful ignorance or you won't be designing a solution, you'll just be designing a fight. None of our biggest problems need to be a fight anymore. If your “solution” causes a fight that delays the solving of a major problem, then you've either done it by accident or you've done it on purpose, but whichever it is you haven't designed your solution inside The Prince Principle. Try again, because it won't work.

The temptation to wilful ignorance can be strong because defining a “something” outside of the zero sum is not a simple thing for a modern human to do. It hasn't occurred to us yet that actually solving something inside the zero sum is not possible. Inside

the *quid pro quo, do ut des* negotiations that take place in our zero sum, moneyed-up society, nothing major can be solved, and that's the only way we ever try. When the core deal breaker requirement of one, is the core deal breaker problem of the other, you need to try something else, especially when the core can be defined as fifty, sixty, seventy percent of the issue in most cases. Unfortunately we've never imagined there was another way to do this in the big picture, until now.

The temptation to wilful ignorance is strongest when it comes to dealing with those we have always viewed as being responsible for the problem we're trying to solve. In the way we have always viewed things we have no other option but to hold the view that they do not deserve any special treatment, but even more, that they deserve to be punished. That they should be punished is certainly the case most times. That they don't deserve any special treatment is not only a reasonable view, but in common human perceptions as they have existed for as long as we remember, this is almost the only view to hold.

This is where The Prince Principle kicks in: The people who have caused the problems are almost always the people with all or most of the power in a major problem. So in regard to the issue of special treatment, do you want the *status quo*, do you want a fight, or do you want to solve the problem. If you actually want to solve a major problem in this world,

with or without The Prince Principle, then you must view the issue of Deserve as completely irrelevant; you must train it out of yourself or it WILL infect some of what you do. The issue of Deserve is addressed more fully in other chapters.

If we ask a protester what all of these people in the logging industry, the oil and coal industry, the whaling industry, and all of the others we object to will do for a living if the protesters get their way, and the best they can come up with is get another job without any appreciation of what it is they're saying – massive microeconomic impacts, worldwide recession (full of misery) in the case of the fossil fuels industry, and regional recessions (again full of misery) in the case of most others – then this is wilful ignorance: “I have my problem to solve and that’s the only thing I’m interested in.” This is a way to make noise. This is the way to a fight. It’s not a way to SOLVE anything.

From

Emotions in decision making

It is a long perpetuated fantasy in our societies that we must take emotion out of our decision making process in order to make good or balanced decisions. If we are to deal with other humans in this world, then that long held view is actually a little ridiculous if you think about it for more than a few seconds. We need to strive to incorporate our emotions into our decision making

process, not eliminate them.

When people say they are taking emotions out of their decision making what does it even mean? Does it mean that they will forego any thoughts of personal gain for themselves (does that emotion stay in)? Does it mean that when making decisions they are equally likely to come down on a side that is going to make their situation worse, because analytically speaking that's the best option (does that emotion stay in)? Does it mean that if forced to assign someone to a life threatening task they would choose their son or daughter to do it if someone less qualified were available to do the job (does that emotion stay in). Does it mean that a decision to sack 5000 workers is done without regard to any emotion? Not even a little *schadenfreude*?

As if people can actually take emotion out of their decision making in reality: it's just another red herring to justify bad, usually mercenary, behaviour without having to think of all that messy stuff like, ruining the lives of ten thousand people; you know, little stuff like that. What it actually means when somebody says they are taking emotion out of their decisions, is that they are reserving all of the emotion in their decision making for that which will give them a better outcome for them and them alone. Now that it's been said it sounds so obvious doesn't it?

Now having said that many of those who claim to be able to do such a thing truly believe they can do it;

let's examine what it is they are actually doing. When a person "takes emotion out of their decision making" what they are doing is drastically narrowing their sphere of concern when making a decision. In such a process you kick a hell of a lot of facts to the curb. When someone "takes emotion out of the decision making process" they are admitting that problem is too difficult for them, and this is how they make the problem more manageable; this is how they make the decision making process easier. The idea that your decisions will be better if you "take emotions out of the decision making process" is patently ludicrous if you think about it for more than just a few seconds.

From

Learning to apply

The Prince Principle

Anybody can try to apply The Prince Principle but in order to do it properly you need to be a certain type of person. You don't need to be a "wiz", and even though I have asserted that this WILL allow us to solve all of our biggest problems, for real this time, it doesn't require any spooky magical powers that only I can do. Because it is completely different to anything we've ever tried before it requires an intellectual roadmap and that's what this book is. There would absolutely be more than a million people in this world who could

apply The Prince Principle properly, but you will almost certainly need to have a certain range of views, attitudes and basic skills in order to do it:

- You need to be inquisitive.
- You need to use reason.
- You need to understand what facts are.
- You need to have life experience.
- Alas for those on the Right, you need to lean to the Left. I didn't really need to state this one because it becomes increasingly clear as you read the rest of this list. As the saying goes, "reality has a definite liberal bias".
- You need to have access to compassion for those outside your social group.
- You absolutely must be able to empathize with people who don't think the same way you do.
- You need to have a character that is more than just a tiny bit sensitive to shame. So in other words a healthy and fully functional Superego; nothing additional just one that operates properly.
- You need to be patient.
- You need to be of a moderate temperament; assertiveness without aggression, and very pliable.
- **Over a dozen more in the book.....**

www.h3hq.org